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PROCEEDINGS

CTC CHAIR INMAN: Can I call the meeting to order, please? Can I get you all -- it's great to have such a good crowd, but let's get to work. So here we are. Fran Inman, Chair of the California Transportation Commission. And one point of order, if anybody is looking where to turn in their speaker card -- Doug, if you can raise your hand over there. He is collecting them. So make sure everybody gets a chance to share with us.

So with that, we are going to go first to our Pledge of Allegiance. So if you all would join me, we will say the Pledge of Allegiance.

Okay. Right back here.

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

CTC CHAIR INMAN: Okay. This -- my goodness. We're a noisy crowd, that's all I can say.

So anyway, thank you all for joining us today. This is our second combined meeting. And I would say let's roll up our sleeves and get together. It's great to be here at Metro. We wanted a great big room and we got one, so it's great to have so many folks with us.

I just really want to thank everybody for their engagement and for all of my fellow Commissioners and the
CARB Board Members for carving time out.

    This is important work for all us to do together. And I know everybody has a gazillion things and we tend to get working on our stuff. And I think the more we can sit around tables and roll up our sleeves and get work done together will be great.

    So looking forward to the presentations today. I want to thank our staffs both at the CTC and at CARB, because behind all of this there has been an awful lot of work that's been done, so these things look rather easy by the time we get here. But it's not because there isn't an awful lot of hard work and commitment from hard working great staff. So join me and let's give our staffs a big shout-out. Thank you.

    (Applause.)

    CTC CHAIR INMAN: And I do see in the room a lot of our transportation partners and stakeholders. And it's absolutely fantastic that we have so many of you here with us today. And with that, we're going to defer the roll call. Unfortunately, we have some traffic issues and logistics issues on both boards this morning. So we're missing a few. Intel tells us that they're within range. But being one that kind of had to jump out of her car and transfer the keys, I know what that feels like. So we will call the roll once we -- in about 10 or 15 minutes.
So with that, I'd like to pass it to my fellow Chair, Mary Nichols, for some opening remarks.

ARB CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you very much, Fran.

So at our last meeting, we were in the CalEPA building, and the CTC members came to us. This time, we're in a transportation facility, although, it's not owned by the State. But I, too, want to thank the MTC for having us here. We've been hosted already this morning. We had a need to do a conference call earlier. We were given a room and tremendous kindness in helping us find our way around.

So it's good to be here. And as you noted, the statute that told us that we needed to get together once -- twice a year, every six months, was premised on the idea that coordination needed to happen, and people needed to see that it was happening. And I think our first meeting was a good indicator of the fact that we could get together and just go over some very specific issues, but also share viewpoints, and get to know each other better.

And I view this as an opportunity to continue as we delve into some pretty deep waters on issues that are pending in the state with respect to climate and transportation.

So thanks for chairing this time, and let's get to work.
CTC CHAIR INMAN: All right. So today, we do have a robust agenda. And typically we like to hear the public comments with each item. But today, we're going to try to get through the bulk of the agenda, and then engage our public comments, just out of fear that we won't get to cover the agenda that's set in front of us. So we welcome the public participation. I don't want you to feel discouraged at all. We want to hear from you. And you're welcome to comment later as well, I think. But Doug collecting cards.

So with that, I'd say we all get started. So I think we do have some of our Assembly Members here. I know we're going to call Chairman Frazier out when we do the roll call. But I also want to call him out right now. We do appreciate you joining us today.

We appreciate all you've done for transportation and continue to do. And we love your passion and support for the transportation sector.

And Assembly Member Cervantes, is she here? Yeah. Okay. Good you made it. I assume you didn't have a great commute either this morning.

(Laughter.)

CTC CHAIR INMAN: Thank you so much. And she's -- Assembly Member is really the one -- the statute that said, hey, you all need to sit around a table on a
regular basis. So we thank for you that, and here we are. And so it's fun to see those come together. So do you want to make a statement, Assembly Member?

ASSEMBLY MEMBER CERVANTES: Yes.

CTC CHAIR INMAN: Okay.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER CERVANTES: Yes. Thank you so much. Good morning to all of our Commissioners and Board members, as well as my colleague Assembly Member Frazier. It is great to be back at the second joint meeting of this collaboration with the CTC and CARB.

As you know, this collaboration is a clear directive from Governor Brown to set forth our State's clean transportation policies. And, you know, we need to ensure that we achieve this region by region engaging every community, every stakeholder along this process.

The recent election mandated by voters of this great state was clear and convincing. They want state dollars invested in a modernized system of transportation infrastructure. And this much is clear to me, the economic and environmental shift toward a clean economy is imminent.

This week -- I'm not sure if many of you had an opportunity to go down to the L.A. Car Show. You can go down there till December 9th. You will see a fleet of new electric vehicles. Announcements by General Motors,
Volkswagen, and eventually Ford that full electric vehicle production is coming, and it's indicative of this trend.

However, our goal is to identify solutions that make progress on all these efforts. As we know, this is already under way, and -- within this realm. And moreover, recently, as we read the White House report on climate change, it presents this ideal opportunity to show how our state could, with proper planning and execution, can make real meaningful change.

And that is what we look forward to -- what I look forward to engaging with many of you on in this year to come and beyond. Thank you for all of your hard work and your commitment to our great state.

CTC CHAIR INMAN: Thank you, Assembly Member. Also, it's great to have Secretary Annis with us today. We really appreciate you joining us. It's important. You are our partner, and we truly appreciate that.

So with that, I want to give a shout-out to our friends at Metro for hosting us. We, at the CTC, don't have our own great big board meetings, so we partner with our friends on everything we do, including where we meet. So here we are, and -- is Phil Washington here?

Okay. Phil, come on down.

MR. WASHINGTON: Well, thank you so much, Madam Chair. And thank you to the joint committee. Let me just
say that we appreciate your leadership. We thank you for
your leadership as you lead in this area of the state.
Welcome to Los Angeles. We're happy that you are here.
We think that Los Angeles is the perfect place to talk
about mobility, to talk about innovation and all the
challenges that we face right now.

(Thereupon an overhead presentation was
presented as follows.)

MR. WASHINGTON: Just wanted to go through just a
brief deck here. You all know the area and you know how
many people that we have here. Lot's of folks, lots of
cars, the most populous county in the U.S., and a lot more
people coming to Southern California in the next 40 years.

--o0o--

MR. WASHINGTON: L.A. County is really, really
big. It is incredibly big.

(Laughter.)

MR. WASHINGTON: The last time I looked, L.A.
County was larger than 42 states. So the -- just the vast
area that we -- that we service is just tremendous. And
we believe that L.A. Metro is really uniquely situated to
address the challenges facing CARB and the State. With
this great population and the housing and transportation
needs that are out there, we can be an incubator for
innovation, which is what we are looking to do.
L.A. Metro, just at a quick glance, third busiest transit system in the United States. We're behind New York and Chicago. We're gaining on Chicago in term -- and I can say that, because I'm originally from Chicago, so we're going to overtake Chicago.

(Laughter.)

MR. WASHINGTON: Lots of employees. Lots -- huge fleet of buses, 2,300 buses, which by the way, we're looking to electrify the whole fleet by 2030, ten years before the State mandate of 2040. Lots of freeway HOV miles as well.

--o0o--

MR. WASHINGTON: We are in a very, very unique role, where we are an operator, a builder, a funder, and a planner for the region. We also play a huge role in what I call transit-oriented communities, joint development, station area planning, funding to meet the sustainability communities strategy. Right now, and I read the report -- the recent report, I believe, from last week, where it talked about the State may not be reaching their targets, but we do have Measure M. We do have SB 1 funded projects. And I believe that they are helping us reach those targets.

--o0o--

MR. WASHINGTON: Measure M, I don't expect you to
see all these lines, but the green is our transit projects, the blue our highway projects. We have 40 major highway and transit projects within the next 40 years. We are in full build mode, and that includes transit systems, highways, looking to make this a sustainable community in Southern California.

--o0o--

MR. WASHINGTON: Some of you have seen the pie chart here for Measure M. It is the most comprehensive program in North America, where we are -- we have the largest piece of this pie is transit projects. We have a slice for highway projects. We have a slice for local return, that is giving money back to the 88 cities in this country for them to do their local streets and roads.

--o0o--

MR. WASHINGTON: And then we are looking to become, what I call the Transportation Center of Excellence for this country. While we're implementing the largest transportation expansion program in America, this gives us a great opportunity in our minds to become the transportation center of excellence. And so we've put together a five-point plan that talks about the idea of being the Transportation Center for Excellence.

This first point is mobility innovation. We are partnering with the private sector in a big way to
implement mobility improvements. Our -- we created an office of, what I call, extraordinary innovation.

We have evaluated over 100 unsolicited proposals. And what we're saying to the private sector is you do not have to wait for us to put out a request for proposal, an RFP, we want your ideas unsolicited. We will evaluate those to see if they make sense. We have received, as I said, over 100 unsolicited proposals for very, very large transit projects and small projects as well to include our mobility on demand, our microtransit on-demand bus service that we're looking to implement right now.

So we're confident that these transportation options will help us attract new riders as we implement these various plans.

--o0o--

MR. WASHINGTON: The second point is capturing the hearts and minds of people. And I often talk about how the car industry, they've done a great job over the years of making car ownership and driving a car very, very sexy. I mean, I -- you know, when you look at commercials, you have, you know, the hair flowing in the wind, Matthew McConaughey, you know --

(Laughter.)

MR. WASHINGTON: You know, he's driving the Lincoln Navigator, or whatever. So the question is how do
we capture the hearts and minds of people as it relates to public transportation?

And so we are looking to do just that. We have a new Join the Movement video that is playing in prime time, looking to enhance the customer experience as we deliver these outstanding trip experiences for our customers.

We also have put together a Strategic Plan Vision 2028. It looks at the next decade and looks to put customer experience at the core of everything that we do.

--o0o--

MR. WASHINGTON: And we're also doing, what we call, a Next Gen Bus Study. We are reimagining our entire bus service that we have on the street, starting from scratch, and wiping the slate clean. We know that there are new employment centers around the county, new residential centers. So we're wiping that slate clean and putting out a whole new batch of bus service as we go forward.

This is about a 15 to 18 month effort. And we will complete this effort and bring it to our board some time mid next year.

--o0o--

MR. WASHINGTON: The third piece of this five point plan is really embracing equity. And we took to our board what we call an equity platform for adoption. What
we're saying here is that everything that we do, we will look through the lens of equity to see if it makes sense and is equitable for the communities in which we traverse.

We want to look at every project through that lens, every infrastructure project, every bus route through the lens of equity, and make sure that we are addressing this issue of service on the street, making sure that we're embracing equity in our transit-oriented communities, looking to prevent displacement and gentrification where we can. We understand that we do not control everything, but we can influence, instigate, and impact.

So we're working with local cities and the county more than ever to work through zoning issues and funding issues to prevent more sprawl and build more infill housing.

Around this equity piece, we are also looking to build career pathways in the infrastructure space. We're looking to build the workforce of the future. One of our big concerns is do we have the workforce -- the qualified workforce to do all the projects that we have -- that we've been asked to build, the construction job trades, the special trades, the hard-to-fill positions like track signal maintainers, signal inspectors.

And so SB 375 can and should be a job creator,
and we should sell it that way as well.

--o0o--

MR. WASHINGTON: Also, in this embracing equity sort of category and understanding that we are concerned, and we all should be concerned about the lack of a qualified workforce, we are developing a transportation school, a transportation school grades 9 to 12. We have kicked this off. We're partnering with the County of Los Angeles with a focus on young people in those grades, kids in those grades from the foster care system, from at-risk kids that are in the system with a focus on transportation infrastructure skill sets.

--o0o--

MR. WASHINGTON: The fourth plan in our five-point plan is fostering continuous improvement. We are looking to be responsive, accountable, trustworthy. We are -- in this area, we are really focusing on our best practices and lessons learned as the guiding principles also being a good steward of taxpayer dollars, of course. We don't take for granted the trust that the public has put -- given to us through local sales tax measures. And so we're being very, very judicious in how we do that. And part of this is forging a new working relationship with the State across many different projects and programs.
MR. WASHINGTON: And then the final point is what I call stepping into leadership voids, and really transforming transportation in L.A. county. It's really -- it happens through a regional collaboration, as I said earlier.

MR. WASHINGTON: Stepping into these leadership, voids, we do not control everything, but we can influence. We can impact. We can instigate. We understand that mobility is really the foundation of our local and State economy. And we think sustainability will be a major industry in our state. And so again, while we don't control these things, we can instigate. We can influence the lack of affordable housing. We can talk about the surplus of parking, too much parking, making it easier for people to drive. We can weigh-in on those things.

And then also stepping into leadership voids, remaking Union Station where you're at right now for the future to accommodate the many projects that we are building through Measure M.

MR. WASHINGTON: We are also looking to stand up a -- what would be the first in this country a full-on passenger railcar manufacturing facility. Right now,
there are assembly facilities around the country, but there's no full-blown railcar -- passenger railcar manufacturing facility. We want to stand one up right here in L.A. County. We think that the country and the need that we have right here in Southern California calls for that. We convened a group of railcar manufacturers around -- from around the world this last August. And there's great interest in standing up a railcar manufacturing facility right here to make our region more sustainable.

And then lastly, in terms of stepping into these leadership voids, we want to leave, what I call, an infrastructure inheritance for our children - not an infrastructure deficit - an infrastructure inheritance where our kids can talk about how this generation left this infrastructure inheritance, and we made the decisions that were necessary to protect them as we move forward in reducing our carbon footprint and building infrastructure in this country.

--o0o--

MR. WASHINGTON: So let me say that we appreciate the partnership. We appreciate the opportunity to highlight some of the things that we're doing. And lastly, thank you so much for your leadership.
CTC CHAIR INMAN: Thank you, Phil. If you can standby just a second. I want to see if my colleagues have any questions. But I have a couple of quick ones. Bears/Broencos, Rams/Chargers, do you know? Do we -- just kidding.

(Laughter.)

MR. WASHINGTON: I'm a fan of both, unless they're playing each other.

(Laughter.)

CTC CHAIR INMAN: Well, we're so delighted that you're here, and we really do appreciate your leadership. One thing that I was thinking about -- a couple of things. One is we've got some games coming up. Maybe you want to opine a little bit about our transportation participation to really ensure that our Olympic games are successful, and what lessons we've learned, and what we're trying to really roll up our sleeves and kind of accelerate, I think, so to speak.

And then another question, this -- you don't need to answer this one. But I think it would be good for all of us to get in the habit of sharing the five things that are keeping us up at night, or the three things that we wake up and we worry about. Because I think that kind of will get us to the heart of what problems we really need to work on together.
So that would be great. But if you could maybe just speak briefly --

MR. WASHINGTON: Sure.

CTC CHAIR INMAN: -- about the Olympic Games, I say that as the former Chair of the L.A. Chamber, I can never put that hat away. So we have partnered with Phil, the business community has, on an ongoing basis. And clearly, the success in landing the games is something that we're all very proud of.

MR. WASHINGTON: Yes. Thank you for the question, Madam Chair. The 2028 Olympic Games is on our mind big time. We have an initiative called 28 by 2028. That is 28 projects that we are looking to complete by 2028.

And these 28 projects are some highway projects. They are some transit projects. We have mobility on demand on that list. We are well on our way to complete those projects by 2028.

Now, there are some challenges, because eight of the 28 projects are actually outside of the ten-year window, when you look at the Measure M schedule. And so the challenge has to do with advancing the funds -- the funding and moving that funding up to be within the ten-year window. So that is our challenge.

As a matter of fact, I'll be briefing the L.A.
Metro Board this Thursday on some ideas to move that money up into the ten-year window to complete by the Olympic Games. And, of course, one of the line items in that funding plan includes the state, some funding assumptions. So thank you in advance.

(Laughter.)

MR. WASHINGTON: So we -- we're excited about that. We're excited about what we can do with 28 by 28. And then your other question, what keeps me up at night.

I actually sleep pretty well.

(Laughter.)

MR. WASHINGTON: But right before I fall asleep, a couple of thoughts. One is as we -- as we put all of this work -- this infrastructure work on the street, do we have the contractor capacity? That concerns me. The contractor capacity.

I mean, we've got 28 by 2028. We've got a football stadium going up. We've got cranes all over Southern California. So do we have the contractor capacity?

And I talk to contractors all the time. And we want to be able to implement all kinds of delivery methods, whether it's design-build, design-bid-build, public-private partnerships as well. And so the question,
as we try to accelerate projects, has to be will the
private sector take on risk to do, in this case,
public-private partnerships and put money out there to
advance our projects.

The other thing that I think about right before Iall asleep is this issue of the qualified workforce. The
qualified -- the lack of a qualified workforce. We need
to grow our own for them to work on these projects. It's
not that we don't have the pool of young people to work on
these projects. The challenge is how do we train them.

CTC CHAIR INMAN: Chair Nichols, did you have any
questions for Phil.

ARB CHAIR NICHOLS: No questions. Thank you.
It's a pleasure to meet you. And I've been living in Los
Angeles for many years now, and only recently begun to
take advantage of your system. And I appreciate it very
much, appreciate what you're doing. Thank you.

MR. WASHINGTON: Great. Thank you.

CTC CHAIR INMAN: How about any other questions,
comments from other colleagues on the dais?

Okay. Phil, I guess you're off the hook, but
thank you so much.

MR. WASHINGTON: Thank you. Thank you.

CTC CHAIR INMAN: Okay. Are we ready to take
roll?
One more. Okay.

We're still waiting for one more. So we'll delay our roll call. And we will move now to Item number 3, Senate Bill 150, the report findings, and Carey.

(Thereupon an overhead presentation was presented as follows.)

MS. KNECHT: All right. Good morning. And thank you Commissioners, and Board members, and staff. My name is Carey Knecht. And I am a staff member with the California Air Resources Board's Sustainable Communities Section. And I'm very happy to be here today to share key findings from CARB's report to the legislature under Senate Bill 150 on the progress that has been made in reducing the greenhouse gas pollution from passenger vehicles under SB 375.

--o0o--

MS. KNECHT: This is a great time for us to take stock of our progress so far, and to look ahead at the challenges to overcome. Ten years has passed since the adoption of SB 375 connected regional planning to State climate goals.

Real progress has since been made. Under 375, regions create Sustainable Communities Strategies, or SCSs, as part of their regional transportation plans. These include strategies to meet per person greenhouse gas
emission reduction targets set by CARB.

Most regions have now gone through two planning cycles, and CARB has verified that every region has created a plan that will meet the targets that CARB originally set in 2010, if implemented.

This planning has led to new conversations about how regional plans can provide important economic, health, equity, and environmental benefits for Californians. Regions have also seen success implementing best practices to ensure those benefits are realized. And the State has played a role too.

The State has set aside incentives such as those from cap-and-trade. Senate Bill 1 has provided needed transportation revenue. And most of those funds are directed to fixing existing infrastructure with historic increases in transit spending and active transportation investments.

But have these been enough, and what progress are we actually realizing on the ground today?

Last year, Senator Allen authored Senate Bill 150 posing that very question to CARB. And last week, CARB released its first report in response to this legislation. The report includes CARB's assessment of: One, what progress has been made in implementing SCS strategies, and with what results for greenhouse gases and other outcomes;
two, what are the major challenges for implementation, and; three, what are some regional best practices and the impact of State policies and funding?

---o0o---

MS. KNECHT: As such, the report is both data and policy focused. It measures progress on two dozen metrics, and where possible compares them to the expectations set out in MPOs' regional plans. The report also incorporates testimonials and lessons learned by those on the front lines of implementation.

In preparing the report, we held meetings and interviews with regional agencies, the public, academics, State agencies, local governments, builders, and community groups.

After analyzing the input, we shared our preliminary conclusions in workshops, and one-on-one meetings with MPOs, State agencies, and non-profit groups, and then refined them.

---o0o---

MS. KNECHT: So now to share some results.

A central finding of this report is that we are not on track to meet State climate goals under SB 375. As shown here, both greenhouse gas emissions, in blue, and vehicle miles traveled, or VMT, in red, per person are not much lower than they were in 2005, and are headed in the
wrong direction.

And, in fact, we just added new data from 2017. And unfortunately, this trend is continuing. This falls far from the trajectory that we expected to be on, based upon adopted plans as shown there in the green dots. So when we are talking about VMT, or vehicle miles traveled, what we are talking about goes beyond just a single metric. It's really about the relationship between where people live, where people need to go, and the ways for them to get there.

We want to make it easy for Californians to get around and do what they want to do efficiently. This is key both to achieving State climate goals, and also produces many other valuable outcomes from reducing congestion, to saving families money, to improving public health.

--o0o--

MS. KNECHT: Although it appears that the state is unlikely to meet its SB 375 targets for 2020, I do want to be clear that the state has already met its overall greenhouse gas reduction targets for all sectors for 2020.

But with transportation being California's largest source of emissions, meeting targets by 2030 will require us to improve performance in this area.

--o0o--
MS. KNECHT: To better understand the rise in greenhouse gases, we looked at almost two dozen indicators. This graph shows what portion of people drive alone to work for selected regions. And as you can see, about three out of every four people drive alone, a trend that is flat or rising in most regions.

The Bay Area is an outlier in this with a shrinking share of commuters driving alone to work. When I talk about regional results, I want to be clear that I'm not talking about what the MPOs are doing. What we're really talking about are the aggregate impact of hundreds of decisions by what may be dozens and dozens of agencies and private actors working together in a given region.

--o0o--

MS. KNECHT: We also looked at transit service and ridership. The graph on the left shows transit service hours per capita. And you can see that after a decline during the recession, it has almost returned or returned to previous levels in most regions. These changes in service did affect ridership there on the right. You can see how they trend together until about 2014 when ridership began to fall independently. And, in fact, this is happening in regions not just the most urban.

--o0o--
MS. KNECHT: Next, we looked at housing. In our interviews and in the last Board and Commission hearing, we heard the a lack of housing supply, particularly near job centers, was causing housing prices to rise, and that the affordability and displacement crisis is increasing how far people have to drive.

And the data we saw shows that California is producing only a fraction of the homes that it did before the housing market collapse.

--o0o--

MS. KNECHT: The result is that the housing cost burden has grown. This shows what portion of rental households are paying over 35 percent of their income for housing in 2010 in gray, and in 2016 in red by income.

This chart focuses on the Bay Area, but the results are fairly similar in most other large regions. And, in general, you can see the housing burden has gone up with particularly significant leaps in some income groups.

The analysis method does not show what's happening in the lowest income groups, where the vast majority of household were already overburdened. But we believe the burden has continued to grow, and that the growing burden is causing real budget hardship and increasing homelessness.
Not shown here, but we also found that households of color and Hispanic households have a greater burden than white non-Hispanic households.

In looking into how this was occurring, we found that local cities and towns are completing their planning for housing at all income levels, but that the permits issued for lower income housing are falling far behind the need.

These and other findings suggest that housing affordability and possibly also displacement may be increasing how far people have to drive.

--o0o--

MS. KNECHT: Our report also studied transportation spending. Over $1.1 trillion will be spent during the time period covered by adopted regional plans. So we wanted to understand more about how those funds were budgeted, and what shifts were occurring in the budgets to align this spending with climate and other goals.

These budgets, of course reflect local, regional, State and federal funds, and funding decisions by many agencies. And we found some positive shifts. Most of the large regions plan to increase the share of funds spent on road maintenance and decrease the share spent on road expansion.

Transit spending, both on operations and capital,
has risen significantly, those noted above and some
regions, not by enough to maintain service at per capita
pre-recession levels everywhere.

Spending on active transportation has also been
increasing. These positive shifts are supported by State
policies such as SB 1, High-Speed Rail, increased funding
for active transportation and cap and trade.

--o0o--

MS. KNECHT: We also look to see whether there
have been shifts in spending by mode that is between
roads, transit, and active transportation. In the largest
four regions, looking at it in this macro level, we did
not find a significant shift between the most recent two
plans, between the current plan and the one before that,
in plan transportation as we would have expected.

And when we asked whether a shift would have
occurred if we had gone back one further plan to look just
pre-SB 375, we were told that in these regions it would
probably look fairly similar.

--o0o--

MS. KNECHT: Before I leave the metric section,
I -- we want to acknowledge that there are many issues
that the numbers currently cannot capture. There are
metrics that are difficult to measure or where the data do
not exist. For example, if someone living in a
disadvantaged community with low transit service can't get to a job interview or to a job, their commute is not going to show up in the commute data.

Or if someone is displaced and cannot afford to live near their job, our current data is insufficient to tell us even how much extra driving that results in, much less what this does to their support networks or to the neighborhoods where this displacement is occurring.

On the other hand, when a family lives in a neighborhood where they can conveniently walk or bike to work, to the market, to parks, if their young teens can walk to school into their friends' homes, and if seniors can stay in the same neighborhood after they no longer drive, it is hard for us to report what this extra time and freedom mean, either for the climate or for people's health and quality of life.

--o0o--

MS. KNECHT: So the report shows that we are not on track, but the real question is why are we falling short and what will it take to change this?

The intent of the report is not to blame any one group or entity. These outcomes are the results of all entities carrying out their mandates and acting within the structure of current incentives, law, and policies. And progress has certainly been made, as I've been
And we heard about multiple opportunities, both existing and emerging, tools, laws, and funding sources for agencies to do more.

Every agency could take useful steps now, and has a crucial role to play. These joint meetings can even be a place for us to put forward ideas and implement solutions. But what has happened so far is not enough to enact the scale of change needed. And in the many interviews and consultations that we held for this report, we heard about the many barriers, competing band-aids, incentives, and restrictions that have limited how well state, regional, and local agencies have been able to advance sustainable communities.

The report finds that there is a fundamental disconnect between the factors that shape regional growth and development, such as how infrastructure funds are spent and the policies shaping growth and development, and the outcomes that we are trying to achieve.

So as a state, we are not on track. We need to improve on how we build and invest in communities and transportation. We need to make more significant policy changes identified through a collaborative process to do this successfully.

--o0o--
MS. KNECHT: As a starting point, the report identifies eight priority, challenge, and opportunity areas. Many of these align well with the four points that Director Bransen proposed as a focus area last time for CARB and CTC collaboration. Of these eight, I will now highlight three where the authorities and ongoing work of the CARB and CTC would allow us to use this forum to advance early action.

We put these forward for your consideration to ask whether further discussion at an upcoming joint meeting would be worthwhile.

--o0o--

MS. KNECHT: First, funding. CARB heard in numerous interviews and workshops that a critical test of SB 375's progress was whether investments are shifting in ways that improve transportation choices. And there have been definite improvements in this area via SB 1, programs led by the Strategic Growth Council, new housing funds, and other State efforts.

Regions have been taking -- have been taking action as well. For example, some are publicly ranking transportation projects to prioritize those that best meet regional goals.

But overall, state funding is generally not well aligned with health, equity, conservation, and climate
goals. A number of complex factors, such as historic formulas, fragmented decision-making authority, local sales tax commitments, and political forces are holding spending in place.

The action plan, and this joint body, could recommend improvements to relevant State transportation, housing, and climate incentive funding guidelines and plans, and outline how to increase scrutiny on projects that may perform poorly on key goals, especially when State funds will be utilized.

--o0o--

MS. KNECHT: Second, underserved communities. In preparing this report, we reviewed research outlining the large disparities that unfortunately still exist from historic and systemic injustices. Regional planning offers an opportunity to begin to address a range of social and transportation justice issues, rural mobility, public health, affordable housing, and quality of life for people who have been unjustly burdened.

We found some regions adopting best practices, such as conducting needs assessments, using transportation funding to reward localities for affordable housing, using participatory budgeting to select transportation projects and more.

Every region handles this differently. And
stakeholders suggested to us that there is an opportunity for the State to provide more support and guidance. For example, while important work is going on around the state, currently there does not exist a unified state vision or strategy for underserved communities to improve travel choices, economic development, health outcomes, and access to jobs, affordable housing, and other opportunities.

--o0o--

MS. KNECHT: Next, new mobility.

New technologies, such as smartphones, have begun a revolution in how we travel and communicate. The benefits of things like ride hailing, scooter sharing, and eventually fully automated vehicles could improve travel choices, especially for those who need them most, and get people around more efficiently.

But without policies to shape their deployment, they may also increase congestion and pollution and reduce transportation equity. California's four largest regions have launched a future mobility research program to study these issues and begin developing policy.

Some are already pilot testing how new mobility strategies can support traditional public transit, and transportation demand management, and helping local agencies design mobility hubs. We recommend that a
think-tank be convened to identify the transformative
technologies, partnerships, policies, and critical steps
to ensure that these innovations foster greater livability
and provide clear environmental benefits.

--o0o--

MS. KNECHT: The report identifies other
challenges that the action plan could address as well, and
regional best practices, and state efforts to build upon.

These include: Preserving and increasing homes
for local -- I mean -- excuse me, for low income
households and making it easier to build homes, especially
in key areas; traveler incentives and changing the travel
experience to encourage new travel choices.

An example of this would be the Orange County
Business Council's, "Just One Trip a Week Campaign", with
the City of Irvine to encourage travelers to try new
choices.

Third, transportation pricing; fourth, addressing
data and research needs; and finally, addressing the
limitations of SB 375 to make maximum use of the
substantial work that currently goes into regional
planning.

--o0o--

MS. KNECHT: The report recommends that a high
level interagency body be asked to facilitate
collaboration and produce a joint action plan to address these eight challenges. Currently, there is not a group or program set up to do all of this. However, this could build upon the ongoing work of many agencies and collaboratives working at specific intersections, including CARB's scoping plan work, Caltrans' California Transportation Plan, and others.

As noted above, individual agencies also have important work that they have done and can do. But we believe we will not succeed without a public forum for collaborating across agencies and scales to find synergies across our mandates and identify new solutions.

We recommend that this action plan identify responsible parties at the state, regional, and local level; set timelines for work on policy, investment strategies, and research; and recommend improvements to State law.

--o0o--

MS. KNECHT: That concludes my presentation. Thank you all very much for your time. I'd be happy to answer any questions that you have.

CTC CHAIR INMAN: Thank you, Carey. I do want to recognize Laura here. I think I see you in this last slide, our CTC ace staffer.

There you are. Okay. Perfect. A picture speaks
a thousand words, so there you go, so...

Anyway, questions, comments from my colleagues up here. Okay. Dan -- or Dr. Sperling, I guess I'm supposed to say.

ARB BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: I guess we're being formal today.

(Laughter.)

CTC CHAIR INMAN: No, I may call you Dan.

ARB BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: I just want to add my support for this. You know, I think the Air Resources Board has come a long ways in appreciating how what we do relates to all of these other sectors. I mean, we look around and we see there's huge problems with housing, congestion is getting worse, transit is struggling. You know, we have accessibility problems.

And I think the staff report was very good in saying we're all in this together. So I'm hoping today that we can come to an understanding that we do need to work together on this, that none of us -- none of our agencies -- you know, no one group, no one person is going to be able to change this.

But we've got -- I mean, we do have the great State of California, but the great State of California is suffering some serious challenges. And I think the time is now to a address it.
Housing and climate, traffic congestion, accessibility, these are all things we ought to be able to agree with -- agree to -- that are challenges that we need to work together on, and we haven't.

And I think -- so I'm pleased we're meeting today here, but I think we need to get our minds focused that we really can't just keep meeting. We've got to do something about it.

CTC CHAIR INMAN: Thank you, Dan.

Yes, Chair Frazier.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER FRAZIER: I'd just like to read a little bit of a statement prior to the meeting really going -- kicking off. And I just want to thank the Chairs for both initiating this meeting today on this important issue.

The version of SB 150, by Senator Allen, that you see in law today was carefully crafted in my Committee. The language that dictates what the report should include was negotiated with a wide variety of stakeholders, which helped remove all of the opposition from this bill. The intent of my Committee, in improving SB 150, was to provide a status report on the implementation of SB 375, the mandate on regions, and the way to share MPO successes, stories and barriers placed on them by State policies.
It was not, and I repeat not, intended to be a punitive measure or in any way call for a reorganization of the way the State funds and implements transportation projects. I'm concerned that this report could serve as a blueprint to undermine our citizen's ability to make local decisions in the best interests of their communities by replacing our current process with a one-size-fits-all top-down approach.

This is not the way California does transportation and land use. This was not the intent of S 3 -- SB 375. We believe in local people making local decisions.

As Chair of the Transportation Committee, and a member of the Assembly, I think my committee and many in my House will be skeptical of any legislation in this direction.

I'm also concerned that the report neglects to address top priorities of our transportation system. The safety of the traveling public is paramount. Mobility and the economy have to be factors that are inclusive. In fact, goods movement, a major economic driver for the state, is not even being considered, which Mr. Corey and I have had several conversations about the freight industry being included in a top priority going forward.

The report concludes that regions are not
implementing their SCSs, and must do more. Everyone needs to remember that since the passage of SB 375, we have experienced the Great Recession, we lost redevelopment, and we had a backlog of billions of dollars of basic maintenance needs for highways, bridges, and transit systems, not to mention the unprecedented need for housing.

Even with the passage of SB 1, we still have a funding shortage in basic maintenance and safety, and it's going to take us decades to recover. Let's keep these things in mind as we consider all of these issues today. And I look forward to today's presentations, but understanding that legislation that was passed in the -- which was passed in the past, doesn't mean that it necessarily worked, and that it can be rescinded at the will of the Legislature.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

CTC CHAIR INMAN: Thank you, Jim.

Any other comments?

Yes, Commissioner Madaffer.

CTC COMMISSIONER MADAFFER: I didn't want to speak right after Dr. Sperling, because it might look like we're ganging up, but.

You know, I have a couple of things. First of
all, I was very pleased to hear it. I've certainly read the report. You know, kind of like as a futurist, I have a lot of concerns. In much of what I read, I am concerned about declining transit ridership. I am concerned about poor land-use decisions that are being made by local government, where we are not getting the density in the housing along major transportation corridors. And I do think somehow or another there needs to -- whether it be incentives or otherwise, methods to stimulate this.

You know, hey, I used to be President of the League of California Cities, so I -- nobody has to question my thinking when it comes to local control. But I also realize politics and NIMBYs keep needed workforce housing from getting developed. And I think if I take anything out of any of what I've read in the SB 150 report, is my grave concern that we're not doing enough to stimulate more workforce housing and affordable housing throughout the state of California.

I also have a number of other issues that I'll probably talk about as we come forward in this. But just as kind of introductory, you know, I remain concerned about congestion pricing. I understand it. I understand what it does. But at the same time, we also have to be mindful of the public. I understand the issues of developing more zero-emission vehicles.
Let me share with you today when I arrived that I probably spent 15 minutes driving around in the parking structure here at Metro, because there's inadequate signage to tell me where to plug in my EV vehicle. And I've been trying -- as most people know, I've been driving an all-electric car for over five years now. And it gets very frustrating for me when I come to a public place, especially this place, where I can't even find where to park.

I finally found a spot and it was great. And it was great to see many are filled up, but I just spent the last 20 minutes downloading an app and putting in my credit card number, so I have the ability of actually charging my car while I'm here, so I'll have enough juice to get to Riverside for our Commission meeting.

(Laughter.)

CTC COMMISSIONER MADAFFER: So I just make these things that we're not doing a good enough job in this state, if we really want to see the adoption of more zero-emission electric vehicles, especially if you show up here at L.A. Metro. And you would think that would be it.

Lastly, you mentioned something that I was intrigued by. While I love the recommendation, and I agree with it, that there should be some kind of a joint committee. And I think it should include legislators. I
think it should include Transportation Commissioners. I think it should include CARB Members to really foster a future perspective on this.

Where I really feel we're a little short, and I would -- and I hope, Mary, you and the folks at CARB can prove me wrong, is in the area of technology advancements. Too often, you know, I see fundamental shifts in transportation over the next decade to where car dealerships as we know them today will probably be gone 20 years from now. I really question whether or not buses that go by with nobody in them is really an effective use of our tax dollars when you could probably just give somebody a smartphone.

I understand the issues, of - I've seen the slide - 200 people being moved in their own cars, 200 people being moved in Lyfts and Ubers, and 200 people in a car -- in a train, and 200 people in a bus. I've seen that, and I get that.

But I think using technology, we can bring people together through pooling and other things. So I would hope, as we talk about this, we do not ignore the advancement -- the rapid advancement that's happening right now in technology.

Let's not miss the boat.

CTC CHAIR INMAN: Thank you, Commissioner.
Yes, Commissioner Mitchell and then we'll go to Dan. Or Judy.

(Laughter.)

BOARD MEMBER MITCHELL: Yes, we can go by first names. Thank you. And thank you, Mr. Madaffer for those comments. As Jim mentioned, he was President of the League of California Cities, and I was also. I followed shortly after Jim.

So when we talk about local control, that's a mantra that we have pursued at the local level and will probably continue to pursue. But that doesn't mean that we shouldn't approach these issues regionally, because transportation is a regional issue. It goes across county lines, it goes across all of our borders, and we need to be making sure that we're collaborating and synchronizing what we do.

We also need to recognize the great diversity in the state, that what works for SCAG may not work for SANDAG, may not work for the Bay Area. So as we form this Mobility Action Plan that we're talking about, you need to build into that the diversity that we're going to find as we work across -- across regions.

I've thought about this over the last few days, because one of the things we do is we look at transit-oriented development. This is where we going
to put housing and transit together? And we're looking at building affordable housing. No question there's a need for housing and affordable housing.

But I also look at that and turn it backwards. Like, what are we doing to provide access to transit, to mobility options for the neighborhoods that already exist? Because I notice in Los Angeles, the way our geographical structure has been formed is major arterials run all across this city. And about one block off of those arterials that's your neighborhood.

And how can we better align what we're doing along the major arterials with those neighborhoods that are just one block away? I think that's an area that needs to be explored, and we can maybe find some solutions.

The hard thing with SB 375 from the very beginning, I thought, was that it involved to such a high degree individual's personal choices, what they can afford, where they can live, where they already work or where they're going to work, where their kids are going to school now or where they want their kids to go to school.

So all those factors come into play when people decide on these choices, where we live, and how we get to work. But one of the things I think that Jim mentioned that is really important is a vision for the future. And
things are changing so fast that I think it's hard to plan today to know exactly what's going to happen tomorrow.

But what we're seeing now out there, and GM announced this with their recent cutbacks, was they plan to be a company that provides mobility services. And this changes the landscape to a huge degree when we think about what does that mean?

And I think that's something we should keep in mind as we plan for the future. What would we be doing in the way of providing mobility services? It might look different from the structure on the ground today with buses and light rail, and TNCs. So I think we need to keep in mind what is that going to look like in the future? How can we plan today for the changes that we are going to see in the next 10, 20 years?

So it's not an easy task that we have before us. It is very challenging.

Thank you.

CTC CHAIR INMAN: Thank you, Judy.

Yes.

CTC COMMISSIONER DUNN: Thank you very much.

CTC CHAIR INMAN: Commissioner Dunn. Lucy.

CTC COMMISSIONER DUNN: Thank you.

I really appreciate the presentation. And thank
you very much for the very thoughtful comments. A couple of things though on the opportunity areas I just want to focus on. I think, first of all, you cannot discount the fact that notwithstanding the issues California has about a bit of a declining middle class, we're -- we've got very wealthy people, and very poor people, and a high poverty level in the state.

However, we have a very strong economy as well. And when you look at that -- I look back to the days of watching in the Great Recession, there wasn't that big an issue with a commute on these freeways, because no one was employed. And now, we've got full employment, and a car means freedom, and opportunity, and mobility for people.

So we have to not take that away to be able to create wealth for those disparaged areas or the lower economic bases. We have to allow them to create wealth in a good economy. God knows we're going to be in a recession, who can predict when, so we need to plan for that. But a strong economy produces what we're seeing today with mobility and congestion. So I think that's important to remember.

The second thing is I want to really make very strong, we talk about affordable housing all the time. This state is so far behind. We need all housing, not just quote affordable housing. We need housing in all
income categories everywhere. We haven't met our housing goals since 1989. This is long before even the Great Recession. So let's think about term -- ways in our opportunity areas to reduce barriers that exist for producing housing for all income categories in order to meet climate change goals.

It's a tweaking of the words, but it matters, I think, well to a mindset when we say state targets blah, blah, blah, blah, as opposed to reducing barriers to meet our goals.

You know, I mean, I've said this before, right, CEQA is a problem in this state. It's the Holy Grail for reform. And yet, we make it impossible to meet climate change goals in transportation, in housing without looking at things that are adding barriers to achieving the goals. Really important to phrase it in a way that I guess gets people motivated.

The other one I want to share with you is I really commend Mr. Madaffer on the technology. I am so there, having just ridden Metro Link this morning from Orange County to L.A. Impossible to figure out where a train schedule is on the internet. Impossible to align schedules between Metrolink and Amtrak to make it easier for someone that doesn't do this every day how to get here.
And the safety aspect. I just happened to be in a car where a mentally ill person started to engage another passenger. There's no -- there's no sign on the wall that gives me a text, so that I can text someone to say could we get someone in this car very quickly. Safety is critical. I am very safe in the bubble of my car, even as I'm sitting in traffic. I did not feel safe this morning on Metrolink. And fortunately, that person got off the train, so that there wasn't an altercation.

But that's a really important component for technology is accessibility to be able to pull up a schedule, which is why the grassroots campaign of trying to teach people how to read a schedule, I think, and not be afraid of it, but also to feel that they're safe when they do ride transit I think is critically important.

And then the last piece is especially for us, this joint meeting in -- with CTC and CARB, remember a lot of these projects have just been funded. The ATP projects are not yet producing measurable results. I ask every single time I see an ATP funded project, how many cars did it take off the freeway today when you created this bike lane? Well, Lucy, we haven't built it yet. We just funded it. And there are no -- there's no connective tissue yet between -- and how do you measure bike lanes, how do you measure safe routes to school, how do we get
that lineup of SUVs that drop other kids off at schools
every single day? But it's safe to walk in their city.
Why aren't they allowing their kids to walk? How do we
measure those ATP projects when they're just getting
built?

So be gentle with us, and be gentle with
ourselves as we figure those metrics out to be able to
encourage good behavior in the future.

So that's where I would -- I would ask is think
about reducing barriers on all of these things as we move
forward to address these goals.

Thanks.

CTC CHAIR INMAN: Thank you, Commissioner Dunn.

Yes, Chair Nichols.

ARB CHAIR NICHOLS: Seeing no other hands up at
the moment, I wanted to do what I usually do with our
Board. I didn't give opening remarks, so maybe this is a
wrap-up because we have other reports and things to hear
from us well.

So just to put this item in some context, if I
may. SB 375 when it passed was an attempt, I believe, to
bring local governments and MPOs into the climate process,
and to recognize the fact that even if we were to achieve
our goals, we wouldn't be able to maintain them over time,
without a land-use and transportation system that
collectively could provide the services that people want, maintain prosperity in our state, and at the same time reduce our emissions somehow. And I participated in a number of the preliminary meetings and workshops that led to the establishment of the regional goals, and the metrics, and the measurement technique that was based on a concept of greenhouse gas emissions per capita, so not to cap growth, not to do anything to restrain it, but simply to recognize that as we grow, we were going to have to find ways to emit less.

What this report shows, I believe, is that the incentives that were built into 375, which mainly involved exemption from CEQA review for climate emissions, for projects that were consistent with these Sustainable Community Strategies is not enough to, at least in the short term, make the kind of change that people thought was going to need to be made. That's it. That's what it shows. And I think the facts are pretty clear about that.

What you do about this, where this leads you, in terms of your thinking, could depend on many different factors. And I think it's worthy of discussion, if we all agree, that our joint missions -- our joint and several missions, could lead us to some ideas that might do better. But it doesn't say how, or where, or when. In fact, I think the suggestion, even of a new body or a new
plan, is questionable in and of itself personally. You know, having participated in so many of these over so many years, we might decide to go in a completely different direction. But I do hope that people will look at it simply for what it is, and not feel like it necessarily requires us to respond in any particular fashion, other than to recognize that there's an issue here that we might want to try to do something about it. Thanks.

CTC CHAIR INMAN: Thank you. And I'm going to go to Commissioner Van Konynenburg and then I think we need to move to our next item. But, yes, Paul.

CTC COMMISSIONER VAN KONYENBURG: Okay. Thank you.

CTC COMMISSIONER BURKE: I have one sentence

CTC COMMISSIONER VAN KONYENBURG: Okay. I'm sorry, Commissioner Burke, so we'll do Paul and then --

CTC COMMISSIONER BURKE: I appreciate that.

CTC COMMISSIONER VAN KONYENBURG: You want to go first?

CTC COMMISSIONER BURKE: No, go ahead.

CTC COMMISSIONER VAN KONYENBURG: Oh, Okay.

Okay.

(Laughter.)

CTC COMMISSIONER VAN KONYENBURG: All right.
CTC COMMISSIONER BURKE: I only have one sentence.

(Laughter.)

CTC COMMISSIONER VAN KONYENBURG: Okay. Well, I want to first of all thank -- I want to thank ARB staff for Deputy Director Weiss and I had a briefing on Friday with ARB staff. And I really appreciate you taking the time to brief me.

So there's a couple -- I have a couple concerns. I agree with Dr. Sperling that the -- that we should collaborate, bringing our own disciplines to the table to collaborate on future efforts. I guess one thing that jumps out at me, part of collaboration, I think one thing would be really super helpful -- I notice in the footnote at the beginning of the report is that the document was reviewed by the staff of ARB, but not reviewed by your Board.

I similarly got the sense that even though it was mandated that this be done with the MPOs, that they were not -- they were consulted, but not given a chance to comment on a draft before it came forward in a meaningful way.

So if we're to collaborate, one of the first things, you know, from -- to the -- one of the first things I would suggest is that reports like this that we
actually work together on them in the future. If we're going to be real collaboration, we need to re -- we need to work on these together, and we need to work with our partners who are on the ground doing the work. That would be my first suggestion.

I think the other, I would like to echo Commissioner Dunn's comments regarding the SCS plans. Those SCS plans, remember, we were in a funding drought -- so they've been in place for ten years, but we've been in a funding drought for about eight of those years. And so now we're first -- we're starting to see projects actually get funded out of those.

So the results -- we won't see those results for another ten years. So I think it's unfair to measure the -- saying that the SCS plans are ineffective until they get to the point where they've actually moved the needle.

And then finally, I have an opportunity to discuss VMT as a metric of success, of whether that's the measurement of success. And again, I thank staff for elaborating when they say VMT what all that's included in that term. I think another metric is gas and diesel consumption. If we were to see gas and diesel consumption go down significantly over the next ten years, I think that also could be a metric because that would really be
reflective of tailpipe emissions.

So having more metrics than just -- I think we should open it up to what the metrics of success are.
Even though VMT has a lot of things behind that, I'd like to see more metrics of success used as we go forward.

Thank you.
And I'm sorry for taking a little long.

CTC CHAIR INMAN: No, thank you. I think that's exactly what we hoped for was people to talk.

Commissioner Burke.

COMMISSIONER BURKE: I would just say something very briefly. When we look at 375, we were in a different environment, and some things have changed.

We no longer have a redevelopment agency in all localities. I was very impressed by the housing portions in this report. And the fact that certainly 375 talked about transportation as it relates to moving forward in terms of the housing element. At our table, we should have those funds for low and moderate income housing.

I don't say that we have to have a new one set up, but we have to have some mechanism for bringing into our discussions -- we don't have redevelopment agencies, but we have tax credits that are made available to many people, in order to meet the 375 goals. I just say that we need to make sure that they're at the table.
CTC CHAIR INMAN: Very good. Thank you, Yvonne.

No, in full disclosure, you're working with a left-handed chair. So that's all I can say.

(Laughter.)

ARB BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: That's good.

CTC CHAIR INMAN: Diane, I wasn't slighting you.

ARB BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Thank you. No, that's fine.

CTC CHAIR INMAN: And I'll try to look over my shoulder a little better.

ARB BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Thank you.

I just wanted to quickly add a couple of thoughts. One, I just really want to thank the staff -- the CARB staff. I feel like this has been an enormous effort. And in addition to the amazing data collection and analysis that you've done, I had the opportunity to come to a couple of the community meetings that were held. And I felt like those were really a Herculean effort. And I know that they happened all over the state. And I just want to express my deep appreciation that you reached out in the way that you did, that they were community friendly, they were accessible.

And I think that the voices of impacted communities are really reflected in this report. So I think it's really important that we really acknowledge
that. And I want to say thank you for that. I guess for
me, I feel like the solutions are not -- are going to be
long term, and they're going to be short-term. And I
think that's what everyone is kind of saying.

We really can't undue 100 years of poor planning
that was really focused around a car culture. We've
been -- as the gentleman from L.A. Metro kind of said,
we've been pretty successful at that. And now we found
that that really doesn't work for our health, for air
quality, for the quality of life that we have in our
communities.

And particularly for disadvantaged communities
and environmental justice communities, I think this
intersection that you've incorporated in the report of
housing and transportation, and taken it to the next
level, and really analyzed it is really critical, because
those are both places where disadvantaged communities
suffer, and where they need assistance. So I really
appreciate the focus there.

And I also want to lift up Dr. Sperling's point
that we really need to focus on action and understanding
that there are longer term solutions that we need to look
at, but we don't have time for just long-term planning.
We need to have action now. And I like the idea of the
committee or the task force, but I don't like the idea of
more meetings that don't get us to action.

So I also appreciated the more focused interventions that you talked about in your recommendations, and particularly those that would focus on community interventions, where there may be simple, not that costly, interventions that could happen in communities that get people on transit, that make them feel safe on transit, and also that would be something that people would embrace in different communities.

That said, I also think we need some metrics and some rigor across the state. So what is the transit capacity per capita that should happen across the state? How do we look at that to ensure that all regions are actually looking at a transit capacity that's appropriate?

And they should, as others have said, develop what the solutions are, like, how do you get there, but that the capacity should be consistent across the state. I know we're going to have time to talk more, but I just wanted to lift that up, and again thank the staff so much for your great work.

CTC CHAIR INMAN: Thank you, Diane.

So I love the discussion, and I may get fired as Chair, but Commissioner Earp did you want to say something?

CTC VICE CHAIR EARP: I know you've got to move
on. I have a very short statement about action. Maybe one of the things we could do is to -- it should be a simple step, but it's not, and it wasn't when SB 375 was passed, is that we could include transportation in some of those incentives that were supposed to help move along some of this development. That was left out.

And here we are talking about transportation today, and SB 375, and no one has -- you know, they just kind of moved on. And you know what, let's -- let's look at the basics as to what helps get projects on line. There's some good projects that could help move some of these goals along, and they don't get those incentives that SB 375 offers other areas of development.

CTC CHAIR INMAN: Thank you, Commissioner Earp.

Okay. Thanks. That was a great start, I think, and I look forward to more robust -- if I could just add my little word. I would love to drill down a little bit more about jobs, because to borrow a line from my fellow Commissioner, jobs are where houses -- or, I'm sorry, houses are where jobs go to sleep at night.

And I do think that we all agree we have a housing crisis. I don't think there's anybody in our state that isn't in agreement on that, so clearly, and the nexus -- we feel very strongly the nexus between transportation and housing. When I hear of the commutes
from the Bay Area with folks starting on their train ride
at 4:30 a.m. taking a three-hour ride, and trying to do
their job, and then three hours home, and an hour each way
for some transition.

You don't have a life, and that's not sustainable
in the long term. You can't have justice for your family,
or your person, or your community, or your job. So I
think for all of us to -- and I really would like to drill
more and understand more about the jobs.

And also, jobs have changed. We talked about
technology and how the world is changing so rapidly. The
young Millennials are kind of consulting now, and they
don't get hired for that lifetime career anymore. They
may work for several folks at the same time. And I think
we have to really drill down.

So I do want to thank you for the work. And I
would say we've got a lot of work. And this did just come
out, so I think one of the things we can do is everybody
have a time where we can maybe go chapter by chapter and
have some robust discussions about what the solution sets
to work on first. And I love the ideas of figuring out
some short-term as well as long-term, because we get
discouraged.

You know, if we're only looking at long-term, and
it takes so long, we need some attaboys along the way, I
think, in terms of improving, and whether it's safety, security, signage, whatever, we can do the list. And let's celebrate together some early success and some long-term success.

So with that, hey, Doug let's call the roll.

CTC AGPA REMEDIOS: Thank you, Madam Chair.
Commissioner Alvarado?

CTC COMMISSIONER ALVARADO: Yes.

CTC AGPA REMEDIOS: Commissioner Burke?

CTC CHAIR BURKE: Here.

CTC AGPA REMEDIOS: Commissioner Dunn?

CTC COMMISSIONER DUNN: Here.

CTC AGPA REMEDIOS: Commissioner Earp?

CTC VICE CHAIR EARP: Here.

CTC AGPA REMEDIOS: Commissioner Ghielmetti?

CTC COMMISSIONER GHIELMETTI: Present.

CTC AGPA REMEDIOS: Commissioner Guardino?

CTC COMMISSIONER GUARDINO: Present.

CTC AGPA REMEDIOS: Commissioner Kehoe?

CTC COMMISSIONER KEHOE: Here.

CTC AGPA REMEDIOS: Commissioner Tavaglione?

COMMISSIONER TAVAGLIONE: Here

CTC AGPA REMEDIOS: Commissioner Madaffer?

CTC COMMISSIONER MADAFFER: Here.

CTC AGPA REMEDIOS: Commissioner Van Konyngenburg?
CTC COMMISSIONER VAN KONYNENBURG: Here.

CTC AGPA REMEDIOS: Chair Inman?

CTC CHAIR INMAN: Here.

CTC AGPA REMEDIOS: Member Frazier?

ASSEMBLY MEMBER FRAZIER: Here.

CTC AGPA REMEDIOS: Madam Chair, we have a quorum.

CTC CHAIR INMAN: Thank you. Are we going to call our colleagues' roll, please.

ARB BOARD CLERK DAVIS: Dr. Balmes?

Mr. De La Torre?

ARB BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: Here.

ARB BOARD CLERK DAVIS: Mr. Eisenhut?

Senator Florez?

ARB BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Here.

ARB BOARD CLERK DAVIS: Assembly Member Garcia?

Supervisor Gioia?

Senator Lara?

Ms. Mitchell?

ARB BOARD MEMBER MITCHELL: Here.

ARB BOARD CLERK DAVIS: Mrs. Riordan?

ARB BOARD MEMBER RIORDAN: Here.

ARB BOARD CLERK DAVIS: Supervisor Roberts?

Supervisor Serna?

Dr. Sherriffs?
ARB BOARD MEMBER SHERRIFFS: Here by virtue of active transit.

(Laughter.)

(Applause.)

ARB BOARD CLERK DAVIS: Professor Sperling?
ARB BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: Here.

CTC CHAIR INMAN: Hooray.

ARB BOARD CLERK DAVIS: Ms. Takvorian?
ARB BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Here.

ARB BOARD CLERK DAVIS: Vice Chair Berg?

Chair Nichols?

ARB CHAIR NICHOLS: Here.

ARB BOARD CLERK DAVIS: Madam Chairs, we have a quorum.

CTC CHAIR INMAN: Thank you so much.

Okay. Trying to get our agenda back to some timing. I'm going to move to Item number 4. And we are delighted to have Maura with us today to give us an overview. Thank you.

Maura Twomey.

(Thereupon an overhead presentation was Presented as follows.)

MS. TWOMEY: Good morning, Commissioners and I'm Maura Twomey from the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments. And on behalf of my MPO partners, I
first want to thank both the California Transportation
Commission and the Air Resources Board for the opportunity
to provide an overview of the RTP/SCS process, and its
highlights, challenges, and needs.

--o0o--

MS. TWOMEY: I'm first going to provide some
background on the development of the RTP/SCS, including,
first, our partner agencies, the relationship between the
California Transportation Plan and regional transportation
plans; the statutory requirements for the development of
the RTP/SCS; and the need for long-term, equitable,
sustainable revenue to support implementation.

--o0o--

MS. TWOMEY: Just as it takes a village to raise
a child, it takes many partners to develop and implement
an RTP/SCS. In addition to our local jurisdictions and
federally recognized tribal governments, the successful
development of any RTP/SCS relies on collaborative
partnerships like those with you: The California
Transportation Commission, who is responsible for the
development of the RTP guidelines and is a funding
partner, and the Air Resources Board who is responsible
for establishing GHG reduction targets and accepting or
rejecting the MPO's determination that the SCS would, if
implemented, meet the GHG reduction target.
We also have many other partners, including the Federal Highway and Federal Transit Administrations who review and approve our plans for compliance with the Clean Air Act, the FAST Act, the Civil Rights Act, and many other federal regulations. Failure to comply with federal requirements can render MPOs ineligible to spend federal funding.

We also are partners with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, who works collaboratively with FHWA and FTA to ensure our plans conform with the Clean Air Act requirements; Caltrans, who reviews plans for consistency with State law, and is responsible for the development of the California Transportation Plan; the California Department of Housing and Community Development, who is responsible for certifying the regional housing needs allocation process; the California Department of Public Health, who advocates that positive health outcomes continue to be an integral part of the planning process.

And there are many other partners, including the Strategic Growth Council, the Office of Planning and Research, air quality management districts, and other MPOs.

--o0o--

MS. TWOMEY: As regional planning and statewide planning become more integrated, the California
Transportation Plan, or the CTP 2040, provides an aspirational statewide transportation system vision, a vision capable of meeting mobility, safety, sustainability, and economic objectives in the fight against climate change.

However, unlike the regional transportation plans, the CTP 2040 is not financially constrained, nor does it undergo CEQA review, and it is not required to be consistent with air quality conformity requirements.

--o0o--

MS. TWOMEY: And speaking of those requirements, the RTP/SCSs are required to meet more than 70 federal and State requirements. They're also required to be consistent with seven national transportation goals, eight federal transportation administration policies, and 11 State goals.

This creates a tug of war between goals and priorities for scarce resources. It took 362 pages worth of RTP guidelines to outline all these requirements. Yes, 362 pages. A few of the resulting plans are on the table before you.

--o0o--

MS. TWOMEY: And all of these requirements and goals must be met in an era of decreasing resources. Thirty percent less gas will be consumed in 2035 than 2005
under existing regulations. As you can see by the chart in front of you, gasoline consumption, the blue line, begins to decline in 2015, but that decline becomes even greater after 2020.

As fuel consumption decreases, so do transportation revenues collected through federal and state gas taxes. The next slide you will see starts to highlight the connection between fuel consumption and the Federal Highway Trust Fund, a major source of transportation for all the regions.

The Federal Highway Trust Fund is on an unsustainable course due to necessary increases in fuel efficiency and the resulting decline in gas tax revenues. Let me focus you -- your attention on 2020, as it is an important year as we move to the next slide.

--o0o--

MS. TWOMEY: Based on the latest Congressional Budget Office estimate, the Federal Highway Trust Fund becomes insolvent by the year 2021. What does that mean? This means that the federal government is not anticipated to collect enough revenue to meet its financial commitments to transportation. This creates uncertainty in the delivery of transportation system as outlined in the region's RTP/SCSs.

Will the federal government resolve this funding
issue?

Absolutely. How it's resolved, however, will impact the implementation of each region's RTP/SCS. Declining fuel consumption is also an impact on State gas tax revenues. Under the scoping plan scenario, this problem is expected to grow worse with fuel consumption under the scoping plan 60 percent lower in 2035 than it was in 2005.

--o0o--

MS. TWOMEY: Federal funding makes up roughly 16 percent of the investments from the five regions you'll hear from later today, that's just over $130 billion. In my region, we spend an additional 1.2 billion of federal funds. This creates uncertainty under which to deliver the RTP/SCS. The Commissioners and Commission staff may well remember a similar dilemma in 2010.

As you can see, finding predictable, equitable, sustainable transportation funding solutions is critical to the success of California meeting its climate, equity, health, economic, and transportation safety goals.

--o0o--

MS. TWOMEY: On the State side, SB 1 provided $52 billion of new funding for transportation, the first increase in reliable funding in more than 20 years. However, this $52 billion is only about a third of the
$138 billion needed above and beyond the RTP/SCS investments to adequately maintain the State highway and local roads system. And that $138 billion does not include the $135 billion required for transit maintenance.

--o0o--

MS. TWOMEY: As we've discussed before, as if our transportation funding needs are not daunting enough, let's talk about housing, as the RTP/SCS is about building livable, sustainable communities, which require housing.

The Twin Rivers project in Sacramento, pictured on the slide before you, seeks to implement the SACOG's region's RTP/SCS. Unfortunately, the sponsors applied for affordable housing sustainable communities funding and transportation -- transformative climate community funding to no avail. Although I highlight the project in the Sacramento region, there are many projects in every region of the state similar to this one.

All this is to say, project sponsors are taking strides to implement the regional SCSs. Unfortunately, the resources to support these projects are woefully inadequate.

To point, roughly $2.5 billion was requested from the Affordable Housing Sustainable Communities Program in the last three fiscal years, only $470 million was awarded. That's a more than $2 billion shortfall in
funding. Approximately, four out of every five projects that applied for this program did not receive funding.

Each of the projects that applied was required to be consistent with regional RTP/SCSs and illustrate the desire to implement the SCS. Funding, however, woefully lacks behind the need.

--o0o--

MS. TWOMEY: So this provides just a quick overview of the RTP/SCS development constraints. This afternoon you'll hear presentations from MTC, San Joaquin COG, SACOG, SANDAG, and SCAG that will focus on RTP/SCS successes and challenges, what the MPOs have learned to date, what we need, and the policy recommendations that support the implementation of their RTP/SCS.

That concludes my presentation. I'll be happy to answer any questions.

CTC CHAIR INMAN: Thank you, Maura.

Questions for Maura?

Okay. I'm looking over this way.

Okay. Thank you so much. I appreciate it and love those images. Those charts help us a lot.

Okay. We're going to move on to the next presenter, Chris Schmidt I believe.

(Thereupon an overhead presentation was Presented as follows.)
MS. SCHMIDT: Good morning, Commissioners and Board members. Glad to be here. And I'm Chris Schmidt the Division Chief for Transportation Planning for Caltrans. And I just wanted to share with you some Caltrans perspectives on this very important topic.

--o0o--

MR. SCHMIDT: So my presentation overview has just a few highlights here, some topics I want to cover:

The role that we have in this entire process, some of what's going on where we feel we're already moving in the right direction collectively; some discussion about transportation funding, as you heard from Maura and some of those requirements that the MPOs are required to comply with; the transportation vision moving forward; some opportunities to leverage some ongoing efforts that we're already engaged in; fostering additional collaboration through the development of the next California Transportation Plan, the plan for 2050; and then some opportunities for strategic alignment.

--o0o--

MR. SCHMIDT: So Caltrans' role in all of this is a statewide leader in collaboration and partnering. Caltrans is entrusted with efficiently managing and preserving and protecting California's transportation system, which is one of the state's most vital assets.
At the same time, we recognize that we need to balance mobility demands and economic vitality with environmental equity and health considerations.

We recognize that California needs a robust multi-modal sustainable transportation system, and we acknowledge that we have a strong role to play in helping the State meet its GHG reduction goals. We have new perspectives on what the transportation system needs and how to get there.

While historically capacity changes -- or excuse me, while capacity changes are still appropriate, and in -- in some cases, that is not our first to go-to strategy any longer. We now look at a fix-it first approach with preservation of the system as a key goal, and also looking at increasing the efficiency of the existing system. We’re also embracing performance management and sustainability.

Early on, Caltrans was a member that helped initiate the State Coordinating Committee, a multi-agency effort, that laid the foundation for legislation that created the Strategic Growth Council. Also, Caltrans initiated the Regional Blueprint Planning Process, which was another foundational effort that led to some of the modeling improvement efforts that enabled MPOs to start complying with SB 375. So we’ve been collaborating for
MR. SCHMIDT: As far as moving in the right direction, you've heard already that there -- there's been great success in just getting to where we are today, and more needs to be done. We do want to underscore though since the passage of AB 32 and SB 375, much has been achieved. MPOs have adopted SCSs and they have been approved by ARB.

And as you'll hear later on, there have been a number of accomplishment, and there are still a tremendous number of challenges in implementing those SCSs and achieve that desired outcomes.

But great strides have been made in other areas as well. For example, in terms of active transportation, it was mentioned earlier, we have a very robust funding program. We're seeking a tremendous number of projects to be funded. And certainly, given the number of projects submitted and the funds available, it's a much oversubscribed program.

The SB 1 Transit grant programs for example are also strengthening the transit infrastructure and services. You've heard a little bit about that today. The inner-city rail projects and commuter rail programs are seeing dramatic increases in ridership. Other transit
success stories include the expansion of bus Rapid Transit and BART.

And while transit ridership overall has been a challenge, as we're seeing some of the declining trends, investments in high-quality transit is seeing ridership growth. And that could continue as more of those investments come online and those services are made available.

So the other thing that you heard earlier, Metro is doing as well, funding programs are transitioning the transit fleet to zero-emission vehicles. And that's also very important as we make that investment in our infrastructure.

Looking at congested urban highway corridors, the Department is embracing a corridor approach. And what we mean by that, we're looking at all modes within a corridor today. In many cases, the best solutions for solving our congest highway delays are really making investments in new and improved transit services.

An example of how we operationalize that is through the New Solutions to Congested Corridor Program, which embraces a multi-modal corridor investment strategy. And it really sets the expectations that projects will actively manage those corridors for success.

Where new highway lanes are added in the program,
they must be managed lanes. And funding eligibility for that program is hinged on having an adopted SCS in place within the region. So the connection is quite strong there.

--o0o--

MR. SCHMIDT: I also want to just highlight a little bit of what Maura highlighted earlier relative to how we -- how we conduct this planning. The planning funds for the regions come from two sources, the federal and the State side. And really on the federal side, we've got $63 million that we allocate annually to the 18 MPOs. And they've got to comply with all the things that Maura mentioned, so I won't belabor that point too much.

The one that she didn't mention is at the bottom, the federal transportation performance management requirements. And there's a number of goals that the federal government actually puts on the state as well as on the regions to achieve certain system performance. And those goals are actually in -- somewhat in conflict with some of what we're talking about today. For example, there is no federal performance measure or goal for GHG reduction.

So as we work together, we want to make sure that the planning funds that come from the federal government are used to deal with the federal mandates, and that the
State planning funds are used to address those State requirements, and that's a balancing act that the regions always have to play, and we help to facilitate that.

MR. SCHMIDT: On the next slide, I just want to highlight a few of the key things that some of the MPOs are doing, both large and small. These are the specific SB 1 transportation planning fund dollars that we're providing through the new SB 1 program. And I would submit to you that all these MPOs are really trying to could innovative things to figure out how to get their SCSs implemented and to be successful.

MR. SCHMIDT: So what is that transportation vision that we're shooting for. Maura mentioned it earlier in the CTP 2040 what the vision is for that. What we're really looking for is a vision that provide more ability choices that enables Californians to opt out of congestion. And it means that we have to develop and implement strategies that offer transportation choices that people don't have to experience congestion or contribute to congestion. So we need to get there.

It means that we need robust transit, extensive active transportation networks, and an efficient state highway system. We've got to make the system work better,
among other things. These strategies are not only good for VMT reduction, which we're talking about here, but they can also be applied in corridor based approaches leveraging system management strategies. That's sort of a euphemism for pricing.

And emerging technologies, that's been mentioned here a number of times, definitely need to be fully explored to really provide key choices that commuters really want.

So how do we do that?

--o0o--

MR. SCHMIDT: Well, we should leverage some of the things that we're already doing and things that are already underway to achieve that vision.

We propose really to leverage the existing partnerships that we have to achieve these desired outcomes. One example on the leveraging that we're doing at the State level is we have a housing and transportation work group. They just met here in November. Representatives from Caltrans, ARB, HCD, OPR and several other agencies meet and actually talked about some of those housing and transportation challenges, and also how to inform the administration on what to do moving forward.

We can also leverage the many other advisory committees that we have in place, such as those that are
addressing freight issues that were brought up earlier, active transportation, and other key mobility challenges that we have around the state.

We also pride ourselves in leveraging the relationships that we have with our regional partners, especially the relationship with CALCOG, the Rural Counties Task Force and self-help coalitions. Those are key partners in really discussing where those changes can be done systemically.

We also have in place robust research programs. ARB, Caltrans, and the Strategic Growth Council all fund and support research efforts. And we can certainly gear our research efforts in the right directions.

In addition, Caltrans is making an effort to explore big data to better help us. There was a discussion earlier about ATP and data supporting ATP mode share changes. Big data is a way to help us understand what travel behavior is doing in the future.

And then also, we are interested in the VMT metric. We are very much -- see the benefit of using that metric in terms of measuring the environmental impacts of projects. And we plan to continue to work with our partners to figure out best to implement.

--00o--

MR. SCHMIDT: So quickly in terms of CTP 2050, we
see that as a fostering opportunity for collaboration, both among the State agencies, the general public, but really also with our regional partners. You heard earlier, and it's a fair critique, this is an aspirational plan. It can set a large scale framework on some of the things we wish to do. It is not intended to be fiscally constrained. It does not go through CEQA, but it needs to be reasonable. It needs to be feasible. It can't just be completely pie in the sky.

    The key thing, it is statutorily mandated. It is funded. It is staffed. It is guided by the guidelines that the Commission has adopted for the development of the CTP. It is an opportunity to really collaborate. And we would submit to you that there is a process in place to do that, and opportunities to foster that collaboration.

    The plan itself tries to really address some of the key priorities that were called out in the 150 report, the technology, the equity, housing, the public health, the adaptation. Those all issues that we're already hearing about from the general public as we're doing our outreach.

    We do want to focus on innovation. We're looking for what is the future. We have a future of mobility white paper that highlights a lot of those ideas and challenges and opportunities. How do we get those into
the plan and make them a reality? We also want to think
about scenarios. Where do we really want to be, what
likely outcomes do we want to see, and how can we analyze
means by which to get there?

So tremendous opportunity there.

--o0o--

MR. SCHMIDT: The plan itself is being developed
as we speak. As I mentioned, we're just kicking off most
of the key aspects to it. In 2019 will be the primary
heavy-lift portion. And then we hope to have an adoption
in 2020. So a lot of opportunity to collaborate.

--o0o--

MR. SCHMIDT: And finally, I will just say, in
terms of strategic alignment, you know, as the 150 report
indicates, and we've been discussing here today, there's
lots of issues that influence travel behavior. And I
think that's pretty clear to all of us. Transportation
investments and how this system is managed are important
factors in delivering a safe, and efficient, and low
carbon transportation system that we all want.

But there's lots of other issues. Certainly
clearly, housing land-use policies have a huge influence
on travel behavior. And we have to continue the
discussions here, discussions through the CTP development,
and really discussions in all the other forums that take
place to figure out how to get that collaboration to occur.

And clearly, the strategic alignment that addresses our mobility environmental goals, while also growing our economy, to the -- to your earlier comments about jobs, and improving the quality of life for all Californians is really what we're mostly trying to achieve.

So I thank you for the opportunity and would be happy to answer any questions.

CTC CHAIR INMAN: Thank you, Chris. So I know we have a question from Commissioner Kehoe.

CTC COMMISSIONER KEHOE: Thank you, Frank.

Thanks for the presentation, very good information. I've got an ongoing concern about transit. You know, we're seeing ridership go down. But I think I heard you say that when it comes to high-quality transit, we're seeing increases in ridership.

MR. SCHMIDT: So investments that are really paying off are the kinds that service quality is emphasized, service that are frequent, they're safe, they're clean, they're well scheduled, they're understood by the customer.

CTC COMMISSIONER KEHOE: And what are -- name some for me, please. What are you biggest success
MR. SCHMIDT: So some of what we've seen are the successes here in the L.A. basin, the silver line for example; some of the light rail projects that we've seen the extensions of the light rail services. You know, those are different kinds of services. They're not the traditional what historically we call traditional bus services. They're being reoriented to be on a pulse-based system where transfers are easier, where the connections are easier.

The commuter rail investments that we've seen and similar to that, where we're seeing higher frequency services that are more robust and more reliable.

And I think we're starting to see where those investments are being made in those higher quality services, you're attracting riders. Where the services have perhaps been not reoriented, where they've been functioning in congested condition, you're not seeing the same kind of ridership.

CTC COMMISSIONER KEHOE: That's good news. I think that frequent scheduling cleanliness and safety are keys if we're going to get people to really think of transit as a legitimate alternative.

And I also hope that we -- there's more discussion, at some point, about how we can directly
subsidize transit users, whether it's students, hospital
users and employees, senior citizens. You know, we know
where they're going. Is there some way they could have
a -- you know, some sort of extra support and get them on
buses and transit more often?

So just a thought.

CTC CHAIR INMAN: Thank you.

CTC COMMISSIONER KEHOE: Thank you, Fran.

CTC CHAIR INMAN: Do we have any other comments? Dan.

ARB BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: You know, I'm trying
to restrain myself here, but --

CTC CHAIR INMAN: Oh, it's -- we're -- it's all
good.

ARB BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: You know, the first
step is we need to acknowledge we've got serious, serious
problems, and almost every metric is going in the wrong
direction. And I'm not talking just environmental. And I
think we need to full -- you know, I know Chris knows
this, and I know Caltrans knows it, and each agency,
entity knows it in terms of their piece.

But let me just repeat again, go through this
list of how we need to really, really rethink what we're
doing in transportation. I've studied transportation for
decades. This is my profession as a researcher. And I
think we need to be outcome oriented.

So, yeah, we can say there's lots of improvements being made that MPOs are doing lots of little good things, and Caltrans is doing lots of good things. But if you look at it big picture, I'm going to just go through these, you know, one by one just be very blunt.

Congestion, it's getting worse. Safety, it's getting worse. We have more -- we -- we're seeing an increase in fatalities, which is the first time that's happened -- actually, per -- you know, per capita, that's the first time in history that's happened. The cost of travel is going up. The cost of buying a new car now is over $35,000 for a new car. The cost of owning and operating cars has gone up. There's funding gaps, as we've heard. So we don't have the money to deal with the infrastructure and all the other problems.

Transit ridership. Okay. You know, we used to not pick on transit, because it's so important, and we didn't have any good alternatives, but we've got to be more open-minded, clear-eyed about what's going on. Transit serves less than two percent of passenger miles in this state. So -- and it's either flat or declining, and depending on where you look at. But even if you doubled it, it's tiny. And we're talking -- we relate it to equity and accessibility.
As it's been pointed out, we have these very high poverty rates. And that translates to a lot of people not having access to cars. And we have created a car-centric transportation system, which marginalizes so many people in terms of income, in terms of physical disabilities.

And just one little statistic to highlight it, taxis, the most expensive mode there is, 40 percent of taxi rides are by households with less than $25,000 income. Why are they doing it? Because they don't have good alternatives. People, even if they have cars, they're not reliable.

And so -- and then, of course -- and then there's the transportation greenhouse gases. That's going up unlike the other sectors in the -- of our society, of our economy.

So, I mean, this is not good news. And if we make minor incremental improvements, that's not going to address most of these. We've really got to acknowledge that something really big and different needs to be done. And, you know -- and it's not going to be simple, and it's not going to be easy. But we have to -- I mean, I think the first step is just acknowledging we've got a real problem here.

And we haven't seen this in the transportation sector in a very -- you know, since interstate highways.
So, I just -- you know, it's -- I'd like to -- you know, it's going back to the point where first acknowledge it, and then we have to think about, you know, there are all these new types of business models.

Just as a little tiny example, you know, these electric scooters. So there's lots of issues with them, but if we go back to what, you know, Caltrans is saying, our number one strategy should be to increase choice and figure how to make it work, instead of just criticizing everything, or saying it's a problem, but taking a more positive approach.

We need to figure this out, and we're not doing it. And we do have the tools and the business models to make it a lot better, but we're not -- so, okay, let me turn it back to you.

CTC CHAIR INMAN: Thanks, Dan. Thank you. Appreciate it.

Commissioner Madaffer.

CTC COMMISSIONER MADAFFER: Just briefly to pick up on that. If we could figure out ways through these efforts to embrace more of what the private sector is out there already doing. You know, for me, this takes Commissioner Dunn's comment earlier today. I want an app, and they're out there -- I don't care if it's Lyft, Uber, Waymo. They're all out there -- ubiquitous to all forms
of transportation. I want to pay for it out of one pot of money. I don't care if it's eventually when I pay for my miles, as we move to a per mile fee, which we know that's where we're going, if it's Amtrak, Metrolink, COASTER. I don't care what the label says. If it's a JUMP Bike, if it's Lime scooter, a Bird scooter, a taxi, I want to be able to punch up something right here and get on and move. And if it can aggregate me to somebody else who's going in the same place, all the better, and that's where I think we need to be looking.

CTC CHAIR INMAN: Great. Anyone else?

I would just add a little bit in terms of customer service, and you all know my early roots from the hospitality sector. And I think everybody should start in the hospitality sector. Because I think if we're really going to get people to have choices and make choices, we really -- and I was encouraged to know that Phil is doing that. I know some of our other agency partners. But there's a lot of models out there who have really done customer retention. You know, we want to grow our ridership in some of these things.

But what do we know about who's riding them? We were just up in the Monterey Salinas Transit tour. And they've got a good handle, I believe. I mean, they told us that more than 52 percent of their riders ride five
days a week or more. Well, that's a real different model
than if you're riding one day a week.

    And so I think really to look at what are those
barriers, and to -- I forget who brought it up. It might
have been Commissioner Dunn, but somebody talked about
freedom, mobility, and all the choices that people want to
have.

    And then, you know, if you're trying to balance
your family and work-life, and everything, and you've got
to get kids to different places, and you're hauling stuff,
let's make sure that it's easy to do, and roll our
suitcase in here. So it's all good.

    I think people probably need a little protein, a
little bit of lunch, so we're going to break for lunch.
I'm going to ask Doug to give us some directions. But I
have one ask for all of you out there -- I'm really glad
you're here, and we want to hear from everybody. I'm
going to ask you have a lunch with somebody you don't know
today, okay? Because we all just go to our comfort zone
and talk to the same people we all talk to, but let's go
visit with someone new today, find out what's keeping them
up at night.

    So with that, Doug.

Okay. Follow Doug.

(Off record: 11:59 a.m.)
(Thereupon a lunch break was taken.)
AFTERNOON SESSION

(On record: 12:48 p.m.)

CTC CHAIR INMAN: Okay. Guys, grab your friends. We're going to get to work.

Commissioners, Board members, can I ask you all to come join me.

Are you ready to go?

Okay. Let's call the meeting back to order.

Well, except I'm missing my colleague, Chair Nichols, so we'll give Mary a minute to get here.

Okay. We've -- Richard is going to do his best Mary impersonation. Richard Corey will be --

(Laughter.)

CTC CHAIR INMAN: Here we go. I think we have our Board members joining us. So let's get started.

We've got a busy afternoon, and looking forward to hearing from all of you.

So with that, I'm going to ask our MPO presentation to come forward. I have Andy Chesley up first, is that -- no. Oh, it's another fellow. Okay.

Hasan.

MR. IKHRATA: Thank you. Chairwoman and men, Commission members, Board members, good afternoon to all of you.

Now, what you had your lunch, I hope you will
give me two minutes and pay attention to what I'm going to
tell you, and hopefully you'll pushback on me if you think
otherwise.

I'm here. You see the slides. I'm -- I am
Executive Director of SANDAG as of yesterday.

(Laughter.)

MR. IKHRATA: But -- but I'm talking -- I'm
talking on behalf of SANDAG, SCAG, San Joaquin, MTC, and
SACOG.

Now, don't hold them responsible to anything that
I say that they don't agree with.

I listened to the presentations this morning. I
listened to the discussion. And we act like surprised why
is the numbers going the other way, because they are going
the other way.

VMT per capita is up. The economy is doing, like
Commissioner Dunn mentioned. Transit ridership in the
nation, and mostly here, is declining. And we should not
get surprised, because for the last 60 years we build our
lives around driving. And SB 375 came and said to the
MPOs go ahead and develop Sustainable Community Strategies
that reduces per capita greenhouse gas emissions.

I want to remind you - maybe you don't know this
and maybe you do - that MPOs are not in charge of land
use, that the majority of the funding that MPOs had -- has
spoken for by the voters of their regions. And so to tell an MPO says you have too much money, that's way over-exaggerated.

I want to piggy-back on something. Does that mean we -- there is nothing we can do?

Absolutely not. There's a lot we could do. I am a firm believer that technology is taking over. When you hear the executives of GM and the executives of Uber or Lyft saying that we need to get into this ride-sharing program, because in ten years, we're not going to be selling cars. You better believe this -- these statements is worth billions and billions of dollars.

So what do we do moving forward?

I can tell you from SANDAG's standpoint. To Commissioner Madaffer's point, I promise you if the Board continue to employ me, you will have that app, Mr. Madaffer, for every San Diegan, for everyone coming to San Diego an app that tells you how to go around. We will deploy the three -- the Professor Sperling three revolutions.

But that by itself is not enough. You have to combine that with a transportation system, and I underline transportation system. It is not transit against the highway. For the first time in our country, the first time there is more people who work at home and telecommute
than riding transit.

Think about this. There is the people today in our country that telecommute and work at home than riding transit. Now, you should not -- I was telling Commissioner Kehoe earlier, you should not expect people to ride transit if a choice is a transit that takes three hours and a car that takes 35 minutes. The question is how do you provide a transportation alternative, if not as good as the car, better than the car? And you combine that with the technologies, with TNCs, with the three revolutions. And I promise you inn San Diego, we're going to work on that.

We're going to make it so that if people take that alternative, whatever it is when we define it, that it is as convenient, if not more convenient, than the car. Then we might impact land use, which we are not in charge of.

But once you have the transportation system and you deploy technology, then land use can be impacts. But I also want you to know that you should not expect MPOs, all of them, to do magic. And in the next couple of years, we're going to submit a plan, put it in front of the Air Resources Board staff and say we need our per capita Commission's best in our modeling and analysis, and based on a plan that goes until 2050.
Now, you could say, well, look at the number. You're not doing it. We're going to reject your plan. That would be a big mistake. That would be a huge mistake, because that would be going backward. Let us work together and deploy the resources that we have at our disposal to provide that transportation system that work together, that deploys technology, that make it attractive for people to take choices.

By the way, if you provide choices, then you should price the system. You cannot price the system now, because you penalize people, because there is no other alternative. But provide good alternatives and price it, nobody will blame you. At least I can speak for San Diego, that's what we're going to try to do. And I hope my Board and the Mayor of San Diego will allow us to do that, to provide the 21st century transportation system that deploys technology, that the three revolutions become part of it. So I ask you to think about don't get surprised that the numbers are going the other way.

On this SB 375, yes, it didn't achieve the numbers, but it's allowing us to have this discussion, and we need to continue to having it. And we should not focus on the number yet. If we see regions not trying to build that system I'm talking about, then let's talk about it. Let's penalize them.
But right now, I think there's no surprise of what's happening. I think we need -- desperately need to deploy technology and provide transportation alternative that works, give people alternatives. We need to price the system right, and definitely we need to deploy the three revolutions as quickly as possible.

So, speaking on MPOs that represent 85 percent of the State population, 33 million. And I think what one thing SB 375 did is allow us to work much closer together throughout the state.

--o0o--

MR. IKHRATA: And I can tell you, since SB 375 passed, we've been discussing things that's going to result in actual real projects that get us closer to having a transportation system that provide choices for Californians, for all 40 million of them.

So with that, I thank you, and I will be very happy to take any questions.

CTC CHAIR INMAN: Okay. It's on.
Thanks, Hasan.

Do we have any questions for Hasan?

Yes, Dan.

ARB BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: Well, Hasan is one of my heroes --

MR. IKHRATA: Thank you.
ARB BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: -- because whatever success there has been for 375, Hasan gets a lot of that credit. But I want to ask now that we're here, you have all this experience with the MPOs, what do you think we, CTC and CARB, can be do to help you accomplish what you want -- would like to accomplish?

MR. IKHRATA: Thank you. One is you have -- between the two of you, you have a lot of funding, and you have to allow MPOs sometime to use that funding to our real transportation system of the future. Deploy the technology. I think you should probably look at the criteria of how you get funding, because incremental change, funding -- I mean, there is lot of successful projects around the state, but they do not -- when you have a state of 40 million people and 67,000 clean of highways, it is hard to see that incremental change at the regional level.

But what you would do is make the funding available, actually change the way you look at our plans. Remember, our plan is going to satisfy what the voters voted for, our plan is going satisfy what the federal government wants from us, and whatever remaining is not enough.

What's enough is for both the Commission and ARB to make funding available to do the things I'm talking
about. And short of that, we're going to be talking about the same things 50 years from now. And I hope not. I really do believe technology is going to take over. And shame on us if we don't deploy it. But we need the resources to do that. So that's one thing you could do.

And when we submit our plans to you, don't look just at the numbers, look at the direction that MPO is trying to go. Because this approving a plan and going to doing, you know, fantasy plan is not doing any good. It will work the other way.

CTC CHAIR INMAN: Okay. Thank you, Hasan. We appreciate your comments.

With that, we're mixing up the schedule here for me. So, Alix is next.

MS. BOCKELMAN: Good afternoon, Commissioners and Board members. My name is Alix Bockelman and I'm the Deputy Executive Director for policy with MTC and ABAG. And I'm going to advance the slide deck here.

--o0o--

MS. BOCKELMAN: There were a few more slides actually about sort of all of our plans compiled together in terms of the investments. This one shows that, but I think we talked about that earlier. So I'm going to advance to the MTC, ABAG specific slides.

--o0o--
MS. BOCKELMAN: All right. So what I was going to do is give a few highlights from our plan, and then talk about some of the challenges that we are facing in our region in the Bay Area, and then talk about some of the actions we've been taking to try to be successful in delivering on SB 375, and then give some specific policy recommendations. I think each of the other MPOs are going to go through a similar framework, and then conclude with some of our sort of joint policy recommendations.

So with that, in terms of Plan Bay Area, really the cornerstone of Plan Bay Area is focused growth. This strategy has been the cornerstone of the last two plans, and it's key to achieving our GHG reduction targets and accommodating the region's population growth.

So specifically what does that mean? It means that we are planning for 77 percent of the housing growth in Priority Development Areas. These are areas that have been locally nominated to take on growth, and they are served by robust transit.

Within that 77 percent, nearly half of the growth, or half altogether of the housing growth, is forecasted in the three large cities of Oakland, San Jose, and San Francisco. In terms of what we're already seeing is that the share of housing in PDAs, as well as the multi-family housing, has increased while development
outside of the urban footprint has slowed in the Bay Area. We also are investing in new and modernized transit to serve these Priority Development Areas. We've had several new BART extensions come online, a new rail system in Sonoma and Marin, as well as we are investing in new and modernized railcars for BART and Muni.

So another key element of our Plan Bay Area is really reinvesting in our system. In terms of our investment priorities, our primary commitment is fix it first. And that was a key emphasis in our first plan as well. Ninety percent of our plan's forecasted revenues are dedicated towards operating, maintaining, and modernizing the region's transportation infrastructure.

We also -- another key element of our plan is really planning and investing for fewer auto trips. The plan invests almost two-thirds of future funding to investments in public transit, mostly to ensure that transit operators can sustain existing service levels through 2040. Only ten percent of our funding is dedicated to widening or extending the region's street and highway network and extending or expanding transit lines.

The combination of the region's focused growth in transportation investment strategy leads to a reduction in the region's per capita VMT and greenhouse gas emissions.

Another very important element of our plan is
supporting disadvantaged communities. Equity is a critical component. And the investment strategy's equity roadmap elements put regional discretionary dollars towards some of the highest priorities to advance equitable outcomes in the Bay Area.

This includes fully funding transit operations, including all of the region's bus operators. That's key for ensuring mobility for lifeline riders. In addition, the plan allocates billions of dollars towards frequency improvements on bus systems across the region, reducing the wait time for riders. Third, it puts $2 billion towards the lifeline program and other county access initiatives, which are designed to specifically target the needs of low income and minority residents.

In the near term, we are rolling out a means based fare program to make transit more accessible and affordable for low income residents.

--o0o--

MS. BOCKELMAN: So moving to the Challenges, and there are many. And I Chair Inman asked what keeps us awake at night? And I think in the Bay Area it's housing affordability. We have a housing crisis in the Bay Area. And our plan projects that not to get better. Housing costs are expected to grow significantly, increasing the risk of displacement.
Plan Bay Area 2040's worst performance was related to housing plus transportation affordability. While transportation dollars are benefiting low income residents, it is housing that proves to be the critical factor in improving the affordability in the Bay Area.

For affordability and affordable housing, the plan wasn't able to change the trajectory trend of ever increasing rents and home prices that are creating serious pressures for lower income families. We need to explore policies and strategies that can better address the housing costs component of this, if we want to be an equitable, inclusive region going forward.

Another one of the challenges that has been touched on a little bit today is transit ridership and emerging mobility. The Bay Area has a history of robust transit service and ridership, ranking third for per capita transit ridership among the 10 largest metro areas.

Now, I think earlier a third was used also, but I think that was on one system, and we have 26 operators, so it's all combined. So anyways, I don't want to steal Phil Washington's thunder there.

On a typical weekday, Bay Area residents boarded buses, trains, and ferries approximately 1.8 million times. While ridership has surpassed pre-recession levels on a per capita basis, transit use is still about ten
percent below the levels of the early 1990s. More concerning is that after several years of growth, we're seeing that our rail systems are starting to lose ridership. BART and Caltrain, which we're seeing year after year a significant growth. Also emerging mobility is disrupting how we operate, fund, and plan. San Francisco's TNCs and Congestion Report, included the alarming finding that ride hail services accounted for 47 percent of the increase in vehicle miles traveled between 2010 and 2016 in San Francisco. Other reports indicate that TNCs are affecting our travel decisions, particularly transit, walking, and biking.

On the positive side, of emerging mobility, our regional bike share system has seen a quadrupling of trips with over one million trips this year. It also has a robust equity program with a $5 per year low income pass. And over 23 percent of the members of the program are low income users.

As we look further into future, autonomous vehicles could also present or do present another series of risks and opportunities for our regions. Another challenging area is congestion. The region's economic boom has pushed congestion levels to record highs for the fourth consecutive year. Commute times continue to tick upwards in 2016 hitting a record high of over 32 minutes.
And while the majority of Bay Area residents have reasonable commute times, 15 percent have extreme, or what we call super commutes, lasting more than one hour each way.

And the last challenge I will mention we have haven't talked about as much today, but it is resilience. And I think it's very much on our minds, having what we've gone through what we all went through in the state with the wildfires. But the region's growing population puts more people at risk from future sea level rise, wildfires, and earthquakes.

With respect to the wildfires in the Bay Area in 2017, we had the north bay fires, which destroyed five percent of the housing in the Bay Area's fifth largest city of Santa Rosa. On sea level rise, a major east/west connector of the Bay Area State Route 37 is projected to be fully inundated at 36 inches of sea level rise, which could occur by 2050.

But SR 37 has already experienced severe flooding. In early 2017, the entire corridor was closed for nearly a month due to flooding from the Novato Creek. So this type of flooding will become more frequent and severe as sea levels rise. And we really need to focus on resilience of our regions as well.

--o0o--
MS. BOCKELMAN: So in terms of some of what we
have been focused on to try to be successful in our region
and some of the actions, one of the landmark programs we
have over the last several years was to integrate
transportation investments to housing outcomes is what we
call the One Bay Area Grant Program. Over the ten-year
life of the program, we're investing $874 million to
support Priority Development Areas and affordable housing
via supportive transportation investments in local streets
and roads, streetscape enhancements, safe routes to
school, also doing planning in these Priority Development
Areas to make sure that we have the good linkages between
good transit, as well as we're prepared to actually put
more housing in these areas, and also a very small amount
of direct housing investments.

More recently, we adopted a housing incentive
pool, which is really sort of a challenge to local
jurisdictions, and that they will be rewarded the 15 that
produced the most -- produce or preserve the most housing
will be rewarded with transportation dollars to use for
transportation investments.

Additionally, over the last 18 months, we have
been deeply engaged in the CASA initiative, which brings
leaders together from across the Bay Area to build an
actionable political consensus around increasing housing
production at all levels of affordability. And also preserving existing affordable housing and product — protecting vulnerable populations from housing instability and displacement.

This has led to the development of the still being negotiated CASA Compact. The CASA Compact is a 15-year emergency policy package to confront the region's housing crisis head on. It includes a series of policy reforms that will allow the Bay Area to build more housing at all income levels, while protecting the tenants in low income communities.

The Compact also includes a series of revenue recommendations needed to preserve our existing housing stock, subsidize the construction of more affordable housing, and provide assistance to tenants that face eviction.

--o0o--

MS. BOCKELMAN: So in terms of a few policy recommendations, just thinking about the Bay Area. There will be some that sort of are collected for the whole state a little bit later, is that, you know, we think it's really important to partner — that the State and the regions partner on bold housing actions. CASA estimates that the funding gap to implement the compact is 2.5 billion a year, not one time, but a year.
CASA proposes to meet 1.5 billion of that with region and local self-help measures, but the remainder would need to be funded through a partnership with additional State and federal sources.

We also think it's really important to increase the reliable funding for regions, so that they're able to make these connections between housing, transportation equity goals. To bring together all of these elements, there needs to be funding sources that are certain and flexible.

For MTC, the primary source that has allowed us to do innovative programs, such as OBAG, have been the federal formula funds that we get, the STP and CMAQ. The State funding sources have tended to be a little bit more prescriptive and not allow the certainty that we would need to partner with local jurisdictions toward delivery of the SCS.

And I guess lastly, just in a lot of what we're talking about, that mobility is changing. It seems that we all need to work together to figure out how we can modernize funding program administration. As regions try to fund equity programs or try to partner with the private sector on new mobility options, a lot our funding sources don't really lend themselves to these types of projects. They're really meant more towards traditional
transportation construction projects. So I think that will also be important as we go forward.

And that concludes my part of the presentation. I'd be glad to answer questions or you can do them at the end after all the MPOs.

CTC CHAIR INMAN: Thanks, Alix. I think we're going to ask you to standby, and we're going to do all the MPO presentations, because I think there will be some integrated questions hopefully. So thank you very much. We appreciate it and we'll hold our questions for Alix.

Okay. Here's Andy.

MR. CHESLEY: Thank you, Chairs, Commissioners, Board members. I'm Andrew Chesley. I'm the Executive Director for the San Joaquin Council of Governments in Stockton, California.

We have -- I wanted to say thank you. SB 375 was a process bill. It was meant to change the way we do business in each of our regional transportation planning agencies to --

--o0o--

MR. CHESLEY: -- integrate better transportation, land use, housing, health indicators, greenhouse gas emission reductions. And to that extent, it has changed the way we do business at the metropolitan planning organizations throughout the state. To that extent, it
has been a success.

An example for this, in terms of our goal setting regarding Sustainable Communities Strategy in San Joaquin County, the need to meet future housing needs. And when we talk about housing in San Joaquin County, we talk about the jobs/housing imbalance that occurs. We can talk about how -- why it is that we can build houses, but can't build as many jobs to fill those houses. And instead, for some reason or other, we house people and import them to other regions to work every day.

Regional transit expansion has been a key aspect of what we've tried to do doing this just not just about expanding the number of trips but also expanding the way we do it technologically.

Strategic roadway improvements. In the San Joaquin Valley, all eight regional agencies have identified Highway 99 expansion as a priority for us. And we have been taking steps to make that happen. We still have a long way to go. But improving the operations, the safety, the movement between five of the 105 largest cities in the United States, five of the largest 20 cities in the State of California seems to us to be an important priority. So strategic roadway improvements are on our list.

Enhance goods movement. In San Joaquin County,
we've been doing goods movement since the gold rush days. That has been a key aspect of our connection to the Bay Area.

I mentioned to the California Transportation Commission in October that five years ago Amazon had no employees in San Joaquin County. Today, they are our largest private employer, and within 12 months they likely will be our largest employer straight out. The change between distribution and retail has -- that mix has blurred over the years.

And improved public health outcomes. In the San Joaquin Valley, you will find the eight counties among the worst performers in terms of asthma, diabetes, heart disease. These are important factors now in our planning process, something that was not at the top of our list prior to SB 375.

And we have done this change as well by reaching out to our public to participate even more in our process. As a matter of fact, Ms. Knecht gave a presentation earlier that was helpful in terms of changing the way we do business of outreach, providing many grants to organizations to bring out people for our meetings and our issues, a 400 percent increase in our public transit needs process. And on each of our scoring committees for breaking projects today, we have someone from a public
health organization participating in that.

Next slide, please.

--o0o--

MR. CHESLEY: But we have some challenges. Bus ridership has been an important component of what we've tried to do to build that connection between our housing and transportation improvements. But as you can see, our operating cost continues to go up at a predictable rate, but our ridership has dropped.

We are trying to turn that around by doing technologically different things. We have like an Uber-type service we are -- have the San Joaquin Regional Transit District using in unincorporated aspect -- parts of our county to try and build ridership up there and reduce our costs.

Oh, thank you.

So -- but also at the same time, the ridership on our Altamont Corridor Express is up by 15 percent this year, and it's been going up about five percent each year.

But recognize as well the difference in income. On the San Joaquin Regional Transit District, the median income -- median household income for a rider is $32,000. On the Altamont Corridor Express it's over $100,000 for a household income.

When we start making investments in passenger
rail, it's -- we have to recognize that disparity from those investments in terms of whether it's an equitable or an inequitable distribution of our resources among our population.

Income levels in the Bay Area are, as we all know, fairly high, $120,000 household income and median home values 660 -- 57,000. As a matter fact if you look, the most recent listing -- average listing for houses in the Bay Area is over a million dollars. In the San Joaquin Valley, the median household in -- value is $200,000. In San Joaquin County, it's a little over $300,000

And our household income in San Joaquin County is a little bit over $75,000 associated with that. But the difference between us and the Bay Area is substantial, and has an impact on the way we do our SB 375 planning process.

Also, at the same time, unemployment in the San Joaquin Valley at -- in Stanislaus and San Joaquin County, we're about 25 percent above the state average. But you go farther south in Tulare County it's twice the state average in terms of unemployment.

When you talk in the San Joaquin Valley about what's important to them, it's about economic development. It's about job growth. And it's difficult to -- for folks
to say to themselves that somehow reducing VMT is going to be a positive to improving economic development and economic opportunities in the San Joaquin Valley.

When you look at the upper right-hand corner, super commuting in San Joaquin County is right in the center there. Every morning from San Joaquin and Stanislaus County, 84,000 people travel to the Bay Area for work opportunities. They do that because it works for them.

Taking a longer trip is more important to them than necessarily worrying about being close to where they live. That kind of housing opportunities are just not available in the Bay Area for folks. So they come over into San Joaquin County and purchase a home, at something like $250,000 to $400,000 less. It makes sense to them.

And when you look at San Joaquin County, so you can understand, some of the dynamics, especially with our SB 375 planning, when you look at the shortest median commute distance, San Joaquin County has the shortest median commute distance in the nation among all urban areas.

We also have the largest percentage of people who travel more than 90 minutes for a commute. So we have both ends of the spectrum in San Joaquin County, and we have to do our planning accordingly for that. Rural
versus urban, the San Joaquin Valley, when you make a
decision about where you're going to invest resources
trying to make a decision about whether to invest in
Woodland, or in Fresno in terms what's the best return, in
terms of reducing greenhouse gas emissions, it is -- will
almost always be Fresno.

If it's a decision between investing in Thornton
or investing in Stockton, it will almost always be
Stockton where the investment will occur. But that has
social inequities inherent in it. And that's something
that in our SB 375 process our board wrestles with all the
time.
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MR. CHESLEY: Success stories. So bus transit,
all-electric BRT. We're the first all-electric route bus
rapid transit in the country in Stockton. And by 2025 all
five of our bus rapid transit routes will be all electric.

Rail transit. Expansion into Sacramento and
Merced. Thank you very much to Secretary Annis and to
Chairman Frazier and the State Legislature, we have $900
million to make expansions of passenger rail service,
which, as you can see from a distance perspective, makes a
big difference in terms of our ability to reduce
greenhouse gas emissions an VMT.

And -- but it's drawing a lot of our resources
into rail transit. As a matter of fact, when you look at rail transit versus highway capacity, there's almost no money in the next ten years going into highway capacity in San Joaquin County, but there will be over a -- over a billion dollars going into rail transit capacity increases.

In the areas of public health, we've integrated public health metrics into our planning process. It's been a little challenging to do so, but it's essential to do so with the health indicators that we have in San Joaquin County and the rest of the San Joaquin Valley.

Housing. Assisting local groups in their efforts to secure funding. We've been -- we've done a great job along these lines, but the need is so great. It's so fantastic that even these small efforts are tough to measure against SB 375. Nonetheless, these are the kinds of success stories that the SB 375 process was meant to create.

--o0o--

MR. CHESLEY: So some of our policy recommendations. Redevelopment is our largest missing tool. I think you'll find everybody agrees on that, and even the State Legislature is picking up the issue here in this coming session.

Mobility is evolving. Fund sources must become
flexible enough to support this evolution around mobility. And mobility, when you go out -- you talk to our constituents in the San Joaquin Valley, they tend to equate mobility with economic development, not with reductions in VMT. It is important, when going out and meeting with our folks, to recognize that demonstrating economic development, job growth, the ability to offset this jobs housing imbalance issue is important. And from that, maybe you can reduce VMT. But job growth tends to dominate the discussion.

Accelerate the development and improvement of technologies. And that's definitely something we are trying to do in public transit. There will be marginal differences associated with this, but we're trying new things in public transit, and I think you'll find that with each of the MPOs that address you today.

And lastly, statewide pricing strategies. When it comes to pricing, it's -- we don't have the tools at the region. When you talk about trying to price parking in the downtown area in the San Joaquin Valley, where you are already have a dearth of development and activity in the downtown area, you don't -- pricing doesn't really make much of a difference.

But pricing strategies at a statewide level can have a real impact upon the amount of VMT and greenhouse
gas emissions. So we encourage both the California Air Resources Board and the California Transportation Commission to consider that in your discussions.

Thank you very much for your present -- for allowing me to present to you, and I'll turn it over now to the next speaker.

CTC CHAIR INMAN: Thank you, Andy.

So next. Thank you, James

MR. CORLESS: Well, good afternoon, Board Members, Commissioners. James Corless. I'm the Executive Director of the Sacramento Area Council of Governments.

---o0o---

MR. CARR: It occurs to me actually as we take this look back at SB 375, I used to work down in the Bay Area. I actually used to work for MTC. And I left California for 10 years and came back. So it's a little bit like when you've left your house for a little while and you've seen your garden actually grow.

I've seen actual the change in the last ten years that you're all discussing today. And let me offer three just brief observations. While I think none of us from the MPO perspective think this is enough or we're completely achieving success here, let me tell you three things that have happened.

Number one is we're being much more quantitative.
While our models, and looking out 20 years, and whether it's 18 or 19 percent, maybe is not what the travel models were built for, we are moving towards a more data driven understanding of the biggest bang for buck on our transportation investments, and that's a really good thing.

I think cross-border collaboration and actually understanding what's going on between our regions, you're going to hear me talk about mega regional investments that go across our traditional boundaries of regional agencies. And that's why it's great to follow Andy in San Joaquin, and MTC in the Bay Area, because economically we're linked.

And then finally, I think social equity understanding the divide between the transportation haves and have nots. And this is a part of a conversation, while by no means have we solved it or done enough, but it is now infused into this debate here in California. So I do need to say those things in terms of what I think SB 375 has provided.

So from a Sacramento perspective, we're six counties, 22 cities. I do remind you all too, I think you all know this, the MPOs and the COGs have the local governments on our boards. Every local government in the Sacramento region, six counties, sits on our board, the
very people that make those land use and housing decisions are on our board.

Let me give you a couple of highlights. While I think -- and this may be sadly an exception, rather than the rule, we have been able to use the CEQA streamlining that was promised in SB 375. You remember back in 2008 this was supposed to be -- if you were compliant with the plan and you had development in housing you wanted to do, you got CEQA streamlining.

I think I probably have about 17 Ph.D.s who are trying to figure out exactly how to use CEQA streamlining. So it shouldn't have to be that hard, which is maybe why it's the exception, but we'd be glad to offer our -- sort of lessons learned on that, but it's a big deal, and we think we could probably do more with that.

I've actually been in front of the CTC before to talk about one of the programs we're proudest of and that's Civic Lab. We know in our region we're inland California. We don't have the resources and the funding, and we never will to basically solve all of our problems. So we've got to be smarter.

Civic Lab is a program to basically take an incubator approach to our cities and counties. The first year we ran it, we said what if you didn't have a lot of money, and you had to use technology and creative problem
solving, how would you solve your transportation problems. And I'm going to -- I'm going to come back to one of the solutions for that, We've seen great things emerge from this Civic Lab program over nine months, and our Board has put a million dollars into funding the pilot tests.

And finally, fourth bullet down there, I will tell you our general plans, our local governments have changed their zoning and their planning as a result of this. Maybe not enough, but things are changing. They -- and they are actually looking to us to ask us if things are SB 375 compliant. So those are some -- those are some good -- good things to celebrate.

But we have challenges. And I think all of us, as you're hearing today, are absolutely willing to admit we've got -- we have a big hill to climb, whether we're trying to hit our greenhouse gas targets, or achieve social equity, or achieve economic prosperity in inland California.

You know, I think it's been mentioned, about the timing of SB 375, in terms of both the Great Recession, the loss of redevelopment. I cannot tell you how important and impactful that was in our region.

We want to do, and we have an SCS, a Sustainable Communities Strategy that is going big on infill development, not Manhattan styke infill development, two,
three stories over retail along all of our old aging retail corridors.
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MR. CORLESS: But we can't get that to happen because we've got Bay Area labor costs and we don't have Bay Area home sales or rental cost. So we have a -- we have a cost differential. While CEQA is a problem in our region for sure, we actually have a financial gap. We would love to write down that financial gap, if we had flexible funds and resources to do it.

And finally, and I'll come back this too, I would just say there's a lot of State level programs and criteria that are statewide that just don't work for smaller communities, for inland California, Centra Valley.

I'm going to give you some examples. Let me -- let me give you some successes though, in terms of specific projects. I mentioned the mega region. Andy mentioned the ACE Train and the service down from now San Joaquin opportunity to Silicon Valley. Pretty soon, again with the leadership of a lot of the people in this room, we're going to extend that up to Sacramento. That ACE Service is going to be an economic lifeline that will come down through the tri-valley and Silicon Valley. We're going to be speeding up through two SIP grants, the capital corridor to connect us.
And let me tell you why this is important. I was doing a presentation recently in I think it was Roseville, and somebody say that's great. So I can go shopping, you know, in downtown Sacramento. That's great. I want you to go shopping. Here's the other benefit of this, when start-up companies are looking to leave California -- and we don't want them to leave, Carl, I understand that. But when they're thinking about the high cost of doing business in California, they can put part of their operation in inland central California and have part of their operation in Silicon valley. I know this to be a fact. There are people now living in Sacramento who are going to work two days a week at a start-up company in Silicon Valley and living in Sacramento and taking the train. So this is an economic competitiveness play, as well as just a simple steel wheels and steel rail.

The third bullet down, electric shuttles. We are going big while we -- we want eventually maybe to get light rail out to our airport. It's going to cost us a hell of a lot of money and take a really long time to build light rail to our airport. So we have just funded a new electric shuttle service that will be non-stop from downtown to the airport, from UC Davis to downtown to the UC Davis Med Center in downtown Sacramento.

We are doing that, because our board actually
committed flexible funds to what we call our green region program. We're funding electric buses, electric shuttles, and car share in low income communities around our region. And our board, when we adopted this program, said will this help us achieve our SB 375 targets. It's front and center in their minds.

And finally, last bullet, one of the projects of many we're proud of that came out of our Civic Lab Program, we have summer construction internships for low income youth to get them to job sites. They were showing up late. So the first experience of the employer is I'm taking a chance on a kid and he's -- and he or she is showing up late to work. And the kid gets there late. Why? Because, either they're taking three buses, they're relying on a -- on very unreliable transportation from a relative. So we are going to pioneer a very simple microtransit service that will actually pick up kids and get them to actual job sites on time. So that is not the first experience they or their employers have.

That came out of our Civic Lab Program. The funding that it takes to fund something like that, it might be a little more costly than a fixed route transit service, but it's going to be mere effective. We won't have enough of that kind of flexible funding to underwrite some of those projects.
MR. CORLESS: So policy recommendations. I just want to end on a couple of these notes, before I turn it over. I know you all know, and we've mentioned redevelopment, I can't tell you how innovative financing is -- we just -- we've lost those tools. The tools we do have, the few we have, like EIFDs, are not working well enough in our region.

We need more flexible infrastructure funds to support infill. I was talking to one of our smaller cities to the north of Sacramento. We were talking about infill development, and the SCS, and meeting SB 375. And the city manager said, you know, we've actually lowered some of our fees -- our impact fees, but I'm not getting enough of the interest in the development community to come in, because our impact fees are so high, because we're basically -- we're using impact fees to pay for everything.

So I said well, what it -- what would it take? And he said we've got to go to zero. If I can actually wave impact fees, I think I can get interest from the development community. We can come and build the things that we want in the SCS. But I've got to have some sort of backfill to replace at least a portion of those impact fees.
We -- by the way, Bay Are mentioned CASA and their housing initiative this -- it's almost a challenge program, a pilot program that we're readying to take to the State and the Legislature next year to help meet our greenhouse gas target, is very much inspired by that story on impact fees and a flexible fund that we desperately want to fund the infrastructure that the impact fees would normally fund.

Support for next generation transit in suburbs and small towns. I mentioned how tough it is just to simply run a fixed route bus service in small towns in suburban areas. Where we can do it, we should, but as an earlier speaker said, we need high frequency transit. I believe high frequency bus transit can and should work in our region.

But funding and running a really once-an-hour bus to very low density rural areas is not going to cut it. And that's again when you -- when we measure the success of things, like how much we're funding transit, what we really should be measuring is how much are we spending on actually moving people to opportunity. That should be the measure of success. So we need help, but we need help across the state to understand what are innovative solutions in lower density more rural ag areas, suburban areas, where another new form of flexible transit can
work.

Pricing, we've talked a lot about that. This is going to be a major part of how we want to get to our target. And finally, I just want to end on this note, as I've mention a lot, the Central Valley, inland California smaller towns, it's very hard for us to compete for cap-and-trade funds.

So we have a project. It's a wonderful project. It's revitalizing public housing, development just north of downtown Sacramento. We want a light rail stop. We want the funding to build a light rail stop, so that we have transit. But we can't qualify for the cap-and-trades money, because we don't have transit access, right? So it's a chicken and egg issue on some of the criteria.

So I would just put in front of you, I think as difficult as this is, something that is scaled to the size of communities across California we think would work much better.

Thank you very much for your attention.

CTC CHAIR INMAN: Thank you, James. Stay close, because we're going to do all questions together.

So, Kim.

MS. KAWADA: Good afternoon. Kim Kawada. I'm Chief Deputy Executive Director of SANDAG. Thanks for having us here. I think you're going to hear a lot of
similarities between all our presentations.
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MS. KAWADA: I want to draw your attention to some documents that are on the table. The stuff that -- to my right, the largest stack. That's our last regional plan, and regional -- and SCS. That nearly foot long thing includes the EIR, the technical appendices, the plan itself. That cost nearly $10 million.

So are we having success? We're spending a lot of money. And I do think we're having some success. I do think our plans are good. We have had -- we've worked for decades with our 18 cities and counties. And to work with them to look at focusing growth, at where you put smart growth is -- where you put transportation at, try to innovate.

So I think, in some respects, they're good. I think some of it is we are having difficulties actually implementing the plans that are in place. The housing that's included and what's being planned for, when you're actually getting down to the actual building and doing, you're already doing something a little bit less.

So let's say you're zone for 20 -- you know, 20 to 30 units per acre. By the time things go through the process, and get public input, and, you know, there's all the stakeholders, many times what people are doing is
building less housing where we need to. And we are having
tensions where we're actually getting the economics
of development is pushing housing or making it more cost
effective for people to build on the fringes and build in
our unincorporated areas.

So our plans are good. We just have to be able
to implement that and kind of affect the way we do that.
So I wanted to kind of put that into perspective.

In terms of highlights, we do a lot of things
that are similar between all our four agencies. Like,
MTC, we have a Smart Growth Incentive Program, that
encourages and incentivize our local jurisdictions to plan
for smart growth, plan for transit, plan for higher
density housing.

We just -- our board just approved about nearly
$30 million of funds in the last year for this. SANDAG
and the San Diego region has been a leader in habitat
conservation. I'll talk a little bit about that in
relation to how we integrate that with our major capital
Improvement projects.

The new things that we're doing that frankly we
are experimenting. We are getting new partners. We are
trying to figure things out, things to support the three
revolutions, for example. We're working on a mobility hub
strategy. We've talked on something like that to look at
how can we take our transit infrastructure that we have, some of which is good. We have some good light rail systems that are in place that serve our highest density populations. They are the highest rider -- rider -- ridership systems, and we haven't seen that drop off in transit ridership on our high quality rail systems that we have in some of our bus systems.

So how can we take that and really use that as a trunk, as kind of the central nervous system, that then we can connect communities. So we've done things like regional mobility hub planning. I have cities that actually do want to implement that, to put scooter share, to put ride share, to put the amenities for shopping, your dry cleaning, whatever, so you can take advantage of the investments your already have today and make those connections that may or may not include typical buses and typical shuttles and stuff. We may need to look at different -- different ways of doing that.

We ran a bill last year on Neighborhood Electric Vehicles, because we have cities that want to -- that see that they can't get people from where their transit stations are out into their communities. And so they want to look at deploying Neighborhood Electric Vehicles to take that and move people around.

We've talked a lot about -- you know, and a lot
of the discussion talks about highways versus transit. Frankly, that's the wrong discussion. Really, people will go and people will use modes if it's convenient for them, and if it makes sense, and if it's priced right. And we'll talk about pricing later.

One of the things that we've been doing as an agency since 1988 when our first sales tax measure was approved was investing in what's now called active transportation, or ATP. We used to call it walkable communities back then. And it was only about a million dollars a year. Since then, we've doubled that -- we've doubled the percentage from our sales tax measure. We're putting monies in. The Board has approved a regional bicycle program, which includes bike lanes, services, education, counting to see how many people are actually using that.

But we're only five years into that. So I think some of the transformational changes you're going to see with active transportation really is going to depend on this infrastructure being built out the same way we've built out our transit and freeway networks.

And we know right now you're going to have a lot of people in the audience. We have relationships with more than a dozen community-based organizations that we've put under contract to work with us in our planning, in our
implementation. Beyond those, we have other partners that we're working with. Many of you, I think, are going to hear from them through the audience that we're working with as well. Because how we, you know, address the have and have nots and where those are geo -- those geographic areas we need to better serve is also very important to us.
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MS. KAWADA: So our challenges. A lot of it you've heard before. For us, we have about 3.3 million people right now. And we are expected to grow about another million, just another million. So I've got three-quarters of the folks and the jobs that are already here. So anything that we do to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, or reduce VMT, or to improve equity is going to really need to focus on the folks that are here today. We're going to need to look at strategies that address those folks, not just the new growth.

In terms of technology and new mobility, that's something we are struggling with. But where I think that regions can play a role that is different from the State agencies and the locals, I think we are that bridge, because we are where we can -- I think things can be tested. We've been very successful early on.

Back in the nineties, I was a project manager for
our first congestion pricing pilot program. So that has formed the basis of our hot lane networks in not just the San Diego region, but all throughout the state. That started as a pilot project, because people thought we were crazy doing that.

So those are the kinds of things that we need to think about now. What are these new things? What are the new mobility services we need to pilot? I think people are open to it, but I don't know if we want to jump, you know, straight into the deep end right away. And I think regions are the places that we can push our local agencies. We can -- we can, you know, bridge that gap between the State, and the federal government, and localities and pilot things that then we can scale up.

Pricing is going to be important. We're right in the midst of doing our next SCS. And so we just started some early sort of concepts, running our models, where we looked at three different things. One, we looked at what if we took all our money and we just invested it in the highway system? Can we reduce congestion? What does that do? Can that reduce GHG? What does that do to VMT.

We did the same thing taking that same about -- amount of money. What if we invested it all in transit. So two capital things, transit versus highway.

And then we did another one that looked at
ramping up a lot of policies. Well, the two capital 
investments both got us below the targets that ARB has set 
for us for 2035. So our targets are in the 19 percent 
range. We got to maybe 15 or 16 percent.

Where we turned up the policies -- and when I 
talk about policies, it's things likes TDM, you know, 
demand management, it's better signal coordination, it is -- but it's pricing. It's pricing parking. It's 
tolling. It's pricing VMT. We got in the 20s in terms of 
GHG reduction. So it can be done.

That scenario showed that we could reduce GHG, we 
can reduce VMT. But guess where it failed? It failed in 
equity, because the folks that are least able to pay 
higher fees are lower income folks. And so that's not the 
right solution either, but that's definitely something 
that we've shown that, yeah, through modeling in our 
exercise, we can do -- we can move it in all the right 
directions, but at a cost. And so that's not the right 
answer.

But we do need to think about, so how do we take 
those models, and how do we apply it?

Right now, in the San Diego region -- and like 
many metropolitan regions, about three-quarters of our 
folks drive alone for their commute trip. I have an 
employer that actually is reverse. Three-quarters of
their people take transit, and take biking, and carpool. And that employer is SANDAG.

So basically in downtown San Diego, we have about 300 employees. We offer reduced transit passes. We offer TDM programs. We subsidize, you know, biking and walking. We have showers in our buildings. And actually three-quarters of our employees take something other than driving alone to work. So we've really flipped that script.

But why does it work? It works because we're in downtown San Diego and we have good transit. It works because we have a walkable system, because we have restaurants, shopping. You can take your dry-cleaning. It works because we provide subsidies. So it's not that there's not models out that work, it's how do you take that and scale it up?

We have our iCommute Program, that reaches out on a voluntary basis to employers that are looking to do the right thing or looking to reduce their parking needs. So as I mentioned, three-quarters of the folks in San Diego for their drive-alone trip is -- you know, drive alone for their commute trip.

For the employers that we work with, we baseline their things. They start off like that. But on average, we've reduced their drive-alone commute by about 10
percent. And that -- we know that, because we survey them
every 18 months and we work with them on a, you know,
really hand-holding basis. So we have that in place.
That could be scaled up working with our jurisdictions.
So there's -- there's models that are out there.

And housing and affordability, I'm not going to
talk a whole lot. I mean, it's really something that I
think everyone knows in the room.
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MS. KAWADA: In terms of successes -- I have two
Commissioners here Commissioner Madaffer and Commissioner
Kehoe. And I wanted to talk about one of our great --
what we feel is a really great success in the north coast
corridor.

This is a -- this is a $6 billion vision for one
of our lifeline corridors. It's our -- it's one of two
north/south corridors. I have about 60 percent of the
population in San Diego region that live in the coastal
area. And here, thank you to CTC, thank you to Chairman
Frazier, thank you Secretary Annis. CTC has invested
funds through the Solutions for Congested Corridors and
funding to improve this.

And what this does is it's looking at
transportation really as a holistic system. So it's not
just a freeway widening. It's not just a double tracking.
It's not just building bike. It's everything together. And what we're looking at is how do people move? People move in this corridor. I have the highest -- second highest inner-city rail system in this corridor, the LOSSAN corridor, besides the northeast corridor. I have, you know, truck traffic, freight traffic that's using this corridor that connects our border and our largest -- California's largest trading partners with Mexico up to north -- you know, ports north and destinations north.

So what we're building here is basically pricing -- building new lanes that can be priced, and incentivized for carpools, and transit, and vanpools. We're double tracking a coastal rail corridor to ultimately provide more Amtrak service, provide more COASTER service, provide more freight service. We're spending more than $100 million in one of the lagoons to re -- to reenergize that lagoon.

Transportation has been a barrier to the environment over the years. And so we are restoring that lagoon, spending more $100 million. The kicker is we knew we needed to dredge and clean the lagoons, and so we're pumping that sand that we dredged -- it's high quality sand -- back on the beaches to improve recreation actually. And it helps with adaptation in terms of sea level rise and climb adaptation, because we have the wider beaches.
So it's helping -- it's for a win-win-win.

One of the things that Caltrans has done, we needed to do retaining walls on some of this. We looked at breaking that retaining wall up, so it wasn't like, you know, some 50-foot high retaining wall, and actually stepping it. And when they looked at that, they said, oh, we actually could basically provide that space now for bicycling. So we added a new bike lane along the side of the freeway for the folks, as I joke, the spandex riders, that like to use it. Because of different ways, we're just looking at how we can encourage transportation.

And we're doing bike lanes. We're making sure our transportation corridors aren't barriers to people needing to walk, and bike, and commute in these local cities and communities.
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MS. KAWADA: So our policies, or in terms of what we're asking for. Obviously, I think one of the things we're looking for is we're spending a lot of time on modeling and numbers. And we know we need to do that. We know we need to be data driven, but we do need to sit down.

The one thing that SB 375 has allowed us to do working with our partners is we're doing a lot of best practices. MTC I think is doing great things in terms of
housing. Other folks are doing things with the urban rural divide. So I do think that we need to spend a little less time and really sit down and going what are the things that we know work, and then how do we -- can we fund that?

Pricing is going to be important. You know, whether it's a VMT fee that we ultimately transform to, whether we get as regions a little bit more flexibility in trying to insert pricing, and do it in such a way that's still safe and can be piloted before we can scale up. I think we need to work on that.

Smart city initiatives. One of the biggest things that people -- people want growth and they want housing. But one of the biggest things that they're frustrated with is traffic congestion. And so one of our ideas with this plan is cities want to do smart signals. They want to provide the infrastructure that's the future infrastructure for EVs and connected vehicles. How can we take that and make it a smart region approach, so we can help the cities look at what they need to invest in. We can help procure things that they need to do in terms of communications, and signals, and whatnot. So that's an idea we have.

And we really need to look at -- one of the areas that we've been trying to push is EVs. We have a
commitment we made with our last plan to stand up a regional charging infrastructure program. We know we need to increase charging stations ten-fold. We know we need to basically coordinate that.

When I started asking our team to look into that, I was sort of -- I'm still confused, because I got a -- I've got ABC of agencies. I have ARB working, you know, on the Electrify America proposal with the Volkswagen settlement. I've got CEC that's helped funded some things. I've got the PUC that's working with SDG&E. We're doing all these kind of charging things. We're sort of circling around these independent planets or moons, and we haven't really sat down and go, okay, we know we need more charging stations. How do we plan for that? How do we -- how do we fund it? And how do we bring all those sources together?

So I think that's where I talk about the regions being that bridge and being -- you know, we can plan. We know what those cities are going to grow. We can help fund. We have great GIS capacities. We have great data.

And so those are some of the things that we'd really like to work on together in partnership with both agencies.

Thank you.

Darin is up?
CTC CHAIR INMAN: Thank you, Kim.

MR. CHIDSEY: Good afternoon. Darin Chidsey.

I'm the Interim Executive Director at the Southern California Association of Governments.

Nice to meet all of you that I don't know, and good to see some familiar faces.

MR. CHIDSEY: Before I get going, I just want to thank your staffs. Our organizations get the opportunity, probably more than any other organizations, to work very closely with both of your staffs on a regular basis. Certainly, they're always professional, and today, putting together, was no exception. So really appreciate it, Richard and Susan, really the six months we've been talking about getting to today, and how exciting it is to finally have this conversation.

We work in this world, as you've seen, you know, over the last hour, every day. Certainly air quality goals are very much tied to our transportation goals, and have been in the, you know, 30 plus years since the Clean Air Act. So it's exciting to be here to talk specifically about what's going on, and really get to dig in a little bit as to what the successes on SB 375 have been, and certainly as has been identified some of those
opportunities to continue forward.

I'm the closer, so I'm going to focus a little bit on some SCAG work, and then also tie together some of the comments you've heard from our MPO colleagues.

One of the things that we jumped over a little bit at the beginning is how much has changed since 2008 and SB 375 passed. We actually had a slide that was earlier that listed off seven things. And I want you to think about how many of them are true today that were true in 2007 that were assumptions when we started down this path.

One, the economy would continue to grow; two, the state's population would continue to grow in similar ways; three, more housing would be built; four redevelopment would play a vital role in success; five, we had significant questions about the impact of technology, but we never envisioned TNCs; six, we would find a way to capture choice transit riders, and; seven, gas prices would continue to climb.

And I say that as the start of our conversation because these are just some examples of things that we really thought would probably be true over the last decade. Let's on a little bit more about the conversation about technology, certainly, at that time, the same year coincidentally, maybe, maybe not, that the iPhone was introduced, right? And here we go, our world of
transportation has completely been turned over. And we're only a decade into that.

And when we talk about long-range planning, and when we talk about the work that we do, I mean, it usually takes decades to make any progress. So I do think it's important that we focus on these things, because certainly some of those were uncertainties and unknowns. And certainly, some of those took some time for us to take a step back and say what does this really mean and how do we do that.

And I think you're going to see and have heard in each one of our presentations, we're all doing that. We're all doing that in a very new way. But what that means is sometimes those successes aren't going to come to fruition as fast as we want them to be. And sometimes not every one of them is going to work, and so we have to -- we have to balance that as we move through.

In the SCAG region, again in 2008, we were in a time just entering into a recession that really over the course of about 18, 24 months took away a million jobs. And think about that a million jobs from a region that's about half the state.

We started at that time really looking more closely at what we as an organization could do at the -- with the economy. We worked more closely with certainly
our business partners and the private sector. And the key question that always came back was we have to invest in our transportation system. We have to think about how do we get people to work? How do we support our economy? And that stayed true as we worked on our initial Sustainable Communities Strategy. And I think that today, if you looked at one success as something that nobody quite saw before SB 375 was passed, it was that sense of collaboration.

Pam O'Connor, who's a past President of SCAG, was President of SCAG when we adopted our first SCS. Where is Pam at? There she is. She thought -- she did the impossible, and that is she brought together a region of nearly 18 million people, 191 cities, six counties, all those different transportation commissions in very -- environmental and business interests and brought them together through a Sustainable Communities Strategy, in its first one that was voted on and passed unanimously.

President Wapner is our current SCAG President, is also here. He was the Chair of the Transportation Commission at that time, and now is our SCAG President. Certainly, as we gear up to do it again, the challenges are going to be
just as great.

But on top of the partnerships that were formed at that time, we've seen a dramatic amount of change in our transportation system. In our last plan, certainly rail transit system expansion has been key to that. The slide that you see in the top right, those big blue lines, those red lines, those shows all, in our plan, of the rail lines that will be in Southern California in 2045.

I can tell you if I showed you that slide from 1990, there wouldn't be one line in it. So when you think about change in a region and how conversations like this can help bring that change forward, it certainly can happen. But again, that's almost a 50-year period. We have to think about how long it takes to move some of these things forward. Not saying that that's okay, but I think some perspective on that is very, very important.

But some specific facts about how much our transit system has grown, and you heard Phil talk about it earlier today, we're going to add over 200 miles in our urban and commuter rail systems, and I think more importantly, about 160 new stations. So when we think about TOD, when we think about changing communities, the opportunities of the decades that are coming before us to really double our rail stations and how we can plan and think more strategically around them, that's a really
great opportunity, and again, one of those things I think is going to take some time for us to really see how it makes it happen.

Our plan certainly focused on population employment growth, in how quality transit areas. Traditionally, in Southern California, it was kind of a 30 percent to 70 split between single family housing and multi-family housing. We started to see that shift in our plans. And certainly, as we're starting to see some of those implemented, the density is certainly increasing, not exactly where we thought it might be in terms of close to transit. But certainly, we are seeing density increase throughout the region.

On active transportation, the initial plan we had about $2 billion. That tripled to $6 billion dollars. And we're really starting to see through programs like our Go Human Program, those of you on the -- on the CTC that can stay Friday night, we're having a special Go Human Exhibit, where we're lighting up a walkway, connecting Metrolink station to the festival of lights. And again, these are really innovative ideas to show how first/last mile solutions can really bring together some exciting change.

And I think most importantly one of the things that we're able to do over this last decade is start to
incentivize our member jurisdictions to think differently about their land use and their planning. We certainly have done that through about 260 local demonstration projects throughout Southern California, $33 million.

We certainly thank the Secretary and Chair Frazier for including more money for that in SB 1. It's a little thing we can do to start to connect on those planning grants to really incentivize some of those -- those incentives moving forward.

--o0o--

MR. CHIDSEY: The challenges. You've heard about -- all my colleagues talk about these earlier today. Certainly transit use is declining. Housing prices are increasing, and certainly not keeping up with our median income. Just as a little note, median income in Southern California is really only about $65,000, maybe $68,000 a year. In the Bay Area, it's over $103,000

So I think it was noted by Member Mitchell earlier, the differences without -- within the regions and meeting the solutions are going to be different within each one of the regions. And that's just one little example.

Here's a shameless plug for those of you that are interested in learning more and aren't CTC Commissioners that are going to be busy on Thursday, we are having our
annual economic summit just down the street on Thursday. And certainly, we'll be updating all sorts of regional economic information, as well as looking at some of the future of transportation how we think Southern California is poised to really grow our economy around some of that transportation and technology.

New technology, you know, has been touched on before. Certainly is going to be a big part of anything we do. What that looks like certainly is going to be a big question mark. But I think one of the things that we've learned, and I'll give kind of a specific example of it, is about five years ago when we're doing our 2016 plan, Hyperloop, which is headquartered right down the street from here, came and met with us.

And we're talking about what we do, and what's the long range plan, and what does it mean, and why it's important? And they said, well, that's great. We want to be in it. You know, we're going to be up and going in two years. We've got to get in this plan. I said, well, here's what you need to do and I lay out a process for them about how they would need to be part of our plan.

And they, you know, certainly as people that are on the cutting edge of technology, that are pushing the entrepreneurial spirit just looked at me with blank stares and then went on along their way.
So I think one of the key things we learned and we're going to have to focus on as we're updating our next plan is how do we make sure transportation, technology projects have a different way to access the capital, and the system, and the regulations that are part of our plans?

Because simply saying go down this path and wait a decade, wait 15 years is not going to move us as fast as we need. So some sort of new framework on that, outside of just trying to understand what technology really means.

And certainly, we talked about climate. We have a lot of work going on in our new plan to really address not just sea level rise, certainly we have the wildfires that have been very impactful in our region, but also things that, like earthquakes, that we know it's inevitable it's going to happen in this region, how do we make sure Southern California is going to be able to show the strength and resiliency needed over the next decades to come.

--o0o--

MR. CHIDSEY: But we have had some success. And I did want to focus on that a little bit. We've talked a lot about the challenges of transit. And I can tell you, you know, a couple specific examples where we have seen transit increase. Certainly, we've seen the Metro Expo
Line be expanded to the ocean. We've seen the Gold Line be expanded.

We've seen all sorts of new investments happen along those transit lines. So I think there are some positive signs for transit in there, particularly on our rail systems, as we continue to connect and grow that system. It becomes more useful. Again, I talked about the 160 new stations. Lots of opportunity. Lots of successes there.

On bust transit, it's true, we've done a lot of work certainly in Southern California understanding why transit has declined. A big piece of that certainly has been, to some degree, the economic growth that's happened in the region over the last decade as people have greater access to cars, because they have greater resources, because interest rates have been low. All those have combined to allow some users to make a choice that made more sense for them.

How do we get those riders back might not be the only question. It's how do we get new riders? How do we make it more useful? And there's some -- I think some positives news on that too.

Again, we're the first -- we're the first time in really 50 years our industry has had to rethink itself. And everyone of those -- the individuals that spoke before
me, everyone of our member agencies has really focused on that.

We see in San Bernardino doing a lot of different things in that county. Orange County, I'm certainly has still had their transit ridership decline, but they focused some resources on one of their lines that had lost the most, you know, readdressed resources from other parts of the county. And they've actually been able, with those change in investments, to start to see an uptick in certainly some of those lines that they've focused on the most.

So it's focusing all of us to work harder, to think harder. But I think a lot of us are -- we are up to the challenge and you're starting to see some of these changes really bring up some new -- some new opportunities as we move forward.

--o0o--

MR. CHIDSEY: A couple policy recommendations from SCAG, and then I'm going to highlight a few from the -- all of the regions that spoke before me.

Certainly, and we talked about this, and everybody has, you know, greater sustainable funding tools to support RTP/S implementation. I think I've met with most all of you at some point individually and talked about the challenges that the SCAG region has had on
cap-and-trade funding. Certainly, very excited by that opportunity when it initially came out, and certainly thank you, Secretary Annis. We always appreciate that the portions that come out of transit do have that sense of regional equity.

Other programs have not had that same regional equity, particularly affordable housing sustainable communities portion. We still are in that 20 percent range of where we have 50 percent of the population in two-thirds of the disadvantaged communities.

So without that, without redevelopment agencies, it has been a challenge, because we have not been able to have some of those catalyst type development type projects in our region. But we are working towards that. And certainly I've got new money to do a couple of those in the years to come.

Certainly looking for State leadership's role in new transportation technologies, in VMT reductions. When we talk about pricing, certainly the idea of congestion pricing and really being able to focus and study that more clearly is something we're very interested in that. Looking at some specific areas and perhaps some pilot programs that we'd like to certainly partner with the State on seeing if there's benefits to doing that.

And most importantly, CEQA streamlining. It's
been talked about from everybody before. Glad to hear the
success that James has had with the SB 375 CEQA
streamlining. We have not seen one of those projects
happen in our region. And so not only on the
transportation, but on the housing side, ensuring that
we're able to cut costs, cut time, and have some sort of
relief on CEQA is certainly going to help move this
forward.

--o0o--

MR. CHIDSEY: When we talk statewide from our
colleagues representing the agencies above, it's a pretty
common list of suggestions. All of us I think could
easily put these on the table. And the one that I would
just add is time. Again, I think that for 30 plus year
transportation plans, that are plans. You know, they're
not regulatory documents. They are plans. They are first
step in thinking what we can and what we possibly can do
in regions, but making sure that there is a little bit
more time than has been, before we judge are they going to
be successful, can they be successful or not?

But I think there's some realities that certainly
Professor Sperling put on the table that we're going to
need to address head on.

And certainly redevelopment, technology, really
finding this way to capture innovation in ways that we
haven't been able to do before. Looking how, if we are going to explore pricing strategies, how do we make sure equity is at the center of that, because certainly that's very, very critical, especially in our region like ours that have a lower median income and high commute patterns oftentimes for those lower paying jobs.

And how do we make sure funding is consistent? The federal level certainly is going to be a big ask, but we're going to have to all get together as we look towards what the future of the Highway Trust Fund looks like. But also on the State side, that certainly SB 1 is a huge, huge support mechanism for the work that we do. But the reality is there still are unmet needs all over the state that we're going to have to figure out how to be innovative to do.

And bold housing actions. I mean, we can't do any of this if there aren't new houses that are being built, that we're finding a way to support workforce, to support low income. Because the reality is, you know, transportation and housing will always be integrally linked. And until we're able to solve one, we're never going to be able to make any impact on the other.

So with that, thanks. And happy for me and my colleagues to ask -- answer any questions.

Thank you, Chair.
CTC CHAIR INMAN: Hey, Darin, thank you so much. And thanks for working closely with our two staffs. And is that any coincidence then that we're meeting on your birthday?

(Laughter.)

MR. CHIDSEY: I thought it was a birthday present to me, so thank you. Glad to be here.

CTC CHAIR INMAN: It is. So we'll all join in wishing Darin a very happy birthday.

(Applause.)

CTC CHAIR INMAN: You thought we didn't notice that.

(Laughter.)

CTC CHAIR INMAN: So if I could ask your other colleagues to come forward and then open it up to questions by my colleagues up here from the Boards and Commission.

Yes. Commissioner Alvarado.

CTC COMMISSIONER ALVARADO: Kim, this is a question for you.

On this $10 million dollar study, that's for your whole are?

MS. KAWADA: Yeah.

CTC COMMISSIONER ALVARADO: And it has the general plans for all the cities. It has, you know,
pretty much everything in your area. You spent 10 million
bucks on that thing?

MS KAWADA: Yeah. That includes the 18 cities
and the county. Their land-use plans has integrated with
our regional transportation plans going out to the year
2050.

CTC COMMISSIONER ALVARADO: And I imagine there
was an EIR did on every single -- on that thing right
there.

MS. KAWADA: Yes. So --

CTC COMMISSIONER ALVARADO: And this is one of
the barriers that we have. And I'm sure this is not
unique to SANDAG. They just spent $10 million on a
regional EIR. Yet, in every single city -- in every
single project in every single city can be challenged on
an EIR, and take years to get through the planning
process.

And, you know, we're here as a Transportation
Commission, we're here as an Air Board, but over and over
again, housing came up as an issue. We need to recognize
these regional EIRs. We need to recognize these regional
planning -- you know, the cities have done their planning.
They've done their housing element. This document has
taken all that into consideration. We need to recognize
that document.
This should be a design review issue. We shouldn't have to litigate EIRs and zoning over, and over, and over again. It should be does this project fit into the community? Does it enhance whether it's downtown, urban, or rural. Does it enhance the quality of life. Does it provide the things that we're looking for.

That's $10 million really that only addressed the greenhouse gas issue. It only addressed -- and I'm not -- I don't -- forgive me, I just drew a blank. SB 375, that only addressed SB 375.

Now, here we go again with every single project in every single town going to be challenged on an EIR. And you do one project here on block A and it has an EIR. And when you go to block B, there's another one. And it -- and it was already taken care of in this thing. The fact is taken care of better because that's a regional look at things, rather than a project-by-project look at things.

So I think, you know, we need to look at -- and I kind of brought it up before. We need to look at a couple things. We need to look at the regional EIRs. And I think we need to look at zoning.

You know, I think that zoning is exclusionary. I think, you know, when you talk about an R1, it should be 20 units unless. And if you fit in, you don't need a
parking variance, then you just go through with it. And again, it becomes a design review issue, rather than a zoning and an EIR issue.

   Thank you, Karen.

CTC CHAIR INMAN: Thank you.

Other comments, questions?

We've got a lot talent standing in front of us.

Yes, Paul.

CTC COMMISSIONER VAN KONYNENBURG: I just want to thank you all for giving us an opportunity to comment in a and very limited way walk in your shoes and have greater empathy for what you go through on this planning process. And I know you didn't have time to go into depth of how much public input you have into these plans.

   But I know from the limited visibility I've had to the different plans, they have a lot of public input. And they're very, very expensive, and very, very time consuming. So thank you for sharing with us, and again allowing us to walk in your shoes and get to know what you go through to get these done.

CTC CHAIR INMAN: Yes, Jim.

CTC VICE CHAIR EARP: So more than one of you talked about the need for additional -- well, flexibility in funding, but also just more money. And I'm trying to figure out exactly where that would come from, or if
you've got any ideas? Because the voters have just
supported a major, and as you all know, very significant
funding increase that was desperately needed for our
transportation infrastructure. They've upheld that --
that legislation through refusing to vote for the repeal.

So that was good news. The Air Resources Board
has a very robust Cap-and-Trade Program that raises a lot
of money. And if you haven't spent it all, you know
where you're going to spend it. So I'm just kind of
wondering, you know, where -- where we would go from here?
Because frankly, we've got a pretty significant chunk of
funding that we need to be pretty responsible for. I'm
not sure that I can think of where else we would go.

MR. CHIDSEY: Vice Chair, absolutely. But I
think what have to do is to put into context that the
plans that we do are 25, 30 year plans. And I think both
of those funding sources that you cited, whether it's an
increase in the gas tax or declining revenue sources.

So as we look to see what's going to happen
towards the future, and we certainly know, you know, fuel
consumption is declining, and will continue to decline,
absolutely SB 1 has put us in a great spot, and I don't
think it's any short-term that there's anything else.

But as we look to the last decades of our plans,
certainly there's going to need to be new funding. Same
with the cap-and-trade funding, if it is successful, certainly we're hoping that emissions are going to decline and those revenues are going to come in. It could go up, but they could certainly decline over those times.

So I don't know that it's a look to a place. I think the other thing I would add is on the federal government side, you -- I know our plan is about 13 percent federally funded. It's about 70 percent local, about 20, you know, plus percent State funded.

So the federal government is going to certainly -- the Highway Trust Fund is going to be insolvent within the next 18 months. So they're going to have to address some of their needs there.

So I think all of them just revolve around not just about more money, but it's about how do we make sure these funds are stable through the future, so we can plan accordingly around them.

CTC VICE CHAIR EARP: I think that obviously Commission Madaffer has been working on a very important program here for the last several years. And I think those of us in the transportation community know that over time alternative funding mechanism is going to have to be in place, because, you know, we're pushing -- if all of these goals that have to do with reducing greenhouse gas are achieved, then we really aren't going to have much in
the way of petroleum based fuels to tax, and the
Cap-and-Trade Program will, at some point, exhaust itself.

And so then we're looking at, you know, perhaps a
vehicle miles traveled program, which apparently nobody
likes around here, as far as vehicle miles traveled. So
I'm just kind of wondering what are -- you know, what our
thought process is. We don't obviously -- I don't think
it's necessary today to start aggressively pushing toward
that, because we have just gone through a major upheaval
to try to just solidify a very important funding source.

But we all know in another 10, 15 years, that
funding source -- those funding sources are going to be
much different than they are today. And so we need to be
able to kind of start laying the groundwork for that.

MS. BOCKELMAN: I'll just add one more thing. I
mentioned sort of modernizing how we administer some of
the programs. And I think that's an opportunity where we
can talk. I understand growing the pot is big right now,
and holding onto SB 1 was a huge victory for everyone.

But as one example, I know there's been a lot --
long-standing discussion about whether the MPOs could have
a greater role in the affordable housing Sustainable
Communities Strategy funding, which is -- goes to the SGC.

Right now, we have a fairly limited role in that.
And I shouldn't be the one saying this, because the Bay
Area has done very well in this program, so you're --

(Laughter.)

MS. BOCKELMAN: But anyways, that said, I think that that was an area where we thought this could -- you know, it would make sense for the MPOs to have a larger role in delivering the SCS. Another one I would mention, MTC really partners very well with the air district in our region, but we have come up, when we've talked about, well, how could we accelerate, you know, conversion of zero-emission fleet for the buses? How can we do more charging stations?

Sometimes we come up against rules that, well, you know, if you want TFCA funds, you need to go through, you know, an annual process, and we need to look at every single GHG for each little piece of the project, or something like that. And sometimes that's very hard when you're trying to put together a very ambitious like let's go ahead and accelerate this, let's do big moves, let's partner, let's put some of our money in, let's put some of your money in.

So I guess I would say that maybe it's not always about growing the pie, but could we think more strategically how we administer the programs, and how we can partner? And sometimes the really complicated application processes that we require, I don't know that
they're always getting us the best outcomes.

MR. CORLESS: Mr. Vice Chair, if I could. Just
to build on Alix's point. The point I made at the end of
my presentation about the -- we have the public housing
redevelopment just north of Sacramento. We can't apply,
because -- or qualify, because we don't have a transit
station, but we want the money to build the transit
station. That would actually be -- that would be a lot
better if we could get some access to those AHSC funds,
and get them at a regional level, and then set our
criteria based region by region. That's just one example.

It's not new funding, but it is a way for us to I
think leverage more of the State funds, and be mindful of
the geographic differences. That's number one.

Number two, I know I stand here with a lot of
MPOs who are in pretty robust self-help county regions,
but there's a lot of inland California, and there's a lot
of the Central Valley who still struggles to meet a
two-thirds vote threshold. I know that's been tried a
lot.

For instance, I've got my Placer County
colleagues here, who if they can't get a lower vote
threshold, would love a smaller geography to be able to
draw. Let us -- allow to us be creative in the parts of
our regions, or even the part -- the subparts of our
counties, or subparts of our regions. The voters that are willing to say yes to something like a sales tax increase, we would love that flexibility.

And just a final point on that coming back from Congress last week, where I testified before the U.S. Senate on the next transportation bill, I am convinced, and I don't have to convince you probably, there's no more 80 percent, 90 percent federal money, right? That -- those days are in the past. What there is probably are loans, are incentive match programs. The Trump administration actually floated this idea for localities that are actually self help. This is the future. We need to do as much self-help as we can all across the state.

MR. CHESLEY: If I could add just a point here. And you know this better than almost anybody, Commissioner Earp, when it comes to a half cent sales tax, we -- I've talked to our board about it, what polls well in our region is roadway maintenance, interchange projects, some local roadway projects that are -- can be improved in some manner.

When we talk about some of the things that we've talked about here before you in terms of greenhouse gas emission reductions, trying to lower VMT numbers, they don't poll nearly as well. It could be -- you could catch particular groups for it. We've talked about a half cent
sales tax on top of our existing half cent sales tax. But it's not something that's going to win the day, at least not at a two-thirds level, for the kinds of things we've talked about today.

CTC VICE CHAIR EARP: And I'll close with just a though on that. I'm glad you brought that up, because I think it's a point that we have to be very, very cognizant of here, so that we're talking in realities. Many of the goals that we are striving to figure out how to get our hands around to reach are important goals. I don't think it's instructive for us to use or rely on one tool to try to do everything. And to think that, for instance, reducing vehicle miles traveled is the linchpin of achieving greenhouse gas reduction.

It is a tool, but it's like trying to use a hammer to put a screwdriver -- a screw in, you know, sometimes it's just not the right tool necessarily for certain things. So I think we need to be very cognizant of the fact that we still live in a democracy. If you ask the average citizen what cap and trade is, you're going to get a blank look.

They're going to have no idea what you're talking about, and they will complete -- definitely not know that cap-and-trade may have added $0.40 to $0.50 to the price of gasoline that they're paying.
They all seem to kind of get the fact that gas
taxes were increasing here, because of recent legislation,
but they didn't really know exactly how that worked
either. And so, I think, you know, when they were
educated about what our -- where our infrastructure was,
and what was -- you know, what was going to happen if we
didn't have that funding, they kind of got that message.
And so we were able to preserve a very important chunk of
funding right now.

But when you get ride down to it, most people are
very, very pragmatic about getting from point A to B, and
what they're dealing with from day-to-day. And it's going
to take awhile, I think, for us to really help enlarge the
vision of all that there is -- that there are benefits
that come with some of the things that we're talking about
today, that are going to take some time, and some
coordination.

I don't have an answer for that. I don't know
where -- you know, and I don't think meetings like this
necessarily are going to solve all of those problems. But
we do need to be able to figure out how we're going to --
how we're going to get there. But we -- at the end of the
day, we do still live in a democracy. We still have to
answer to voters who pay our taxes and pay the bills for
all of this.
And I think that at the -- you know, I live in a community that has done a pretty good job of, thanks to developers, Commissioner Ghielmetti, who have built a lot of bike paths, and bike lanes, and done a lot of parks, a lot of things that have made that community more enjoyable to use, to walk around in, to ride your bike in and so forth, and we live there because of that.

But if I have to go to Home Depot to get sheet of plywood, I'm definitely not going to be doing it on my bicycle. I'm going to be getting in my pickup and sticking it in the back of my pickup. So we have to remember that there's goods movement issues. There's a lot of other issues.

We live -- we had a huge devastating fire in the north. There is now beginning -- they're looking at what happened in Paradise. They had just redone downtown main street, made it more, you know, calming, where they got rid of lanes, and they made it so that there were -- you know, it was more pedestrian friendly. But, you know, unfortunately that didn't help evacuate a lot of people. And so there were a lot of people that died.

I don't know if you can point your finger specifically to that, but I think that didn't help. And so we have to figure out -- we really have to be open-minded about the consequences of where we go with our
decisions on transportation, and how we use our funds. There are very important goals to be achieved in terms of just being able to move an ever increasing population in this state also. And so we're going to have to figure all of that out.

Thank you

CTC CHAIR INMAN: Thank you.
Mary and I are trying to figure out what else we can do. This is great.

Other questions?

Yes, Chair Frazier, oh, and then we'll go to Ghielmetti.

Thank you.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER FRAZIER: So thank you very much, Madam Chair. So just kind of a statement. When we look at unfunded mandates, they're aspirational goals. If we don't give the dollars to accomplish the mandate, then it can't be generally accomplished. We can't expect with people's general funds being taxed to the constraints of the economy now, it's unfortunate.

When you look at the California State Budget, say it's $136 billion a year. We only have about $3 billion of discretionary funds that we can utilize going forward. There's 120 mouths in the legislature. That has to feed those mouths. Okay. Plain and simple. So when
you look at the self-help counties who are going out and stepping forward and being a part of a solution to reduce GHG, to reduce vehicle miles traveled, because of the efficiencies that they're gaining with their investment, they can take their money and do local projects only, if they choose to do so.

And the people that they represent would. So not recognizing the self-help counties is absolutely criminal. They are a big factor in this going forward of the success of everybody's efforts in California.

The other process is that when you look at Mr. Annis's budget in -- over at the Agency, catastrophes have devastated his budget in the last few years from moving forward and going -- and working through the Big Sur, the mudslides down south.

So we have unanticipated costs that have gone completely off the charts. But yet, we talk about doing other things that are either unattainable because of funds, or we're pointing fingers at people because we can.

The other thing is the tools have been removed from some of the MPOs was affordable housing. Twenty-five percent of cap and trade was taken away and utilized somewhere else. That it's intended purpose when it was conceived.

We can continue to talk about this. But unless
there's money, and you have a resource to go to and tap, all of this is for not. We don't have housing, because developers aren't building it, because of legislation that was enacted many years ago called SB 800. And they will not build multi-family homes because of risk for latent and patent defects for ten years. It's an automatic lawsuit, if you build multi-family homes, and Mr. Ghielmetti can confirm that.

So there's all -- so many traps that are laid in place. CEQA. Unless, there's a priority made by this body and all the other bodies in California, nothing is going to be accomplished. We're just going to continue to talk about it. So I wish that we would make a concerted effort to talk about it. If it could be funded, then this would be a possibility to accomplish.

That's all I've got to say.

CTC CHAIR INMAN: Thank you, Chair Frazier.

Commissioner Ghielmetti.

CTC COMMISSIONER GHIELMETTI: He's fund to sit next to.

(Laughter.)

CTC COMMISSIONER GHIELMETTI: I'd just like to turn the attention back to, I think, one of the critical issues with regard to congestion and air quality et cetera, and that's where we put housing. We've created a
lot of jobs, for example, in our area in the Silicon Valley. And we have -- we have some good transit systems. We have a Caltrain that starts in the City of Gilroy every morning and goes into the heart of Silicon Valley, where more of the jobs are being created with Apple, Google, Facebook, et cetera, and for that matter continues all the way into San Francisco, where we have Twitter -- the President's favorite toy -- as well as Salesforce, et cetera, but we have poor land-use policies.

And I think until we address the land-use policies of trying to put housing closer to where we're creating the jobs, we're never going to solve this air quality and congestion problem that's facing the state.

To that extent, I think we need to work with either the League of California Cities, if they're willing to work with us. But there has to be some sort of check and balance in terms of where we're going to put housing. Everyone says there's a housing crisis, but God forbid we put it in your backyard. No one wants it there, but they know there's a housing crisis, and we have to take care of it.

In the State of Massachusetts, and this was developed with affordable housing, they created legislation called 40B. And I'm probably going to bastardize the summary of it. But in essence, it said if
the cities don't put the affordable housing in their
municipality where it should be, the developer has the
right to go to a State appeal board. And the State appeal
board has the right to overrule the city, and basically
usurp their local control.

    No city wants to lose their local control. And
to the best of my knowledge in the State of Massachusetts,
I don't think that's had to take place, because the locals
now feel that, well, if we don't do it, the State is going
to do it. So there has to be some sort of check and
balance, so that we start putting housing where it needs
to be.

    And in the Bay Area we have Caltrain, which I
alluded to. We have BART that goes out to the Livermore
Valley. And we have a SMART Train, that we just paid a
bunch of money for from Santa Rosa all the way down
basically to the Larkspur ferry, which then connects to
San Francisco.

    The housing policies in those areas are flawed.
And I'm not going to point to which cities are flawed, but
they have strong growth control, et cetera, and you can't
get anything done. So we're does it -- where do these
people go? They go to where Andy was talking about, 80
some odd thousand people move out to San Joaquin County.

    And that's a tragedy, all these people spending
all this time on the road, less time with their family, Little League games, et cetera, et cetera. Why? Because housing is affordable out there, because we didn't build it where we should be building it.

So until we address that and make the cities be more responsible, we're never going to solve, Dan, the congestion problem that you alluded to.

Anyway, thank you.

CTC CHAIR INMAN: Thank you.

I do think that with all the discussion today, that development community has been missing as part of this discussion. And as Commissioner Ghielmetti pointed out, and has -- he has so graciously helped us understand the drive till you qualify. And when I hear Andy talking about he's given it a label now. It's called the super commute. That's kind of like my senior ticket I bought on the rail in Scotland was a super adult. And it didn't feel great.

(Laughter.)

CTC CHAIR INMAN: I'm just saying.

(Laughter.)

CTC CHAIR INMAN: No, but I think that it just points out really the collective body that it's going to need, and the resources to Chairman Frazier's point to really get it done.
So I know Secretary Annis wanted to say something and Commissioner Madaffer. Anybody else? We're going to probably try to wrap this up, because we've got a lot of public that wants to comment too.

So Secretary Annis.

CalSTA SECRETARY ANNIS: Sure. I enjoyed the presentation. I was sort of writing down some commonalities of all the regions that spoke, and sort of reflecting too on this as Dan wanders off some of his comments on transit.

And one of the things that -- you know, as I -- as I look to the crowd here, I was thinking of various cap-and-trade grants, and SB 1 grants that are going to transit in your regions. And you know I think I heard from everyone a robust investment in transit. And in the SB 150 report, I think the Bay Area was singled out a bit as having maybe bent that curve and having trends in the direction of growing transit ridership, and many other places seeing transit declines, but trying to reflect on why that might be.

I do think that the Bay Area has gotten about a 20-year head start on investing in quality transit with the BART system. It sounded like Darin you said some of the rail and the SCAG regions started in the -- in the early nineties.
But again, I know through the grant programs and your plans, there's -- we'll see more and more. As Phil Washington said the L.A. Metro projects, you start to see the frequency of the BART system. With Metro -- Metrolink, you start to see the frequency of Caltrain system that's very successful in the Bay Area.

I know, you know, where you have these quality transit corridors, of course, a lot of emphasis on adding housing and other people attracting locations along those quality transit stops. And as Commissioner Ghielmetti said adding more where you have a quality stop without a lot around it.

But I just wanted to see if anyone wanted to comment on that. Is that -- that the investments in transit, I think, are certainly in the pipeline. I don't know, Alix, if you want to observe on the Bay Area why maybe you're an outlier in terms of not seeing that transit decline. And, you know, is it -- is it overly optimistic to see that with some of these investments on the way, that we will start to see more of the regions or big urban areas start to more mirror the success of the Bay Area?

MS. BOCKELMAN: In terms of the Bay Area, I think if you kind of peel back the onion a little bit, we've seen a lot of growth on Caltrain and BART, but we have
seen similar trends in terms of losses on our bus network. So I think it's -- you know, when you look at things in aggregate, it can mask some of what's going on beneath it. So -- and I do think that the success of BART and Caltrain have to do with the land-use decisions, some of them being good. We need a lot more housing around them. But there is quite a bit of housing. And it is a fast and reliable -- they are fast and reliable systems.

So I think what we're seeing though is that, you know, we're seeing a lot trends away from taking the bus service, which I think maybe isn't as reliable. And we are sort of following SCAG and having UCLA look at the transit trends in our region, because as I mentioned even more recently, we are seeing some declines within -- or at least softening, if not declines for BART and Caltrain. And I think we want to understand that better.

I think with BART, I think they have gotten to the point where -- they were getting to the point that it was uncomfortable to ride the system. And that really has to do with we can't just extend the system. We need to keep up with state of good repair, and modernize, and make sure that -- you know, so we've got a whole rail fleet that we're trying to, you know, replace, we're trying to add more, we're trying to -- we've talked to you about adding more for Muni also for the LRV.
So at certain point, your systems can get too crowded, and then people will abandon them again. So I think, you know, it's a -- it's a tricky equation, but we definitely support the cap-and-trade funds, and we think those investments are really important, but we can't just always look at extending. We also have to balance that, especially in places in the Bay Area, like that we have to modernize, and we need to have more frequent service where we can. And we also need to get the local jurisdictions to put more housing near the stops with the high frequency transit.

CTC CHAIR INMAN: Commissioner Madaffer.

CTC COMMISSIONER MADAFFER: Thank you.

You know, I'm really encouraged by a lot of what I've heard today. And I agree, it's great to have the mind trust of the MPOs here. And I think the big encouragement for me is because we're all talking, and we're all listening, and realizing a commonality, and sharing ideas.

You know, I've been taking a lots of notes, like Secretary Annis. And, you know, a few snippets. Clearly having an app that includes all forms of transportation should be a goal for us going into the future. My tech geek buddy here next to me will talk more about that, and those kind of ideas. But really, where you can ride the
COASTer, Metro, Metrolink, Amtrak, Lyft, Uber, scooters, carpools, bridge tolls, and yes, even the miles I drive. Those should all be coming out of one centralized account. We should be setting that as a policy. We should be encouraging industry and technology to move in that. Carl Guardino can tell you right now he's got plenty of companies in the Silicon Valley that can work on that thing or they already are doing it. Government is just not stepping up to let them do it. We need to fix that.

Ms. Dunn and I were talking today at lunch. We don't care if it says Amtrak, COASTER, Metrolink. We want to get from A to B, and I want to use one ticket and one form to get there. And you know what, right now, we're letting the public down. If we're not making it easier for them to use the system, and she has to spend 20 minutes, as I watched today, just to buy a damn ticket to get home, then we've got a problem.

Now, maybe people that do it every day, I get it, maybe they know how to do it. But the reality that's -- that's an issue.

Growth is going to happen VMT is going to keep going up. Let's face it. I know. I understand my friends at CARB want to push that the other way, and I think we can. And I think it's going to have to be
through incentives. But listening to MPO comments today, I conclude a lot of this centers on two words, "land use". "Land use". MPOs don't do land use. Cities do. So that's an issue.

You know, 375 policies haven't really worked. I look to my friend Jim Ghielmetti, and when I first met him, I think I was -- before I was President of the League of Cities, he was BIA, Darrell Steinberg I think was in between the Assembly and the Senate. He grabbed onto our idea and turned it into 375, but we never really did everything that we talked about doing. Cities didn't cooperate, and didn't get to where we wanted to be.

But clearly, as I heard also today, regions are the catalyst between the State and local governments. We need to empower regions a little bit more in some of this stuff.

I'll share with you, back in my days on the SANDAG board, cities in my area were not doing the RHNA production like we wanted to. How did we change that? We used our local sales tax dollars to incentivize good performance. If they did more RHNA housing, we gave them more transportation money for local projects. It got down to one word "dollars".

Housing keeps coming up. Commissioner Alvarado was spot on. You know, if you got that EIR right there,
that ought to be the master EIR. We shouldn't have to be
farting around with all these other documents that end up
slowing down projects and making things cost more money.

Lastly, you know, the loss of redevelopment, that
has been a big problem. And I think Senator Wiener today,
I just read, introduced SB 50. He's kind of bringing back
the bill that will actually perhaps help incentivize
housing along transportation corridors.

To Professor Sperling, I think he really has got
and idea where he can bring forward a technology approach.
The CTC has embraced technology big time, which I'm very
proud to be part of that.

Pricing is important, as I told James Corless.
But it's gone to be done right. It can't become a
disincentive to where it doesn't work, or it's a social
justice issue to the people that have to drive the
furthest, because the jobs aren't where the housing is,
and that's a concern.

So I do like the idea, and I'm certainly going to
encourage my colleagues on the CTC, to, you know, assume a
more leadership role in formulating policy
recommendations, to really find a balanced approach on how
we can achieve California's transportation goals and
objectives, and blend that on issues to reduce GHG as part
of our transportation plan. So again, I want to just
thank all of the ARB folks. And again, this idea of us getting together is not only brilliant, but I hope we do it more often.

    Thank you.

CTC CHAIR INMAN: Great.

    Okay. With that, I'm going to -- oh, James, one quick one.

MR. CORLESS: Really quick. I just want to acknowledge our colleagues the other MPOs. There's 18 MPOs in California. There's a bunch of RTPAs. You know you all know this, the CTC. But I appreciate our ability to come here and give you a little bit of a truncated presentation, just the five of us. But there's a lot of us here that really are working to try to implement transportation, air quality, GHG reductions. So that's all.

CTC CHAIR INMAN: Thank you. And I think we might hear from some of them. I'm hoping. So, anyway. Thanks. Great presentation. You all have given us a lot to chew on. Most of us were taking copious notes here. And I think you've also answered my question, Phil Washington, this morning what's keeping you up at night by some of the challenges you put here.

    And I think also the success stories. So we'll take this and work with this. Good material for all of
So with that, I want to go to the public comment. I want to, once again, thank everybody. It's great to have such a big audience. And you all have been here a long time today, and I do appreciate you sticking with us. We're going to go through these. I think I have 30 something and -- oh, 40 something. Okay. In my 40s now. So please keep your comments succinct. And if you feel like you haven't had enough time to say what you want to say, you can always send us something in writing or we're happy to get your insight and intel in any way we can.

So with that, I think we'll try to keep them coming in waves, if we can, to maximize our use of time. So with that, I'm going to start with Ted Smalley followed by Ahron Hakimi, John Gamboa. We'll do those to start.

MR. SMALLEY: Thank you. I'm Ted Smalley, Tulare County Association of Governments. Thank you for letting me speak briefly. I just want to echo and make the comments from Commissioner Van Konynenburg and Andy Chesley gave a number of perspectives from the valley, and especially Assemblyman Frazier. I just want to note when you come from an area like where we are, economic development is critical. I think it was noted people don't care about achieving all
these things, if they don't even have a job. And so we have to keep that in perspective, as we do our efforts. I want to also note that in our area, we've done a number of different pilot programs.

I want to thank Dr. Sperling a number of years ago when we -- valley came up, he challenged us. And I totally agree, it's sometimes -- one size doesn't fit all. And throwing transit money at certain areas is just a waste of money. And so -- but he didn't just complain. He helped us partner with UC Davis. We have a number of pilot programs going.

And so that's also spurred in our county, we're now meeting with our number two employer about looking at what do we do, not just traditional transit. So I just want to encourage that we need more flexibility especially with some of these transit funds.

Thank you.

CTC CHAIR INMAN: Okay. Ahron.

MR. HAKIMI: Good afternoon, Madam Chair and Commissioners. I will be very brief. I agree with your comments, Chairman Nichols, wholeheartedly. Assemblyman Frazier, I was the lone person who was clapping after your earlier comments.

(Laughter.)

ASSEMBLY MEMBER FRAZIER: Thanks for the back-up.
(Laughter.)

MR. HAKIMI: Dr. Sperling, we've talked and you know my views. I agree with you 100 percent and so does the federal government that safety, congestion, and maintaining what we have should be absolutely our highest priority and that is in federal law.

I will be very brief. We should not continue as a state to blindly invest in areas that do not perform. We must collectively invest our limited and precious resources in areas that we know will produce results. We have over 20 years in the Central Valley of knowledge about how to reduce criteria pollutants. And certain measures -- certain areas where we're going down we know will not make a difference.

So please, let's all get together and invest in the areas that will move the needle.

Thank you.

CTC CHAIR INMAN: Thank you, Ahron.


MR. GAMBOA: This is really interesting to me today. While everybody is talking about a housing crisis, to the constituency, the constituencies the organization that I represent it's not a housing crisis. It's an economic and social justice and civil rights issue on it.
I represent The 200. It's an organization that was started by some of the most revered and older civil rights leaders in our country, one was George Dean, founder of California Urban League; Herman Gallegos, founder of the National Council on La Raza; Bruce Quan, who was the major leader of the Asian community, and an investigator to the Watergate investigation that led to Nixon's resignation; the Honorable Cruz Reynoso, the first Latino on the Supreme court.

These men and others, 22 of us got together, and some of us came out of retirement, to address the wealthy issue in California, an issue that right now that is increasing. It's large and increasing. We quickly came to the conclusion that the reason that this wealth issue is increasing is because homeownership is decreasing in our state.

In this country, we created the greatest middle class the world has ever seen, because we invested in homeownership from 1930 to 1970, but we left communities of color out, families of color. Ninety-eight percent of all the subsidies that came out of those programs went to white families. That left our community so far behind.

That home ownership has been the avenue of wealth creation in this country since the beginning on it, and we were deprived of it. The effect of that, that it left us
not only behind in wealth, it left us behind in all of the quality measurements that wealth provides. That's health, education, name it. We have been left behind.

1970, we started closing that gap on it. 2018 -- by 2018, that gap has increased again. Because of the great -- so-called Great Recession, our community, African Americans and Latinos lost in three years 30 years of wealth gained from 1970 on.

That redlining was a government-supported issue on it, and we're going through the same thing again today, the redlining that is being initiated by the scoping plan of CARB. That's a new form of redlining, raising the cost of housing and putting it further and further away from our community is denying our community access to wealth.

Not only that, it's not only affecting our communities, it's affecting our communities to support. We're going to have four million more seniors very shortly reaching retirement. That burden of support is going to fall on our communities. And our community is less able to support it, because we are not investing in the minority communities, the Millennials and students. Three -- these three populations are not being able to buy their home because of the actions that CARB and the scoping plan is taking.

I started thinking why? Why, as an organization
of good people, creating the plan that is so cruel to our community? Reminding me -- well, many of you are -- well, you look old as I am. You remember the play -- what was it called? I can't remember now. Too old now. But there was a song in there that says why can people be so cruel, or how can people be so cruel on it?

And I was thinking of that, why? And then when I started looking at the personnel of CARB of the 1,600 employees in there, I found that the top management -- in top management, there was only one Latino, zero -- and zero blacks in it. I think that is part of the reason that our community is not heard in this issue.

Thank you.

CTC CHAIR INMAN: Can I ask everybody where -- I love hearing from everybody, but we do have a little time issue, where our transit-oriented CTC that needs to get to Riverside is going to be challenged. But anyway --

MS. HERNANDEZ: Thanks.

CTC CHAIR INMAN: -- delighted everybody is here.

MS. HERNANDEZ: Thanks.

CTC CHAIR INMAN: Jennifer Hernandez.

MS. HERNANDEZ: Thank you very much, Chairwoman and members. I have the privilege, Jennifer Hernandez, of representing The 200. We sent in a comment letter. I think a worthwhile comment letter for you to read, please
yesterday by the deadline, which was put into your quote junk mail, which is unfortunate. You've got a copy, plus the attachments. I just happen to bring them for you.

I cannot believe in 2018 that The 200 had to file a civil rights lawsuit against the California Air Resources Board, because who do you think is hurt by a VMT reduction mandate?

Folks living in Santa Monica and working there or folks priced out? And what is the color, and what is the age, and what is the wealth of the people priced out?

I want to bring to your attention a couple quick things about the California Air Resources Board and urge this combined board, which has real responsibility on the CTC side, to make transportation work, not just deal with GHG.

I want you to know a couple numbers. So under SB 32, a California family leaving counts as a global reduction of greenhouse gas, even when they move to Texas, where their greenhouse gas per capita goes up by three.

That's a metric that CARB has chosen to adopt. It's a metric their senior person, Lauren Sanchez, agrees is flawed. Another metric, they don't count forest fires at all. We met our target, yippee ki-yay. We blew our target so badly and killed people in the process.

What are we doing, and why are we doing it?
The only place you'll find how much greenhouse gas reduction CARB is counting on for its VMT reduction mandate is this study by UC Berkeley, which says it's less than one percent of what California is trying to reduce. And California is less than one percent of the globe.

CARB has always wanted a VMT reduction mandate from the legislature. They tried and failed in 375. The Legislature said no. They tried and failed in 743. The Legislature said no. They tried and failed in 150. The Legislature has said no.

The only time the Legislature has spoken on VMT was to ask the question, a reasonable question, GHG per VMT. As we electrify our fleet, we get cleaner. We don't have to punish the working poor amongst us. We don't have to punish the people who drive the longest who, by the way, are construction workers.

I don't know why CARB believes that it has legal authority to mandate reductions in VMT. But I urge you to put a stop to this study, and please take a look at a civil rights lawsuit in 2018. Why are we having to do this?

Thank you for your attention.

CTC CHAIR INMAN: Thank you.

Okay. Rosa Park, Marjorie Kern, and Darrell Clarke, please
MS. PARK: Thank you. Good afternoon, Madam Chair Inman and Commissioners, and Madam Chair Nichols and Board members. I am Rosa De León Park. I am the Executive Director of the Stanislaus Council of Governments, one of the 18 MPOs, with a population of over 550 residents living in our county.

But I would like to take this opportunity to mention some of the Stanislaus region's advancements that we've had -- that we've done in support of our SCS. First, we are working very closely currently with our San Joaquin Regional Rail Commission and our local jurisdictions to get infrastructure in place that will support Altamont Corridor Express expansion all the way to Stanislaus and Merced Counties.

We are championing this effort, and we understand this is an investment in our future, and that support the goals of your Senate Bill 375. We also have a program called MOVE in our Stanislaus region. And it's a non-profit organization that is designated as our consolidated transportation services agency that is dedicated to connecting seniors, veterans, and individuals with disabilities with transportation options that access for their medical appointments, groceries. And it's a vital component of their transportation service -- services mixed with our Stanislaus County that offers
other specialized services.

We are also working -- you heard our -- my colleague Ted Smalley talked about a partnership that we have with the UC Davis Institute of Transportation Studies, and other of the -- our valley MPOs. It's a pilot program called Valley FLEX, the goals of expanding access to residents in our rural disadvantaged communities to help reduce the greenhouse gas emissions.

Since 2011, in our region, we have decreased our transportation investments from 87 percent in roadways to 57 percent. That has shifted our investment to increase percentage of dollars to transit, increasing our investment from 11 percent, we used to invest in transit, to 35.

So that concludes my comments. Thank you.

CTC CHAIR INMAN: Thank you.

Okay. Is -- Marjorie is not here.

MR. KHACHEK: No, she had to take the --

CTC CHAIR INMAN: It looks like Margie.

MR. KHACHEK: -- train back to the Santa Barbara, so I'm here to speak on her behalf.

Good afternoon, Madam Chair, Commissioners, members of the Board, and Assemblyman Frazier. Sarkes Khachek with the Santa Barbara County Association of Governments.
We are one of the 18 MPOs and we're also a self-help county. We're also a member of the Central Coast Coalition, so thank you to the Commission for having your town hall in Gonzales in Monterey County.

In Santa Barbara County, our highest transportation priority, our highest priority in our RTT is the Santa Barbara US 101 multiple corridor, how SBCAG is looking at addressing congestion, improving the environment and air quality is by implementing a suite of improvements between Ventura and Santa Barbara County, which include an HOV lane, peak hour rail service, interregional transit service, and including improvements on the California Coastal Trail.

So for us, we definitely take this personally. Our outreach process is very robust with our RTP, as well as our other plans. So that's what I think one thing you've heard a lot today from our other peers is that the public outreach process is important, and it is happening.

So with that, we just want to support the efforts of the Resources Board as well as the Commission. We look forward to partnering with all of you to help improve not just mobility and air quality in our region but statewide.

So with that, thank you very much.

CTC CHAIR INMAN: Thank you, Sarkes.

Okay. We have Darrell Clarke up next. I'm going
to ask Tony Boren and David Grub to queue up.

MR. CLARKE: Okay. Thank you. I'm Darrell Clark. Good afternoon. I'm -- I lead the Sierra Club's VMT focused work under our National Clean Transportation For All campaign. And I'm here representing Sierra Club California's Transportation and Sustainable Communities Committee. And I'm local. I rode the train from Pasadena to get here. Much of the rest of the time, my wife and I share a Chevy Bolt EV. So both aspects of what we're trying to do here to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

Echoing others today, I want to focus on, number one, the acute housing shortage we have in California, particularly here in Los Angeles, you know, thinking about the west side, so many jobs, so little housing, therefore very long commutes.

And noting, yes, the Sierra Club supports good, smart growth, affordable, infill housing. And noted from well documented statistics, up to two-thirds reduction in VMT per capita living in that kind of mixed use, dense, convenient community, as opposed to the typical auto-oriented suburbia that we've typically built in California. Two-thirds reduction by doing the right kind of infill, not to mention giving a lot of people the opportunity for housing closer to where they live, which I would hope some of the earlier speakers would find a
welcome thought.

Second, we really need to address the concept of incentives. You know, the most recent report touched on it on page 76, the scoping plan from last year, appendix c, were kind of a beginning, but it all seems to be rather gingerly about, you know, providing positive incentives for people who can carpool, who can take transit, but perhaps they need the right incentive to kind of tip them over to do that rather than drive alone.

And finally, thinking about urgency, there was talk about a Mobility Action Plan. Can we do this quickly, like a 90-day draft, like a final adopted at your next joint meeting in June, so we can move quickly? We do have a 12-year window to 2030, and we need to decide what we're going to do, and do it sooner than later.

So thank you for hearing me and good luck moving forward.

CTC CHAIR INMAN: Thank you.

MR. BOREN: Good afternoon. Tony Boren, Executive Director Fresno Council of Governments.

I'm real pleased here to be in front of you this afternoon to talk about our Fresno COG 2018 RTP. We're very proud of it. We're very pleased with it, as reflected by the unanimous support of our policy board. You say, Tony, why do they -- why did they unanimously
support it?

I'll tell you why. It meets all of our
greenhouse gas reduction targets as identified by the ARB. It meets our transportation conformity requirements. It introduces public health into the planning mix, first time in our history. Significant -- it reflects a significant increase in farmland conversation, 58 percent less con -- farmland consumed based on these sustainable plans.

There are twice as many active transportation projects, 522 compared to the 2014 plan. We had a very proactive public outreach campaign that had a lot of support. We've provided different transportation and housing choices within the plan. Beyond the plan itself, we're also doing a lot of other things in our region having to do with facilitating the transportation of land use, air quality connection.

We have our measures here a half cent sales tax. We have a TOD program where we provide money for planning and infrastructure to help facilitate TOD projects. We have a multi-jurisdictional housing element where we have 15 of our member agencies working together to put together a housing element that provides economies of scale that meets our needs. So we're doing a lot of good things.

But in the end, all of these things what our RTP reflects for us is an ambitious and achievable vision for
the Fresno County region that is both realistic and sustainable. And allows the regions to grow at its own pace as directed by our member agencies, our cities. This is the way they choose to grow. And so I think that's why they have unanimous support for it. We're excited about what we're doing, but we also know that there's some challenges out there.

One of the challenges is just sort of the geographic reality of land use in our area. Basically, the Fresno/Clovis metropolitan area is 120 some odd square miles, 635,000 people within that area served by a half mile grid system.

Now, back in '86 when I first joined COG, we built freeways to provide connectivity to all these suburban communities and provide connectivities to our rural cities. It was a great thing.

Now, fast forward 30 years, and that same land use pattern becomes an impediment, because it's very difficult to get choice transit riders, which the majority or our riders, over 90 percent, are choice riders. So they're not going to ride -- use transit unless it becomes more efficient. Well, this distance that's involved with this horizontal land-use patterns just is an impediment that's very difficult to overcome.

I did want to point out again the issue of rural
transit. The right tool. I think fixed route public transit is not the right tool. We're finding that out over and over again. So again, we need to look for new tools. We need to look for flexibility in terms of using shared mobility services in concert with the fixed route. We need to talk about ADA requirements on our rural routes, the drive that costs sky high. Farebox recovery, we need to look at that. It may not be appropriate.

We've heard redevelopment. Again, that's something we've got to bring down the cost of developing in inner-city. But most importantly, I think you're really, really serious about this, then you're going to have to engage the cities directly, because in the end they have land-use authority. As regions, we can go to them and present the vision and encourage them, and cajole them, and, you know, point out the value and the benefits of developing in a sustainable way.

But in the end it's their decision to make. So when I start to see the League of Cities and CSAC engaged in this process in a real meaningful way, then I will begin to believe that we are really serious about that. But until we get serious about that, we are just kind of the middle man in this process. But we're going to continue to do what we're doing, and look forward to working with you.
Thank you.

CTC CHAIR INMAN: Thank you, Tony.

Okay. David Grub. And then in my queue line I'd like to Will Barrett, Nancy Pfeffer and Ana Castro Reynoso.

MR. GRUBB: Good afternoon, Transportation Chair of the Sierra Club San Diego, speaking today for the San Diego Quality of Life Coalition, a diverse collection of more than two dozen environmental and labor organizations working together to enhance the quality of life in our region and collaborating with our MPO SANDAG.

We support the recommendations in the SB 150 report, including the Mobility Action Plan, and we recommend a strong focus on equity and mobility justice, a diverse stakeholder participation, and full accountability in the planning process.

Thank you.

CTC CHAIR INMAN: Thank you.

Will.

MR. BARRETT: Hi. Good afternoon. I'm Will Barrett with the American Lung Association.

So, generally speaking, the Lung Association looks at SB 375 as critical to public health, a critical tool in our toolbox for improving public health in our local communities. It was wonderful to see so many COGs
referencing their work on improving public health, and equity in their planning processes.

To your question about what keeps me up? That would be that we don't take SB 150 report seriously enough, and that we delay action to take things seriously. As my Hanukkah gift to everybody here today, I'll be as Brief as I can.

Dr. Sperling said we need to acknowledge the report. I agree with that wholeheartedly. We also need to act now on solutions. A few recommendations that we -- involved in -- or included in a joint letter with Climate Plan and some of our partners, we do think that beginning the multi-agency dialogue as soon as possible is the key; that alignment of funding with effective greenhouse gas reduction projects locally is critically important; that we should be creating accountable actions for the State agencies that will be partnering in that dialogue; setting a short timeline for actions a previous speaker mentioned that as well.

We have an urgent situation here. This report lays it out in stark terms, and that if we don't move forward as quickly as possible, we're just delaying, you know, harder solutions down the road.

We think that the report highlights some significant and stunning data gaps that many State
agencies are involved in, and need to work on to close those gaps. We think that having stakeholders involved in the panel will be helpful in identifying some more of those data points that should be reported on.

And then finally, streamlining the application process, and the funding pots, and the ways that local governments can access the funding available at the State level, so that we can really make this a real pipeline. Right now, there are a lot of diverse pots out there -- of funding out there. It makes it hard for especially smaller agencies, some of the rural agencies to really have the capacity to track those opportunities and are often left out. And that's what we've heard in a lot of the dialogues that we've hosted this year. Really streamlining the application process and making a cleaner pipeline for funding to get to the local agencies, so that they can put plans in place that help to achieve the goals and benefits of SB 375 that the COGs are outlining.

Just a final point SB 375 is really -- it's a critical part of our overall strategy to meet our clean air and climate goals. It has to go hand-in-hand with VMT reduction. It has to go hand-in-hand with electrification, and sustainable freight, if we're going to achieve clean air and healthy -- clean and healthy air for all Californians and not leave anyone out.
So as this group moves forward, I think that we do need to focus on public health and equity, and really make sure that that's the focus as we move forward and that we do move forward as quickly as possible, so we can all get some sleep.

Thank you very much.

(Laughter.)

CTC CHAIR INMAN: Thank you very much.

(Laughter.)

CTC CHAIR INMAN: Nancy Pfeffer.

MS. PFEFFER: Good afternoon. Thank you. Thank you very much, Board Members and Commission Members. I'm Nancy Pfeffer. I'm the Executive Director of the Gateway Cities Council of Governments.

I think it's wonderful that these two bodies have become -- begun meeting together. And I'm really grateful to the legislators who made it so. The Gateway Cities are 27 cities and additional unincorporated communities in southeast L.A. county, totaling 2.1 million people. Our members include cities as diverse as Long Beach, Vernon, Avalon, and Cerritos. Three-quarters of our residents are in disadvantaged communities.

I've asked staff to provide you two documents, one is a letter sent to all CARB members in June regarding how little cap-and-trade funding is reaching our
communities. We have five percent of the State's population and have received six percent of the funding as of end 2016. According to State policy, we should be getting at least 10 percent, 25 percent or more, depending on the program.

The key issue is limited capacity in our local governments particularly when practically all the funding is competitive. Technical assistance is occasionally offered, but sometimes even that is competitive. The letter offers two related suggestions to address this problem.

One is an ask that you consider block grant program for a portion of the cap-and-trade funds rather than all competitive. The other suggestion, which could be funded via such block grants, would be to fund councils of governments to keep grant writers on staff. These shared resources could be deployed to help supplement the limited capacity within our cities.

The other document is a brochure describing our COG's current long-range multi-modal Strategic Transportation Plan, or STP. As just one example of what has come out of this plan, we're developing a series of Complete Streets Plans for our arterial corridors, of which we have 25 in our region.

The first such plan identified about 15 to 20
projects in five cities that will reduce GHG emissions. However, implementation is now up to the cities and whatever resources they have. Our STP projects will create the change you're looking for under SB 375, if we address the capacity limitations at the local level.

Lastly, I have one more issue. When the metro board approved the locally preferred alternative for the I-710 south corridor project this past March, a pair of motions directed the staff to collaborate on developing zero and near zero-emissions vehicles. The conundrum in working with agencies such as Metro and Caltrans is that they build the infrastructure, but don't determine the vehicles. This problem is by no means unique to the 710.

To build the necessary partnership, we'd like to see metro and AQMD formalize a long-standing county-wide zero-emission truck collaborative by means of an MOU. I understand there is a draft of the MOU. And I've mentioned this to Board Member Mitchell. It's my hope that you will all support, and, if need be, encourage the development of this MOU and the partnership itself.

Thank you very much for your time and attention.

CTC CHAIR INMAN: Thank you, Nancy.

Okay. Our next group of speakers, Ana Castro Reynoso. Did I pronounce your name right or somewhere close, I hope?
MS. CASTRO REYNOSO: At first I thought you said Rosa. And I was like I don't know who that is.

CTC CHAIR INMAN: Oh, you know, I think I did --

MS. CASTRO REYNOSO: That's okay.

CTC CHAIR INMAN: I was integrating Rosa Parks and jumping together and mixing and matching.

MS. CASTRO REYNOSO: Okay.

CTC CHAIR INMAN: Followed by Duane Baker and Carolina Martinez. So if we can queue up and the microphone is yours.

MS. CASTRO REYNOSO: Okay. So my name is Ana Castro Reynoso with Environmental Health Coalition in San Diego. We are a grassroots environmental justice organization dedicated to achieving transportation justice through mass public transit, and increased investments in environmental justice communities.

First, we sincerely want to thank CARB staff for your bold leadership in crafting this report. We appreciate the extensive community outreach especially in environmental justice communities, and clear inclusion of the community voice.

The last time EHC provided comments on SB 375, we advocated for a 25 percent emission reduction target for SANDAG. This report demonstrates that SANDAG's target and
perhaps all targets need to be revisited and increased.

In San Diego and throughout the state, we are nowhere near our climate equity and transportation mode share targets. Environmental justice communities are still suffering. The findings in this report illustrate just a part of the impacts from our transportation system on EJ communities. Our communities are choking on dirty air, dying in pedestrian accidents, overburdened by housing costs, paying $20 every day for their family's transit passes, and on top of all of that, stuck on various buses for hours just to get to work.

All of these numbers and data represent real people, many of whom do not have the ability or the privilege to be in this room.

The solution is an equity-centered and solutions-oriented approach to mass public transit with substantial investments in EJ communities. To achieve this, CARB must, first, ensure that the MAP for healthy communities does not result in more bureaucracy that slows down immediate progress. While we support the recommendation for the MAP, CARB must ensure the committee is solution oriented with clear timelines and accountability measures in place.

This committee should also work quickly to enact policies that studies show increase transit ridership,
such as reduced bus passes for low income people, and people on Medicare/Medi-Cal, as well as more ambitious policies like transit requirements, per capita and per population.

Second, CARB must create several seats for community voices from different perspectives on the MAP for Healthy Communities Committee. The community perspective can no longer be endlessly relegated to testimony at workshops and hearings. Those most impacted must have a permanent and dynamic role at the planning table.

Third, CARB must invest in community level research on air quality, pedestrian infrastructure needs, and best practices. CARB can provide both technical support and funding and include those findings in the MAP for healthy communities analysis, RTP evaluations, and future SB 150 reports.

And fourth, it is more clear than ever, that SB 375's current accountability structure simply does not work. We need to update and strengthen SB 375 to include higher emission reduction targets, greater transparency on RTP and SCS evaluation, and more than anything a system to hold MPOs accountable to their targets.

And after hearing the conversations that happened today, I really want to reiterate how incredibly important
and fundamental this report is.

What keeps environmental justice communities up at night is having to wake up at 3:00 a.m. just to get to work at 9:00. Environmental justice communities have been ready to take action for decades. And we need CARB and CTC to be just as ready to take that action. And in light of the findings of this report, there is absolutely no excuse not to.

Thank you.

CTC CHAIR INMAN: Thank you, Ana.

Duane Baker.

MR. BAKER: Yes. Thank you and good afternoon.

I'm Duane Baker, Deputy Executive Director of the San Bernardino County Transportation Authority and Council of Governments.

In our roles, we have worked with the CTC and CARB on many fronts. We have worked hand-in-hand with SCAG, our five transit agencies, and our local jurisdictions to reduce GHGs and VMT. We are investing over $600 million in capital improvements and high capacity transit over the next 10 years. This includes incorporating the first zero-emission train set in North America in our Redlands Passenger Rail Project Thanks to a grant from CalSTA.

We are also engaged in a wide range of
sustainability initiatives, in the areas of air quality, health, habitat, and TOD planning. But while we are committed to policies and investments to further to goals of SB 375, we also understand the realities that we must operate within, funding realities. When our half cent sales tax was adopted in 2004, it was before SB 375. We made a promise to the voters of San Bernardino County. There was a list of projects that we committed to, and we are constrained by the ordinance that was adopted by the voters to those projects. We cannot fund beyond that.

Goods movement reality. San Bernardino County has become a central part of an extended goods movement network by virtue of our geography. We are adjacent to the largest port complex in North America, and on the Pacific Rim. We have to deal with the impacts from that, and we work through that with the rail corridors, eCommerce, the changing nature. And it is paramount for the private sector in that to succeed, if they are to have the funds available to them to invest in the clean technologies that we need to meet the goals of SB 375.

And finally, market realities. Before changes in transportation investments are mandated, it is important we understand the market response and how people are making their choices, and their decisions. One size does not fit all. We must tailor strategies to the unique
conditions in the different regions of the state.

Conditions have changed since SB 375 was passed. We have had the recession and the recovery. We have experienced years of economic growth since the depths of the recession, and it should not be a surprise that VMT per capita has increased. Housing affordability has reached crisis levels, and people are driving until they can qualify. This is illustrated by the fact that 79,000 more people commute from San Bernardino County into Los Angeles County than the other way around.

The median price for a house in San Bernardino County is $316,000. The median price for a home in Los Angeles county is 620,000. In Orange County, it's 790,000. We look forward to work with the CTC, and the Air Resources Board, and other partners. But we hope that transportation, environmental, economic, and housing policies are aligned and not at cross purposes.

And finally, it is our hope that any policies or strategies that might be considered to address these issues start from an understanding that different strategies are needed in different regions of our state.

Thank you very much.

CTC CHAIR INMAN: Thank you.

Next, we have Carolina Martinez.

Is Carolina here?
Did she have to leave?
I'll set that one side.
How about Jack Shu?
Kendal from the LA Chamber in the queue line
next, if I can get Kendal down there.

MR. SHU: Hello. Good afternoon, Commissioners,
Board member. My name is Jack Shu with the Cleveland
National Forest Foundation.

Well, we've failed. I'm going to say it. This
report from CARB for 350 shows that we failed. And I --
you know, I could have told you this ten years ago,
because I was involved with a legal lawsuit against SANDAG
together with the Attorney General saying that even though
a document, an EIR, that you spent million of dollars
worth, that can stack several inches high on a desk can be
flawed, and it was flawed.

In fact, it was the first EIR from a major MPO
that had to be decertified, even though it went all the
way to the Supreme Court.

So we know we're failing. And there's one thing
that I learned from that case -- well, several things.
One is that we need to deal with some truths. We need to
deal with the truth that drivers are on welfare. Yes,
drivers are the ones that get more subsidies than everyone
else, but we don't talk about it, even when we campaign
against Proposition 6.

So we need to change that idea, that drivers are not paying their own way, and they probably should start. They should at least pay for the roadways, the maintenance, the law enforcement and everything it takes to keep people driving. And maybe they should be paying for the sickness and illness and the greenhouse gas emissions they produce as well.

And I can guarantee you that if that happened, we would have less driving and VMT would go down, and we'd have to start fixing things. So why not thinking of other ways to raise money that gives the driver the real cost? And I know you're going to say political reality.

Well, Judge Tailor who presided over our case at the Supreme Court -- or the Superior Court said when it comes to planning, when it comes to figuring things out to give to the public, it's only for an EIR, political realities do not matter. It's our job to tell the truth and give people information. And as leaders, as governing boards and bodies, we should be telling the truth. We should be telling the truth of what the cost of transportation really is and who bears it. We do not have a fair system now. It does not make sense to give someone who buys a Tesla a rebate.

Certainly, it doesn't make sense for someone who
is taking transit, walking, and biking to have to pay for
more freeways. And that's the kind of system we have now,
and we need to rectify that. And I think that's the way
we need go to change things.

We need to deal with some outcome realities.
When we talk about real equity, let's really deal with
that term correctly. Equity does not mean equal or
balance. Equity means rectifying things. When the amount
of cancer patients from kids, health detects from driving,
in our urban areas, in our communities of color is same as
those in suburbia, then we have equity. And when we don't
have that, don't tell me about balancing things. Let's
make things right first.

Let's deal with funding flexibility. It does not
make sense to me why we're building more freeways when we
know we need to reduce VMT. We need to fix that. There
are federal funds, State funds, let's fix that, and we
have the ability to fix that. Let's shift that over so we
have alternatives.

There are some good things. And I see some great
things in this report on 350. Finally, we're equating
housing issues with transportation issues. And don't tell
me the MPOs can't deal with land use. We could
incentivize land-use policies through transportation plans
and transportation funding. You can influence land use
greatly.

Let's look at the cost of housing and transportation together as a percentage of family income, and start working towards reducing those numbers. That's a way to really look at the whole picture and fixing -- helping the whole families.

And let's finally look at urban growth boundaries. That's another way to approach land use and our transportation plans can work towards that end as well.

Thank you.

CTC CHAIR INMAN: Thank you.

Kendal, followed by Bryn, followed by Jonathan Matz and because our meeting was advertised till 3:30 and I'm just about officially to go over, I'm going to ask everybody to be as brief as possible and feel free to give us your written comments. We'd love to hear from everybody. And I do want to give everybody a chance to speak, but quickly, please.

Thank you.

MS. ASUNCION: Of course.

Good afternoon, Commissioners and Board members. My name is Kendal Asuncion and I'm here on behalf of the Los Angeles Area Chamber of Commerce, which represents over 1,600 organizations and 650,000 employees in the
region. Thank you for allowing us the opportunity to provide comment on today's report, and that impact of critical issues like the links between transportation, economic opportunity, housing, and our state's climate goals.

In the past decade, California has made significant strides in reducing our greenhouse gas emissions. And we recognize that we must continue to work together to reduce emissions however we do have some concerns.

AB 32 dictates that statewide emission reductions should minimize cost and maximize the benefits for our economy. And SB 375 maintains that feasibility is part of the equation to achieve greenhouse gas emission reduction targets from the transportation sector. Both AB 632 and SB 375 rightfully acknowledge the State must consider the economic impacts of planning activities when determining emission targets.

We are concerned that rules and regulations to reduce emission reductions are taking precedence over economic growth, which would drive businesses and jobs out of the state.

As I was listening to today's discussion, there were a number of comments that maintained -- that maintaining a thriving economy is equally important as
reaching our emission reduction goals.

And all the COGs who have been coordinating with local communities have continued to emphasize the residency, transportation, and housing as key drivers to economic success. The chamber urges CARB to balance emission reductions with ensuring that Californians live in and benefit from a strong and growing economy, and appreciate the spirit of collaboration with this joint meeting.

We invite the opportunity to collaborate on policies to provide insights on the impacts of proposed rules, regulations, and incentives on the business community, and economic opportunity in the L.A. Region.

Thank you.

CTC CHAIR INMAN: Thank you, Kendal.

Bryn.

MS. LINBLAD: Hi. Thanks. Good afternoon. I'm Bryn Linblad with Climate Resolve. We're a local organization focused on advancing solutions to climate change that also help communities thrive.

I want to start by commending CARB staff for really putting in the dedication and the tough work that's needed to help us figure out how we can meet our climate targets, and in a way that really advances equity and health. It was some hard work, all the analysis that was
presented to you today to identify those opportunity areas.

And I think -- I think it deserves a big -- a big appreciation. I think what it doesn't warrant is some threats to rescind authority or reactions from Board leadership to apply the brake pads. I think -- I think it really -- it really warrants our thanks and our support.

It's a call to action. Now, today's agenda was completely made up of informational items. This past June at your first joint meeting, there was a number of us that called for a work group to convene in between these joint meetings, and really put in the work to make progress on rising to the challenges that we're dealing with.

And so I'm hoping that we're -- that we're not going to keep coming to these meetings and kind of throwing up our hands overwhelmed by these challenges, but that we really put in the work to advance the solutions that are needed.

So I think it's time to roll up our sleeves and figure out how we -- how we advance actions that would really make the difference in improving accessibility via non-single occupancy vehicle modes.

So we've submitted to you in your packet, and also to the Governor-elect a transportation platform. It contains a number of -- a number of actions that community
groups statewide put forth as what's -- what's needed to really improve accessibility in a sustainable and equitable way.

And I'll clue you in, public transit is big part of that picture. So we hope it can be a useful resource to the MAP task force, and really strongly support that idea to convene such an outcome-oriented task force, and do it in a way -- and do it in the very near future.

Would like to see a draft MAP by the October joint meeting, and would encourage that MAP task force to include public membership. I think that -- that that's a -- robust engagement is what will lead to more actionable solutions.

I think there's -- there's a real need here for -- for State leadership to form a conducive policy framework that will help us realize better mobility options. I want to -- lastly, I want to thank Chair Inman for suggesting the need to really dig into the challenges that we're raised in the SB 150 report today. To me that sounds a lot like a work group. And I hope at the next joint meeting that we can be thanking the leadership here for making that happen.

What keeps me up at night is my impatience with the institutional inertia that's -- that's really preventing us from making progress. And I'd -- I'd urge
you all to use your power to add urgency to the call to
action that's been presented to you today.

Thank you.

CTC CHAIR INMAN: Thank you.

Okay. Next, we have Jonathan and I hate to keep
harping on this, but we're really running over on that.

MR. MATZ: I'll -- I'll read as quick as I can.

CTC CHAIR INMAN: So give me your best speak
discussion.

MR. MATZ: Okay. Thanks. Thank you,
Commissioners and Board Members. Thanks for the
opportunity to address your meeting this afternoon. My
name is Jonathan Matz. I'm California Senior Policy
Manager for the Safe Routes to School National
Partnership. I wanted to echo Bryn's thanks to the very
impressive and thorough work of CARB staff in this report.

It's -- it's fascinating reading and it's dire
reading. It makes strikingly clear that drastically
reducing how much we drive and not merely swapping out the
fleet of what we're driving is our only hope of averting
climate disaster in the state, converting short trips --
short auto trips to other modes, especially on foot or two
wheels, also transit, is one of the most effective ways of
reducing VMT, and has the additional benefit of improving
health outcomes in our communities.
The Joint Mobility Action Plan that she mentioned, proposed in this report, holds great promise for identifying a way out of this crisis. But we must ensure that any such plan is centered on achieving equity and meeting the needs of underserved communities who have too long been prevented from expressing their needs, much less receiving the necessary support to address those needs. It also needs to be directly implementable with strong built-in accountability measures at every level.

Finally, this report, as Bryn said, is a call to action. And its diagnosis of the problem facing us, its prescription for getting out of there, these may sound like unwelcome doses of medicine, but no one, as far as I can tell, is disputing how we're going to feel as a state if we don't take this medicine, or if we simply decide that we can cure the illnesses that we know we're facing by doing exactly what we've been doing for decades up until now.

So like Bryn, I hope we'll be celebrating with you a year from now the results of the MAP. And I thank you for your time.

CTC CHAIR INMAN: Thank you.

Okay. I'm going to work on my line here. So Cody Rosenfield up next, followed by Richard Lyon, Keith Dunn, and then Richard Lambros, please, if you can queue
up.

MR. ROSENFIELD: Thank you, Board members and Commissioners. I'm Cody Rosenfield from the Coalition for Clean Air. I'd also quickly like to thank staff for coordinating these meetings. It's really important that two of our most important actors cooperate.

How transit dollars are spent has direct impact on the air quality in our state. Adding more highway capacity is no longer a feasible strategy, if California is to meet its clean air and climate requirements.

As I'm sure you all know, the South Coast is very out of attainment with the Clean Air Act requirements. The Transportation Commission really has to cooperate with CARB to strategize spending toward attainment of those standards. In many cases, spending doesn't benefit people who actually live near the projects. An important example would be the 710 freeway, the southern portion where lane additions were the initial proposal. That would have added more trucks to the freight corridor, and spend -- spending billions of dollars only to add pollution.

Thankfully, the lane additions were delayed, but it's not enough. Clean truck lanes and vehicle charging should be a part of any project of that size. The air districts and the Air Resources Board will provide incentives for vehicles, but the Transportation Commission
must create the infrastructure to make those regulations succeed.

As others have said, creating a Mobility Action Plan is a great opportunity to continue this conversation. Prioritizing community input will be really important in that process.

Thank you all.

CTC CHAIR INMAN: Thank you.

Richard Lyon.

MR. LYON: Good afternoon. Richard Lyon here on behalf of the California Home Builders, the California Building Industry Association. We have a letter on file, so that is a detailed letter. I won't spend a lot of time going over that, just to make a couple points.

Our view of SB 375 - because we were at the table. We were part of the coalition of the willing - is that the greatest strength of it is that it's implementation by consensus and a sense of -- spirit of cooperation. It was understood by all when we negotiated SB 375 that land-use decisions, housing approvals, land patterns, transportation strategies, programming, financing, and project delivery take time. They take patience and they take time. They don't turn on a dime.

And in this regard, SB 375 is a bit of an anomaly in terms of our overall state programs. AB 32 and SB 32
had a premium on getting short-term results. That's not
the case with SB 375. We all understand that it takes
time in order for these types of activities to be able to
mature and provide results.

Is VMT increasing?
It definitely is. VMT is an activity that
facilitates social and economic interactions. VMT is not
just a dead weight on the economy, but it's -- there's
some good to it as well. In fact, there's quite a bit
good to it.

Is transit ridership on the decline? Yes, it is,
and we've heard a lot of reasons why.

But is SB 375 producing important groundwork in
regions throughout the state that can provide sustainable
and long-term payoffs. We really do believe that it is.
So we don't subscribe to the notion that SB 375 is under
producing or that it's failing.

A couple of words on the policy recommendations.
In the report, there's recommendations that we might want
to add more targets to the SCS. We think that that would
be the wrong direction to go in. Loading up the SCS with
additional prescriptions and subjecting future
transportation and housing projects to the force
multiplying effects of additional regulatory scrutiny, to
cost, to price rises, and to litigation would do, we
think, very little to advance the notions of environmental
integrity, but it would definitely provide scarcity in
terms of transportation projects and housing.

Fundamentally, we need to look at barrier
removal. And this has been something that's been talked
about. We need to build more housing in California. The
market is going to -- going to deliver California from the
housing crisis, and that's the privately financed,
privately -- private market. It's going to be the
catalyst to provide the housing. Many of those market
rate projects have affordable components to it, so this
is -- this is kind of a twofer in terms of housing. The
market needs to lead the recovery.

We also need to streamline the approval process.
We have CEQA reforms that are there for a very small
portion of an overall SCS. We need to advance that
significantly. If the SCS identifies the preferred growth
pattern in a region, then we need to apply the kind of
reforms throughout the region, not just within very small
and micro areas.

Thirdly, we need to look at tax increment
financing. We've been working with a number of experts.
We have education at the table. We believe that it's
important that we bring that back. That economic growth,
housing, benefits public treasuries from the State, to the
region, to the local. And it is incumbent on those public entities to recognize that and reinvest back in communities to achieve -- and help to achieve our housing crisis, but also to achieve the environmental goals as well.

So it's important that we take a fresh look at tax increment financing. Pricing strategies are important. And then finally, it's important that the public understand the connection between these environmental policies and the everyday cost of living in California.

Thank you.

CTC CHAIR INMAN: Thank you. Thank you very much.

Keith Dunn.

MR. DUNN: Thank you. Keith Dunn. And here I'm the Executive Director of the Self Help Counties Coalition. A lot of people today like to talk about the self-help counties, the investments that we make here in the state of California.

I guess I would just like to remind folks of the collaborative nature in which those expenditure plans are developed. The fact that they don't stop at county lines. These are really regional plans that go into our neighbors and talk about how to best plan and pay for those regions.
I want to address specifically pages 59 and 60 in this AB 150 report where it talks about opening up those expenditure plans and widening them out. We have a saying at Self Help Counties, it's promises made, promises kept. It's really the mantra of our success in that we interact with our voters. And on a two-thirds basis go out and earn their trust, and deliver those projects.

So I just would like to keep in mind that the hard work that these self-help counties have done with political courage some three times to get the voters approval. Let's not mess with that. It's a sacred trust. It's developed collaboratively with citizen input and oversight, and it's really a model that should be implemented with the state. And pages 59 and 60 in the AB 150 report, I just wanted to answer that specifically.

Thank you.

CTC CHAIR INMAN: Thank you, Keith.

Okay. Richard Lambros, followed by Ella Wise, Stacie Dabbs and Esther Rivera.

CTC COMMISSIONER BURKE: Madam Chairman, when are we going to move to accept written statements?

CTC CHAIR INMAN: Well, I'm trying to get this as fast as I can.

CTC COMMISSIONER BURKE: Okay. Then maybe I move that we limit their remarks to two minutes.
CTC CHAIR INMAN: Okay.
CTC COMMISSIONER GHIelmetti: I'll second that.

(Laughter.)

CTC COMMISSIONER BURKE: Sorry.

CTC CHAIR INMAN: I was trying to --

CTC COMMISSIONER BURKE: I don't think the train

is going to wait.

CTC CHAIR INMAN: Well, we do have -- we have a little later train, so we're covered. We're can take the 5:00 o'clock. But anyway, yes, please go and please everybody be brief, and feel free to --

MR. LAMBROS: Good afternoon, I'm Richard Lambros, Managing Director of the Southern California Leadership Council. I have thrown out my prepared text, and I will just make a few observations.

First of all, the Leadership Council is a non-partisan organization led by former Governors Gray Davis and Pete Wilson, and includes three dozen Presidents and CEOs of major industries and organizations in Southern California. We're focused on job creation, economic development, and the quality life in our region.

We've been involved deeply with SB 375 since its inception and throughout its implementation. We obviously read with great interest the SB 150 report. We particularly appreciate the comments you all have made
today. It makes it easier for me to throw out my -- as I said, my prepared comments and just make a few observations. Particularly appreciate Assemblyman Frazier's outlining as the legislative intent of the 150 report.

Let's just focus on one thing, if we can. I'm so glad you heard from the MPOs. You've heard the great things that are being done, because there is a lot of great work being done under SB 375. But let's focus on the finding in the main focus of the report the shortcoming, the shortcoming in achieving targets.

And I want to take you back ten years ago just to hear a quick story, which if you recall, and many of you on this panel and many in the audience were involved in the original target setting, CARB made its mantra for target setting that the targets be ambitious, but achievable, ambitious but achievable.

And that was -- that was throughout the goal. And they set out targets to each MPO. And, in fact, some of you on the Panel remember when it got to SCAG, SCAG said no. Those targets are, in fact, too ambitious. And they said no to accepting the targets. And they asked specifically -- they said we will accept them if we can have some assurances. And they asked for a meeting with CARB on funding.
And during those discussions, the main focus was redevelopment, the dollars that were needed, the tools that were needed, and other funding sources, because it was clear even then, that any planning around what we're trying to do under SB 375 is not achievable, if it is not -- if it is not properly resourced.

And from the private success you know that. You never take on a project if you don't resource it. We took on SB 375. We undertook tremendous planning, and it has been tremendously successful. Pause and take a look at where our trajectory would be on these issues. What would housing look like, what would transportation look like without the SB 375 process? We've changed our trajectory much to the better, but we didn't resource the process.

So I -- our group would argue with several of our partners from the private sector that as you look at SB 375 - and it is healthy to look at it ten years in - just ask two things. One, let's look at the targets themselves, are they achievable? And let's go back to how we're doing our target setting. We can't put more on these organizations than is, in fact, achievable. And two, as have already been covered, we have to have the tools, redevelopment and other dollars and resources necessary to get the job done.

Thank you.
CTC CHAIR INMAN: Thank you.
I know have a bell ringer, so...
Ella.

MS. WISE: Hi. My name is Ella Wise, and I'm the State Policy Associate of Climate Plan, a network of more than 50 organizations statewide working on building healthier, more equitable, and sustainable communities. Thank you for the opportunity to speak. I'll keep it short.

I wanted to echo everyone and thank ARB staff for their hard work. The report is a huge step towards climate accountability and provides a strong foundation for meaningful action. We are not meeting our goals. There's been a lot talked about today, but that's the takeaway. Regions are not meeting the targets that ARB expects them to meet and counts on them to meet.

So this means a lot of things. It means that Californians are stuck in traffic. It means that we're not providing the options for them to be able to opt out of congestion. But it also means, according to the report, that the state will not meet its 2030 goals unless things change.

So what do we do?
Like many others here, we support ARB staff's recommendation for a Mobility Action Plan for healthy...
communities. We -- it should focus on equity and transportation justice, and it should be formed with great urgency. We've provided two letters, one of them specifies who should potentially lead the MAP process as well as a timeline. And we'd like to see a draft outline of the map by October's joint meeting.

But the Mobility Action Plan, or the MAP, includes housing and legislation and a lot of actors, right? So what can ARB and CTC do together to make these meetings meaningful and actionable?

So not only can you support the Mobility Action Plan, but you can focus on funding. That's the power in this room, right, is power over the funding? So focus on the funding and start today.

The L.A. Times Editorial Board wrote a editorial on Wednesday that I quote, "Nor have State officials done enough to align transportation spending with climate goals. Let's change that".

You have the power to change that. Mr. Ikhrata earlier said that would be the most important thing for the State to do.

CTC CHAIR INMAN: May I ask you to cut it off, please.

MS. WISE: Thank very much for the time and your action on this important report.
CTC CHAIR INMAN: Thank you.

Stacie Dabbs, followed by Esther Rivera, Marisela from the Port and Ericka Rincon from Policy Link.

MS. DABBS: Thank you very much. I'll be brief, Madam Chair, if you'll excuse me for the informality in my comments then.

I am the Executive Director -- my name is Stacie Dabbs, Executive Director of Merced County Association of Governments. I'm also the Executive Director for two public transit agencies, our countywide consolidated public transit system in Merced County, and also a five-county system that provides public transit to Yosemite National Park.

I really -- I was disappointed. I think I missed Assemblyman Frazier by about 20 seconds. I just wanted to say I completely appreciate everything that he said. Literally every word that came out of his mouth today, I want to say thank you. And also to reiterate or to strengthen the comments that were made by Keith Dunn.

And the remainder of my comments that I prepared for today I can submit in writing.

CTC CHAIR INMAN: Thank you very much.

Appreciate it.

Okay. Esther.

MS. RIVERA: Hi. Good afternoon. First, I just
I want to thank all of you Commissioners and Board members for your time today, and also thank CTC staff and ARB staff. I know how much goes into these meetings, and we definitely appreciate all the time and effort.

I want to echo a lot of what's been said by my colleagues. But to save time, I'll just say ditto Ella, ditto Bryn, and control very specific comments. So I want to highlight the fact that we are very much in support and appreciate the effort that went into the SB 150 report. And I want to highlight a comment that Commissioner Van Konynenburg made, which was that there needs to be more collaboration between the two groups, not just in the SB 150 report, but I think, and I'll push to say this is my comment, that it should go further.

This interagency work group that we've been proposing since the last meeting is a way to get that collaboration moving and a way to see more action made between meetings. And I think that that's really key.

So we definitely support the MAP, as well as this interagency group that can continue working on some of these items that come up in a more actionable way. But we need to do that now. We need to see this group formed. We need to see action. We need to see it in April. We need to see something else in October, but it's very important that we see that. And I think collaboration is
And I appreciate all your time, and I'll just keep it brief. So thank you.

CTC CHAIR INMAN: Thank you very much. Appreciate it.

Marisela.

MS. CARABELLO DiRUGGIERO: Good afternoon. My name is Marisela Carabello DiRuggiero, and I'm with the Port of Los Angeles. On behalf of the Port of L.A., thank you for holding this important joint Board meeting in our region.

The Port of L.A. is the largest container port in the western hemisphere handling 9.3 million TEUs. There is no doubt that every day is freight day.

(Laughter.)

MS. CARABELLO DiRUGGIERO: The Port of L.A. is also a world leader --

(Discussion off the record.)

MS. CARABELLO DiRUGGIERO: The Port of L.A. is also a world leader in maritime environmental programs, and leading the industry to green all of our operations. The Clean Air Action Plan implemented by the Ports of L.A. and Long Beach is breaking records. This was also a joint effort with CARB, U.S. EPA, and South Coast AQMD.

In a ten-year period, we have reduced emissions
for all our source categories, trucks, ocean-going vessels, trains, cargo handling equipment, harbor craft, like tugboats. Overall, we have reduced diesel particulate matter by 87 percent, nitrogen oxides by 60 percent, sulfur oxides by 98, overall greenhouse gases by 13. All the while, we have increased our throughput -- our container throughput by 10 percent.

We have been able to do this because we're working with our industry partners and our tenants. We have reached these goals on a voluntary process without regulation, and we are not done. We are working on our CAAP, the new Clean Air Action Plan 3.0. Looking at new goals for the next five years, challenging the industry to change over their fleets and equipment, new equipment that has not quite been developed, but some are in the testing phases, working with technology advancement programs and pilots to get there.

The Eco-FRATIS project is just one example that demonstrates technology with drayage trucks to improve drayage operations to and from the Ports of L.A.

The Port wants to thank CARB staff for working with us, and our staff throughout the years. This has enabled the ports to surpass our goals. We also look forward to our continued working relationship with CARB staff so we can hit the next generation of our targets,
continue to work on time lands -- timelines to reach our
targets. This is so important for our maritime industry.

The Port has a proven track record of working
with our maritime industry partners to get their without
regulations. Help us, work with us to achieve these goals
that we ultimately all want to believe -- to achieve.

CTC CHAIR INMAN: Thanks.

MS. CARABELLO DiRUGGIERO: And I just want to
thank the CTC staff for supporting our last two projects
and we look forward to our continued relationship.

Thank you.

CTC CHAIR INMAN: Thank you.

Ericka.

And then I want to have Kurt, OCTA.

MS. RINCON: Ericka Rincon -- oh, sorry.

CTC CHAIR INMAN: Okay.

MS. RINCON: Ericka Rincon, on behalf of Policy
Link. We're a national -- national racial justice
advocacy organization. I also want to express our real
deep appreciation for the -- for the staff's leadership
for putting forth the SB 150 report. We especially
appreciate how prominent equity was lifted up in that
report, and that it recognizes the large inequities in
transportation, housing, and air quality that continue to
affect low income people and people of color in
California, a population that comprises a lot -- a large segment, and really requires us to focus on their needs, if we are serious about building a stronger economy in this state.

We support a number of strategies and echo previous comments made by Climate Plan, Climate Resolve, and California Walks.

I did want to mention that with regard to the Mobility Action Plan, that is something that we support. And we encourage that plan to be focused on climate and mobility justice and to ensure that there's also public membership within that Mobility Action Plan, including community based organizations that serve low income people and people of color.

I also wanted to make -- or mention the transportation platform that Bryn also talked about earlier, that there are several actions in there that are especially focused on how we align our money with climate and equity goals that is also called out in the SB 150 report, including leveraging the large amount of money and transportation for high quality jobs and careers, specifically for people with barriers to employment through workforce partnerships with community based organizations and targeted higher policies.

Thank you.
MR. BROTCKE: Good afternoon. Kurt Brotcke with the Orange Count Transportation Authority. Thank you.

I'm speaking to you as a transportation planning agency. We're also a builder of arterial freeway and transit projects. And we also have to operate and maintain whatever we put out. So that's essentially our role.

Recently, our board approved our long range transportation plan, which is our submittal for the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan. That's a 40 plus billion dollar plan. And much of the funding for that comes through our self-help measure, also know as Measure M.

One of the projects that's in that plan is the Orange County Street Car Project. That particular project just broke ground last Friday. And so thank you to the Commission, to CalSTA, as well as ARB for the $25 million in funding that contributed to that $400 million project. We're very grateful.

I did want to point out on that project that from concept to groundbreaking, that was ten years. And it takes a long time to do big transportation projects. And I think that's something to keep in mind as you're talking about major changes in policy. We're just not there yet.
We're still planning and building projects. So keep that in mind as you consider policy changes in the future.

In terms of operating our projects as well, that's a continual issue for us as well. We don't really have the flexibility in terms of the State funding sources for long-term operations. And that's something that should be on the table for further discussion as well.

In addition to that predicting how we can use those funds in the future for our regional transportation plan and the projects we submit is very difficult when some of the funding programs change or are not available. So flexibility and predictability are very important as we move forward.

As it relates to the SB 150 report, I also want to underscore the points made by Keith Dunn as it relates to our own self-help measure, known as Measure M, as well as some of the other issues in the report that have been noted.

Thank you.

CTC CHAIR INMAN: Thank you.

Sorry for that obnoxious alarm clock. I do hate alarm clocks, but it's necessity right now. I appreciate it.

Mike Lewis.

Is Mike still here?
Not seeing Mike.

Andrew Henderson. Okay. I picked up -- okay.

Andy.

MR. HENDERSON: Thank you, Madam Chair. I'll be very brief. I think it was about three years ago I last addressed the CTC. And I don't know what the exact agenda item was, but we talked about the fact that the legislative imperative and the regulatory imperative has to be GHG reduction, not VMT reduction.

And I thought -- there was a good discussion about that, and I thought there was a lot of understanding of that fact in front of that Commission. The last time I addressed the Air Resources Board was September of 2010, with I testified against the targets that they set, the targets we're now talking about.

And our position was similar to what the -- or not -- somewhat similar to the fellow from San Diego who said he could have told you ten years ago these targets wouldn't have been met. We felt the same way, but for a different reason, and that is that they were unrealistic when they -- when they were set.

In fact, just 18 months earlier, the AB 32 scoping report asked for five million metric tons from the business-as-usual projection for this segment, which is light transportation and land use.
And then just less than two years later, they set the targets, and that five million metric tons was increased to about 21 million metric tons. A huge difference. And we were saying how are you going to get there? How are you going to get an eight percent decrease in what is really per capita VMT, not per capita GHG?

Because the way CARB has set it up is everything related to what comes out of the tailpipe, they take credit for elsewhere. So a mile driven is going to be assessed at a static rate of GHG emissions. So they basically said -- the question is how do you get an eight percent reduction in VMT effectively -- per capita of VMT in the SCAG region when you're talking about a 15-year period in which the housing stock would only grow about four percent?

It's -- so our point was -- the subtitle of the -- of last week's report should be reality is simply not cooperating. And I think they need to look at the targets much more than they need to look at trying to bend reality to meet these targets.

CTC CHAIR INMAN: Thank you.
Okay. Next, we have Wes Reutiman from Active SGV. Is Wes still here?

Followed by Karissa Willette, Building Industry of Southern California, followed by Rio Oxas, People for
Mobility Justice, if you could queue up, please.

Yes.

MR. REUTIMAN: Sure. Good afternoon, Board Members. Wes Reutiman with Active SGV. This is our first time at CARB or CTC, so a pleasure to be here.

I wanted to quickly answer the question that was posed earlier and what keeps our organization up at night? And I think a couple things sprang to mind. Number one is unsafe streets. The number one cause of childhood mortality in L.A. County is traffic collisions still, and predominantly older adults and young people are victims.

Declining air quality. We had 87 days of poor air this summer. So as one -- you know, in the past two decades, it's been the worst streak we've had. And that has a disproportionate affect on young people in our -- in especially the inland valleys, which we represent.

Unaffordable housing is another thing that keeps me at night. We have a lot of people getting displaced and pushed out. And then I think more than anything else sitting in this meeting today is it feels like there's a lack of a sense of urgency based on all these really serious challenges that we're facing and that were outlined in the report among the decision makers, among you who actually have some power to do something.

And we recognize that land use is difficult. You
cannot totally control the land-use issues, but there are
a lot of other things you can do. And I'm going to just
touch base on a couple of the ones that we've noticed.

In our region -- so we work in an area of L.A.
County that has about two million residents, about 30
cities. It's very can-centric. The center of it, top 10
percent most pollution burdened in the state, according to
CalEnviroScreen. Almost no active transportation
infrastructure. Transit is kind of piecemeal. But
there's a lot of interest in changing our communities and
helping people get around. Cities keep applying for ATP.
They don't get it. It's very difficult for small
communities, especially disadvantaged communities to get
it and administer it.

We have a very large student population. Our
Assembly Member, Chris Holden, has applied -- or has
gotten legislation passed through the state multiple times
to do universal student transit pass program to help
increase transit use, especially amongst people who are
open to it. It hasn't been funded multiple times.

CARB and CTC also really focus on EVs, but you're
always focusing on cars. And a lot of lower income people
are open to using other types of smaller electrically
powered vehicles, like electric bikes and scooters, but
those aren't eligible for rebates. So those are just a
couple of the things.

   The last thing I would say, please get of our bubbles. Talk to younger people. Talk to people who aren't homeowners, who don't, you know, drive everywhere all the time.

   Thank you.

   CTC CHAIR INMAN: Thank you.

   Karissa.

   MS. WILLETTE: Good afternoon. My name is Karissa Willette, and I'm here today representing the Building Industry Association of Southern California. On behalf of our 1,100 members consisting of builders, developers, and trade companies within our six county region, we have been deeply involved in the SB 375 process since its inception.

   A decade has passed since the adoption of the SB 375. And the primary findings set forward in this report is that California is not on track to meet the greenhouse gas reduction established under SB 375, despite the fact that California has achieved ahead of schedule its overall 2020 statewide climate goals established under AB 32.

   In our view, the primary reason that the targets established by CARB under SB 375 are not being approached with due speed is because they were uncritically established in the first place in ways that conflict with
how the California legislature intended it to be -- intended it to operate.

Specifically, CARB established that -- targets that assume that citizens would on average drive fewer miles in an ever growing population and recovering economy. It is clear that the overly ambitious SB 375 targets constitute a slow motion attack on individual mobility as measured by per capita VM co-miles traveled.

The assumption about VMT reductions being achievable are being proven to be unrealistic and should be revisited. The SB 375 targets need to be moderated accordingly.

State policy can be improved to make these targets more achievable, and the changes needed include more effective sequestering mining to foster more rapid development of the type of housing and other land uses needed to achieve the GHG emission reductions, the restoration of redevelopment incentives, and also steps taken to advance technical -- technological improvements, especially those in regards to fleet efficiency.

We agree that the report's conclusion that an open and public review of SB 375 should take place, and we look forward to participating.

Thank you.

CTC CHAIR INMAN: Thank you. The dreaded bell.
Rio?

MR. SANCHEZ: Hi. I am not Rio. Rio had to leave a littler earlier. They've ceded their time to me, so go ahead and just double the amount of time for this next speaker.

(Laughter.)

MR. SANCHEZ: I'm Jared Sanchez from the California Bicycle --

CTC CHAIR INMAN: No, that doesn't work, so --

MR. SANCHEZ: That's not allowed here for that?

CTC CHAIR INMAN: Okay. Jared, you can speak, because you're on my list here, but yeah, the two minutes.

MR. SANCHEZ: I'm next. Yeah, that's why I'm saying that.

So I'm grateful you all were able to make it here for this important meeting. I really can't stress enough, as I did in June about the importance of these meetings. It took legislative mandate to get here. Coming from community based organizations, environmental justice organizations, transportation justice organizations, simply because it was clear that you all weren't going to do it on your own. So we stepped in and helping facilitate this process to increase partnership hopefully.

So now the question for me is and for a lot of speakers is what do we do now? Now that this opportunity
is before you, what can joint action look like?

We all can grapple with the SB 150 findings, which I want to acknowledge staff behind me. It was a great report, of course, but it doesn't just end there with what's in the report.

For me, it's about what low income communities of color are saying now and what they've been saying for generations across our state about the vast mobility inequalities. Just because they are not here in this very exclusive space, and just because they haven't submitted a report to you, doesn't mean that you can avoid taking transformative steps to address long-standing systemic inequalities built, maintained, and reproduced by transportation decision making.

I look forward to not just future meetings where this is a specific agenda item, but also where you all make coordinated and joint actions. And I know this isn't required by State law for you all to make these decisions through these meetings, but inaction can be just as disastrous.

Board Member Sperling is right, you all need to act. However, how you act matters. And I hope you all actually embrace the abundance of community wisdom from marginalized and disenfranchised folks, folks of color, and let them guide you in your decision making, or even
better, let them decide themselves, and not just to rely
on a lot of the paid regional and county transportation
agency representatives, most whom are in this room, to
monopolize all the expertise.

Thank you for your time.

CTC CHAIR INMAN: Thank you.

John Barna followed by Wes May, followed by
Lindsey Nola.

We're getting there folks.

MR. BARNA: So you don't want the 15-minute
version, huh?

(Laughter.)

MR. BARNA: Real quickly building on what the
previous speaker said. I think there is an opportunity
for the two agencies to work together. And if you're
going to have an interagency working group, I would
strongly urge that the two entities develop a new
interagency public sector business model to focus on
short-term objectives, not inconsistent with what Dan
Sperling was saying.

The two agencies need to figure out a way to come
together and develop a joint mission for this purpose,
because they are two entities that have fundamentally
different legislative mandates. And so for this effort to
succeed, I would strongly urge that there be a new thing
that happens at the staff level and potentially at the
Board level to deal with these issues, and to then
interact with the appropriate stakeholders.

We've heard a lot today. I would agree with
everything about issues of scale, how to support local
regional successes, how to support green mobility in the
economy, and increase the housing stock that respects
local land use and is more equitable.

The -- focusing on creating short-term achievable
objectives that fit within longer range planning, but
demonstrates real progress that builds on itself is
possible. And that's where that joint mission comes in.

What's going to be required to make that happen
quite honestly is the next administration and Legislature
have to fund it. They have to be able to support
positions. They need to be able to say we agree with this
approach. If they do not, then, you know, these
conversations will keep going on. And I don't know that
necessarily we'll get to a certain place of action.

Lastly, the concerns about current progress need
to realize that what is being measured reflects daily
incremental decisions that mobility customers make,
incremental decisions made by business and industry, and
incremental decisions made by local governments.

I would suggest that a real measure of near-term
success would be mobility customers businesses --

CTC CHAIR INMAN: Thank you.

MR. BARNA: -- and local governments having better choices to make.

Thanks.

CTC CHAIR INMAN: Thank you. Sorry to rush you.

Wes May, followed by Lindsey, followed by Sarah.

MR. MAY: Hey, good afternoon, everybody. Wes May with the ECA, Engineering Contractors Association.

And our member companies -- 200 members companies do heavy underground installation of water and sewer lines in Southern California, sewage treatment plants, water treatment plants. We're contractors and we joined in this letter by the -- from the Southern California Leadership Council, which I ask you to look at, that outlines some of our points of view with other construction industry associations and contractors.

And the key point that we -- we certainly agree with GHG goals and climate goals, but at the same time, we need economic viability. Our guys are out there right now working, operating engineers, laborers, Teamsters, carpenters, cement masons. The trades, bringing home the paycheck which brings them good mental health, good physical health.

Thank you for your time.
CTC CHAIR INMAN: Thank you.
Okay. We have the final three. Lindsey, Sarah and Shirley, if you'll line up we'll love you.
Okay. We're down to two.
Sarah.

MS. WILTFONG: Good afternoon, almost evening.
My name is Sarah Wiltfong, and I'm here on behalf of the Los Angeles County Business Federation, also known as BizFed. As requested, I'll keep my comments brief.

Achieving emissions reductions back to 1990 levels is a beneficial and ambitious goal, one that has led to cleaner air for our communities. While we believe achieving emission reduction is important, as has been stated already, we also must balance these goals with the job creation and the economy.

After reviewing the progress report, we want to make it clear that we believe it's important that the focus remain on greenhouse gas emission reductions and not mandating vehicle miles traveled. The local land use decision making is respected as they are the best decision makers who understand local needs, and that impacts on the economy are -- are not secondary, but at the forefront of the discussion.

We ask that when the California Resources Board considers how our state is going to meet the -- meet its
emissions targets, that it also balances the needs of
California's economy. And we look forward to working with
CARB to make sure that happens.

    Thank you for the consideration of our comments.
Thank you.

    CTC CHAIR INMAN: Thank you for being brief.
Shirley.

    MS. MEDINA: Good evening. Shirley Medina,
Planning and Program Director with the Riverside County
Transportation Commission. And we are a self-help county.
And I want to reiterate what Keith Dunn said about
self-help counties. Our mantra is promises made, promises
kept.

    And with that, I have nothing more to add. I
think you have a big challenge ahead of you. And we are
making progress. I think that's encouraging. And we look
forward to working with you on meeting our goals to the
best of our ability withstanding all the other issues that
are outside of our hands.

    With that, I'd like to welcome everyone to
Riverside that are heading over there to spend some money.

    Thank you.

    (Laughter.)

    CTC CHAIR INMAN: Great. Okay. Well, we're --
we're going to be on that train with you hopefully.
So -- anyway -- do I have one? Do I -- I don't have your card or I --

MR. ELENAS: No, I think it must have gotten lost in there -- but, sorry, I drove from Fresno this morning for four hours. So it's like I'll be brief with my comments.

CTC CHAIR INMAN: Okay.

MS. ELENAS: Thank you.

My name is Grecia Elenas. I'm with Leadership Counsel for Justice and Accountability, not to be considered -- confused with the other Leadership Council I was hearing previously. We are a local non-profit based in the Central Valley, also the Eastern Coachella Valley working with low income, mostly rural unincorporated communities.

And I just, you know, briefly want to just commend staff for their report, a very thorough report. Although, very sobering. I think it resonates a lot with what we see on the ground. We work with dozens of communities on these specific plans. And this is exactly what we hear from them, you know, that they don't see the investments happening. And I think this is something -- this is an opportunity we have right now to breakdown those silos and not just work within interagencies, but most importantly work directly with community members who
are, at the end of the day, the experts of what solutions will work in their communities and what won't.

And if we realistically want to achieve our very aggressive climate goals, I think that's where it really starts right there. And especially looking at those rural communities, because at the end of the day, this is where our multi-billion dollar ag sector is really based out of, and yet they are not receiving any of these benefits, and are at the forefront of all of the burdens.

So thank you.

CTC CHAIR INMAN: Thank you.

Could you see Doug and fill out the paper that we kind of need for our records.

So anyway, I want to thank everybody who hung with us. And sorry that we had to get an alarm going, but I know it was necessary, because I'd love to have everybody have a whole bunch of time.

But in that, I'm going to recognize my fellow Commissioners and Board members, anybody have some closing thoughts?

Yes, Judy

ARB BOARD MEMBER MITCHELL: One thing that we've heard from a number of speakers is concern about the funding. And we recognize SB 375, drills all the way down to local government, where the action really happens. And
local government has expressed concerns about getting funding. And I've heard from them in various other arenas that they'd like to see some kind of local return or some kind of block grant funding for their projects, but that would be a matter of legislative action. The funding, as it exists today, comes by way of the statute.

And so I think for those who are looking for that kind of change should turn to the Legislature to ask for that.

So thank you.

CTC CHAIR INMAN: Thank you very much.

Anybody else?

Yes, Dan.

ARB BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: So I'm going to make an offer --

CTC CHAIR INMAN: Okay.

ARB BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: -- with my other hat on, my university hat.

(Laughter.)

ARB BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: So not in terms of CARB, but at the university -- the University of California, we have four large institutes of transportation studies, and we have a number of researchers around the state. And we have started an initiative to look more closely to support the State at
looking at advanced technologies, innovative mobility, new mobility for transportation. So we actually had a workshop last week. We had 70 researchers, professors show up. And we have a plan that we were going to do a series of roundtables or listening sessions around the State.

So what I'd like to propose -- and that would be in terms of looking at all of the different aspects, you know, congestion, equity, as well as greenhouse gases. So what I'd like to suggest or offer is that we could do that in collaboration or in connection and somehow with CTC and CARB as part of follow-up activity here.

You know, I can imagine there might -- and so we would invite -- we'd work with the Legislature. We'd work with the -- you know, Assembly Member Frazier, and others to do that.

And that could be one outcome of this process. And we would try to -- and we could work with you to, you know, any kind of concerns or products you might be interested in.

And I would suggest also -- I mean, the University of California is the research arm of the State. So let me also suggest that a possibility is we could run individual one-time workshops on different topics like pricing, for instance, that relates to this.
But the big -- the big offer though is a series of roundtable workshops around the state. You know, we'd do one in the Central Valley, one in south, you know, L.A., Northern California. At least three is what we were thinking of. And we can coordinate with you whatever seems the appropriate way, however much credit or responsibility that might want.

CTC CHAIR INMAN: Sure. Okay. Well, I think that's great. I think there's a lot of rich information that we received today. I think we all need to take that and we also need to consider how that would work. And then I think we need to get the plan and the components going. And if anybody got one thing from today, it's complicated. So I hope everybody appreciates that. And we're willing to work.

So I want to say on behalf of my fellow co-chair who had to step out, just thank everybody for your hard work, for our staff, for our folks that came and made the presentations to the public that joined us, and to all of my fellow colleagues. I learned a lot today and appreciate it.

And on your mark, get so, get, run for the train.

Meeting is adjourned.

/////
(Thereupon the California Air Resources Board and California Transportation Commission meeting adjourned at 4:22 p.m.)
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