

MEETING
STATE OF CALIFORNIA
AIR RESOURCES BOARD

RIVERSIDE COUNTY ADMINISTRATIVE CENTER
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS CHAMBERS
FIRST FLOOR
4080 LEMON STREET
RIVERSIDE, CALIFORNIA

THURSDAY, MARCH 22, 2018

9:11 A.M.

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

A P P E A R A N C E S

BOARD MEMBERS:

Ms. Mary Nichols, Chair
Ms. Sandra Berg, Vice Chair
Dr. John Balmes
Mr. Hector De La Torre
Mr. John Eisenhut
Senator Dean Florez
Assembly Member Eduardo Garcia
Supervisor John Gioia
Senator Ricardo Lara
Ms. Judy Mitchell
Supervisor Phil Serna
Dr. Alex Sherriffs
Professor Daniel Sperling
Ms. Diane Takvorian

STAFF:

Mr. Richard Corey, Executive Officer
Ms. Edie Chang, Deputy Executive Officer
Mr. Kurt Karperos, Deputy Executive Officer
Ms. Ellen Peter, Chief Counsel
Ms. Veronica Eady, Assistant Executive Officer
Ms. La Ronda Bowen, Ombudsman
Ms. Emily Wimberger, Chief Economist

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

STAFF:

Ms. Cari Anderson, Branch Chief, Freight Transportation Branch, Transportation and Toxics Division(TTD)

Ms. Heather Arias, Branch Chief, Community Planning Branch, Office of Community Air Protection(OCAP)

Mr. Michael Benjamin, Division Chief, Air Quality Planning and Science Division(AQPSD)

Mr. Pippin Brehler, Senior Attorney, Legal Office

Ms. Kirsten Cayabyab, Air Pollution Specialist, South Coast Air Quality Planning Section, AQPSD

Ms. Nicole Dolney, Branch Chief, Transportation Planning Branch, AQPSD

Mr. Rhead Enion, Senior Attorney Legal Office

Ms. Andrea Juarez, Air Pollution Specialist, State Strategy Section, OCAP

Mr. Vernon Hughes, Branch Chief, Community Assessment Branch, OCAP

Mr. Nesamani Kalandiyur, Manager, Transportation Analysis Section, AQPSD

Ms. Karen Magliano, Director OCAP

Ms. Ajay Mangat, Manager, Freight Systems Section, TTD

Ms. Cynthia Marvin, Division Chief, TTD

Mr. Gabriel Monroe, Attorney, Legal Office

Ms. Lezlie Kimura Szeto, Manager, Sustainable Communities Policy and Planning Section, AQPSD

Ms. Heather King, Air Pollution Specialist, Sustainable Communities Policy and Planning Section, AQPSD

Mr. Craig Segall, Assistant Chief Counsel, Legal Office

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

STAFF:

Ms. Carol Sutkus, Manager, South Coast Air Quality
Planning Section, AQPSD

Ms. Sylvia Vanderspek, Branch Chief, Air Quality Planning
Branch, AQPSD

Ms. Elizabeth Yura, Branch Chief, Freight Activity Branch,
TTD

ALSO PRESENT:

Mr. Alan Abbs, California Air Pollution Control Officers
Association

Ms. Estrella Arana, Sierra Club

Dr. Martha Argüella, Physicians for Social Responsibility

Mr. Victor Banuet, Colton High School Eco-Friendly Club

Ms. Alix Bockelman, Metropolitan Transportation
Commission, Association of Bay Area Governments

Mr. Bo Boylan, Solidia Technologies

Mr. Jack Broadbent Bay Area Air Quality Management
District

Ms. Astrid Calderas

Mr. Todd Campbell, Clean Energy

Ms. Ana Carlos, CCAEJ

Ms. Llesenia Cevallos, Environmental Health Coalition

Ms. Elisa Chang, CALPIRG

Mr. Christopher Chavez

Mr. James Corless, Sacramento Area Council of Governments

Mr. Paul Cort, Earthjustice

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

STAFF:

Mr. George Coursier, Sierra Club San Diego

Ms. Nikita Daryanani, Leadership Counsel for Justice and Accountability

Mr. Harvey Eder, Public Solar Power Coalition

Ms. Demi Espinoza, Safe Routes to School National Partnership

Mr. Steve Figueroa, Inland Empire Latino Coalition

Mr. Juan Flores

Ms. Genevieve Gale, Central Valley Air Quality Coalition

Ms. Shirley Gamble, Watts Clean Air and Energy Committee

Ms. Lillian Garcia, LA Union Hace La Fuerza

Mr. Cristian Garza

Mr. Ruben Garza

Mr. Ricardo Gastelum, CBE

Ms. Esperanza Gonzalez, Environmental Health Coalition

Mr. David Grubb, Sierra Club

Mr. Gabriel Guerrero, CBE

Ms. Lupe Guerrero, CBE

Ms. Katy Gurin, 380 Riverside

Mr. Christian Guzman, CBE

Mr. George Hague

Mr. Kevin Hamilton, Central California Asthma Collaborative

Ms. Michele Hasson, CCAEJ

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

STAFF:

Mr. Allen Hernandez, CCAEJ

Ms. Jennifer Hernandez, The 200

Ms. Lizette Hernandez, Sierra Club

Mr. Miguel Hernandez, CCV

Ms. Bonnie Holmes-Gen, American Lung Association in California

Mr. Hasan Ikhata, Southern California Association of Governments

Mr. Mike Jacob, Pacific Merchant Shipping Association

Dr. Karen Jakpor, American Lung Association

Ms. Asher Jones

Mr. Tom Jordan, San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District

Ms. Kim Kawada, San Diego Association of Governments

Ms. Graciela Larios, CCAEJ

Mr. Thomas Lawson, California Natural Gas Vehicle Coalition

Mr. Bob Leiter, Stay Cool For Grandkids

Ms. Bryn Linblad, Climate Resolve

Ms. Irma Loyva, CBE

Mr. Humberto Lugo, IVAN Coachella, Comite Civico del Valle

Dr. Joe Lyou, South Coast Air Quality Management District

Ms. Margarita Margano, Environmental Health Coalition

Ms. Carmina Martinez, Environmental Health Coalition

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

STAFF:

Mr. Richard McCaskill, CARB Small Business Opportunity
Advisory Panel

Mr. Kent Minault

Ms. Amy Mmagu, Cal Chamber

Mr. Edith Moreno, SoCalGas

Mr. Wayne Nastri, South Coast Air Quality Management
District

Ms. Alli Neri, Climate Action Campaign

Mr. Luis Olmedo, Comite Civico del Valle

Mr. Rodolfo Olivo, CBE

Mr. Brad Poiriez, Mojave Desert Air Quality Management
District

Ms. Esther Portillo, CCAEJ

Ms. Linda G. Pratt, Stay Cool For Grandkids

Mr. Matt Regan, Bay Area Council

Mr. Kyle Rentschler, Sierra Club

Ms. Ana Reynoso, Environmental Health Coalition

Ms. Alicia Rivera, CBE

Ms. Maha Rizvi, represented Assembly Member Eloise Gomez
Reyes

Mr. Thomas Rocha, CCAEJ

Mr. Greg Roche, Clean Energy

Mr. Cody Rosenfield, Coalition for Clean Air

Mr. Carter Rubin, Natural Resources Defense Council

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

STAFF:

Mr. Sebastian Sarria, Climate Action Campaign

Mr. Chris Shimoda, California Trucking Association

Ms. Shelly Sullivan, Climate Change Policy Coalition

Ms. Taylor Thomas, EYCEJ

Mr. Bill Tippetts, Southwest Wetlands Interpretive Association

Ms. Heather Tomley, Port of Long Beach

Mr. Christian Torres, Comite Civico del Valle

Ms. Ashley Tremonti, City of San Diego

Ms. Stephanie Tsai, California Environmental Justice Alliance

Ms. Andrea Viadurre, CCAEJ

Ms. Bianca Villanueva, California Association of Port Authorities

Ms. Joy Williams, Environmental Health Coalition

Ms. Ella Wise, Climate Plan

Ms. Sophia Wolfram, Climate Action Campaign

Ms. Jenny Xiomara Rosales Aguilar, Queremos Cero Emission

Mr. Andrew Yancey, Golden Door

I N D E X

	PAGE
Call to Order	1
Pledge of Allegiance	1
Roll Call	1
Opening Remarks by Chair Nichols	2
Item 18-2-1	
Chair Nichols	4
Executive Officer Corey	5
Ms. Gamble	7
Mr. Minault	8
Motion	21
Vote	21
Item 18-2-2 & 18-2-3	
Chair Nichols	9
Executive Officer Corey	10
Mr. Eder	13
Ms. Arana	15
Board Discussion and Q&A	16
Motion 18-2-2	21
Vote	21
Motion 18-2-3	22
Vote	22
Item 18-2-4	
Chair Nichols	23
Executive Officer Corey	24
Staff Presentation	26
Board Discussion and Q&A	39
Mr. Ikhata	47
Ms. Kawada	52
Ms. Bockelman	57
Mr. Corless	61
Mr. Regan	82
Ms. Holmes-Gen	84
Ms. Tremonti	86
Ms. Reynoso	91
Ms. Cevallos	93
Ms. Margano	95
Ms. Martinez	95
Ms. Gonzalez	96
Ms. Pratt	97
Mr. Leiter	99

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

	PAGE
Item 18-2-4 (continued)	
Mr. Coursier	103
Mr. Grubb	104
Mr. Rentschler	105
Ms. Wolfram	107
Ms. Neri	109
Mr. Tippets	110
Ms. Wise	112
Mr. Rubin	115
Ms. Lindblad	115
Ms. Espinoza	118
Mr. Yancey	120
Mr. Hamilton	123
Ms. Gale	126
Mr. Figueroa	128
Ms. Hernandez	131
Ms. Gurin	134
Mr. Hague	134
Mr. Eder	136
Ms. Daryanani	138
 Afternoon Session	 142
Item 18-2-4 (continued)	
Board Discussion and Q&A	142
Motion	160
Amendment Motion	161
Vote on Amendment	168
Vote on Resolution	170
 Item 18-2-5 & 18-2-6	
Chair Nichols	170
Executive Officer Corey	172
Staff Presentation	174
Board Discussion and Q&A	206
Ms. Rizvi	211
Dr. Lyou	214
Mr. Jordan	216
Ms. Hasson	218
Dr. Jakpor	221
Ms. Tomley	223
Mr. Rosenfield	224
Mr. Garza	227
Ms. Villanueva	229
Mr. Hamilton	230
Mr. Minault	234

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

	PAGE
Item 18-2-5 & 18-2-6 (continued)	
Ms. Portillo	235
Mr. Cort	237
Ms. Williams	240
Mr. Hernandez	242
Ms. Espinoza	246
Mr. Rocha	248
Mr. Carlos	250
Ms. Larios	252
Ms. Viadurre	254
Mr. Hague	256
Mr. Shimoda	259
Mr. Eder	261
Mr. Banuet	263
Ms. Chang	265
Mr. Lawson	268
Ms. Moreno	269
Ms. Hernandez	272
Ms. Thomas	275
Ms. Jones	276
Mr. Campbell	278
Mr. Jacob	282
Mr. Garza	284
Mr. Roche	286
Mr. Lugo	288
Board Discussion and Q&A	290
Item 18-2-7	
Chair Nichols	311
Executive Officer Corey	312
Staff Presentation	313
Mr. Nastri	325
Mr. Broadbent	327
Mr. Jordan	330
Mr. Poiriez	331
Mr. Abbs	333
Board Discussion and Q&A	335
Ms. Williams	338
Ms. Sullivan	339
Ms. Mmagu	341
Mr. Chavez	341
Ms. Gale	343
Mr. Hamilton	345
Mr. Eder	347
Ms. Guerrero	348
Ms. Aguilar	349

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

	PAGE
Item 18-2-7 (continued)	
Ms. Guerrero	350
Mr. Gastelum	351
Mr. Olivo	353
Ms. Loyva	353
Dr. Argüello	354
Mr. Hernandez	356
Mr. Olmedo	358
Ms. Garcia	360
Ms. Calderas	361
Mr. Torres	363
Mr. Lugo	364
Mr. McCaskill	365
Ms. Daryanani	367
Mr. Flores	368
Ms. Tsai	370
Ms. Rivera	372
Mr. Guzman	374
Board Discussion and Q&A	376
Public Comment	382
Adjournment	385
Reporter's Certificate	386

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2 CHAIR NICHOLS: Good morning, everybody. Would
3 you please take your seats We're about to begin.

4 Will you please take your seats.

5 I guess -- I think people are having a really
6 good time, but it's time to start the meeting or we could
7 have a meeting of our own, I guess.

8 All right. It seems that that's what I had to
9 do. The March 22nd, 2018. Public meeting of California
10 Air Resources Board will come to order. Thank you all
11 very much for being here.

12 Before we begin our agenda, we will all please
13 rise and say the pledge of allegiance to the flag, which
14 is right here.

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

17 CHAIRPERSON NICHOLS: Would the clerk please call
18 the roll.

19 BOARD CLERK McREYNOLDS: Dr. Balmes?

20 BOARD MEMBER BALMES: Here.

21 BOARD CLERK McREYNOLDS: Mr. De La Torre?

22 BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: Here.

23 BOARD CLERK McREYNOLDS: Mr. Eisenhut?

24 BOARD MEMBER EISENHUT: Here.

25 BOARD CLERK McREYNOLDS: Senator Florez?

1 BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Here.

2 BOARD CLERK McREYNOLDS: Assembly Member Garcia?
3 Supervisor Gioia?

4 BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: Here.

5 BOARD CLERK McREYNOLDS: Senator Lara?
6 Ms. Mitchell?

7 BOARD MEMBER MITCHELL: Here.

8 BOARD CLERK McREYNOLDS: Mrs. Riordan?
9 Supervisor Roberts?

10 Supervisor Serna?

11 BOARD MEMBER SERNA: Here.

12 BOARD CLERK McREYNOLDS: Dr. Sherriffs?

13 BOARD MEMBER SHERRIFFS: Testing. Testing.

14 Here.

15 BOARD CLERK McREYNOLDS: Professor Sperling?

16 BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: Here.

17 BOARD CLERK McREYNOLDS: Ms. Takvorian?

18 BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Here.

19 BOARD CLERK McREYNOLDS: Vice Chair Berg?

20 VICE CHAIR BERG: Here.

21 BOARD CLERK McREYNOLDS: Chair Nichols?

22 CHAIR NICHOLS: Here.

23 BOARD CLERK McREYNOLDS: Madam Chair, we have a
24 quorum.

25 CHAIR NICHOLS: Great. A couple of announcements

1 to make before we get started.

2 First of all, I want to let everybody know that
3 interpretation services will be provided in Spanish for
4 the discussion items. Headsets are available outside the
5 hearing room at the attendant's sign-up table, and can be
6 picked up at any time.

7 Madam translator, would you repeat that, please?

8 (Thereupon interpretation in Spanish.)

9 CHAIR NICHOLS: Gracias.

10 Anyone who wishes to testify should fill out a
11 request to speak card available in the lobby outside the
12 Board room. We'd appreciate it if you will turn that into
13 a Board assistant or to the clerk seated over here at this
14 table prior to the commencement of the item that you're
15 wanting to speak on.

16 Also, since items 18-2-5, the update on
17 implementation of the State strategy for the SIP, and the
18 South Coast Air Quality Management Plan, and 18-2-6, the
19 update on concepts for minimizing the community health
20 impacts from freight facilities are two agenda items that
21 are closely related, we are going to hear them both
22 together. So the two items will be combined in the
23 presentation, and then there will be one comment period
24 for both items.

25 I want to make sure that speakers are aware that

1 the Board will impose a three minute time limit. We
2 appreciate it if you give your name when you come up to
3 the podium and then put your testimony into your own
4 words. It's easier for us to follow it if you will just
5 get straight to your main points.

6 We appreciate all the nice things you want to say
7 about our staff, but you don't have to take up the time
8 that you want to take up with making other points by
9 saying good things about them. And you don't need to read
10 your written statements, if you have one, because it will
11 be automatically entered into the -- into the record.

12 So with that -- oh, for safety reasons, please
13 note the emergency exits to the rear of the room. There
14 are two. In the event of a fire alarm, we're required to
15 evacuate this room immediately and to go out of the
16 building. When the all-clear signal is given, we will
17 return to the hearing room and resume the meeting.

18 Okay. I think that's it for the
19 pre-announcements.

20 The first item on the agenda was listed as a
21 consent item, a public meeting to consider the South Coast
22 Air Quality Management District's on-road heavy-duty
23 vehicle incentive measure. I need to ask the clerk if any
24 witnesses signed up to testify on this item.

25 BOARD CLERK McREYNOLDS: Madam Chair, we had two

1 people sign up to speak for this item.

2 CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. Since we have had a
3 request now then, we need to remove this from the consent
4 calendar, and follow the normal procedure for a Board
5 meeting.

6 So, Mr. Corey, would you please summarize this
7 item.

8 EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: Yes. Thanks, Chair.

9 The 2016 State strategy for the State
10 Implementation Plan was adopted by the Board March 23rd,
11 2017. The State SIP Strategy contains the State's
12 emission reduction commitments for the South Coast Air
13 Quality Management District, including commitments for
14 meeting the 80 parts per billion 8-hour ozone standard in
15 2023.

16 While regulations form the basis of the strategy
17 and are critical to driving the technology development and
18 deployment of the cleanest technologies into the fleet,
19 incentive efforts are needed to expand the deployment of
20 these cleaner technologies in time to meet the federally
21 mandated air quality standards.

22 Among the proposed measures in the State SIP
23 Strategy was a commitment to develop the incentive funding
24 to achieve further emission reductions from on-road
25 heavy-duty vehicles or the South Coast's incentive

1 measure. This item delivers on that commitment.

2 The South Coast incentive measure supports the
3 need to expand deployment of the cleanest technologies by
4 using Carl Moyer Air Quality Standards Attainment Program
5 funding to accelerate the penetration of near-zero and
6 zero emission heavy-duty trucks operating in the South
7 Coast Air Basin and produce emission reductions in 2023.

8 For these emission reductions to be approved by
9 the U.S. EPA for SIP credit, staff followed U.S. EPA
10 guidance as it worked with U.S. EPA and district staff to
11 develop the first-of-its-kind prospective incentive
12 measure. This effort will serve as a template for CARB
13 and air districts to take prospective credit in the SIP
14 for emission reductions from the incentive programs in the
15 future.

16 This proposal would establish the accounting
17 framework needed to receive prospective SIP credit for
18 turning over on-road heavy-duty trucks to cleaner trucks
19 through existing incentive programs such as Moyer.

20 U.S. EPA guidelines outlined the requirement
21 states need to meet in order for the emission reductions
22 from incentive projects to be SIP credible.

23 California already has in place the accounting
24 framework to receive SIP credit for incentive projects
25 after the projects have been completed, and the funds

1 expended. The South Coast incentive measure extends that
2 framework to future projects for incentive programs where
3 the future funding stream is guaranteed.

4 If approved, the South Coast incentive measure
5 will be submitted to U.S. EPA for inclusion in the
6 California SIP.

7 That concludes pie remarks

8 CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you, Mr. Corey. We have
9 three witnesses who've signed up. We'll start with
10 Shirley Gamble. Ms. Gamble, would you please come forward
11 to speak. There you are.

12 Thank you. Just to be clear, everybody, come on
13 down, and you'll be speaking from the podium here.

14 Thanks.

15 MS. GAMBLE: Good morning.

16 CHAIR NICHOLS: Good morning.

17 MS. GAMBLE: My name is Shirley Gamble. I'm here
18 from the Watts Clean Air and Energy Group. Thank you for
19 giving me this opportunity.

20 I'm here for two reasons: One to say I hope you
21 have the courage and the commitment to draft for the no
22 emi -- zero emission for the drayage trucks. And I just
23 learned what that words means, so that's the one that --
24 the trucks that go from city to city, from the port to
25 the -- to the other cities, so that's one of the reasons.

1 And the other reason I'm here is I'm hoping that
2 the draft includes we say good jobs, but good jobs to me
3 mean jobs that can afford a family to support itself.

4 So thank you.

5 CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you for coming. Appreciate
6 that very much.

7 Next is it Kent Minault. I hope I pronounced it
8 correctly.

9 Hi.

10 MR. MINAULT: Good morning, Board members. My
11 name is Kent Minault.

12 CHAIR NICHOLS: Minault.

13 MR. MINAULT: That's quite all right.

14 CHAIR NICHOLS: Pronounced the French way.

15 MR. MINAULT: French names are awful difficult.

16 I volunteer with the Sierra Club. And I work as
17 an adult education teacher. My remarks are neutral,
18 because I'm perfectly in favor of the incentives, but I'm
19 concerned about what are called near-zero emission
20 vehicles.

21 Right now, I'm teaching a class of students
22 through L.A. Trade Tech to help them pass entrance
23 examples to union apprenticeship programs. And the unions
24 that are looking to recruit are the ones like IBEW Local
25 11, whose members will build the battery electric buses

1 that will be deployed across Southern California in the
2 next 12 years, as well as building the charging
3 infrastructure to go with it.

4 Now, we're calling on the Board to show courage
5 and save lives. As a result of inaction, children are
6 dying. Now, zero-emission vehicles are the solution. We
7 ask that you start moving us to a zero-emission truck
8 rule. What we have now is dirty air and bad jobs. The
9 only winners are the fossil fuel and goods movement
10 industries. Workers are stuck in low-paying jobs, while
11 their families struggle with dirty air. With a clearly
12 thought out plan to move us to a zero-emission
13 transportation system, we can promise our children a clean
14 air future, and their parents decent paying, collectively
15 bargains jobs.

16 Let's demonstrate the leadership that will get us
17 to the future we want. Thanks for your attention.

18 CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you very much.

19 The third speaker on this item has also asked to
20 speak on the other 2 items that were on our consent
21 calendar. And so I am going to pull also items 2 and 3,
22 the cap on greenhouse gas emissions, and the consideration
23 of research proposals.

24 And I think what we'll do is ask Mr. Corey to
25 briefly speak to those items and then we'll let Mr. Eger

1 come -- or Eder pardon me, Eder, come forward and speak on
2 all of them.

3 Okay.

4 BOARD CLERK McREYNOLDS: Madam Chair, before we
5 move to the next item, I believe we need to vote for this
6 item?

7 CHAIR NICHOLS: Excuse me?

8 BOARD CLERK McREYNOLDS: Take a vote for this
9 item?

10 CHAIR NICHOLS: I'm not understanding.

11 Yes, he also wanted to speak on this item as
12 well.

13 Oh, well, he has to be allowed to speak before we
14 can take a vote. Yeah, so I was planning on just doing
15 them in order, is that all right?

16 Okay.

17 Would you go ahead, please.

18 EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: Yes. Thanks, Chair.

19 So the second consent item I'm going to briefly
20 describe it. CARB staff has proposed amendments to the
21 Cap-and-Trade Regulation in order to accomplish two goals.
22 First, CARB staff seeks to clarify existing requirements
23 related to changes of facility ownership. Specifically,
24 the proposed amendments clarify that the Cap-and-Trade
25 Regulation requires a successor entity after change of

1 ownership to be responsible for the outstanding
2 pre-transfer compliance obligation of the predecessor
3 covered entity. This clarification is made in light of
4 ongoing bankruptcy litigation involving a covered entity
5 in the program.

6 Second, CARB seeks to clarify the regulatory
7 procedure for establishing the auction reserve price.
8 Under the existing California regulation, the auction
9 reserve price in effect for a specific joint auction is
10 determined as the higher of the annual auction reserve
11 prices established individually by California and Quebec
12 after converting the prices to a common currency.

13 California's regulation does not reflect changes
14 in Ontario's regulation, and does not recognize the
15 possibility that the joint auction reserve price could be
16 set by the Ontario auction reserve price.

17 The proposed amendment is necessary to reflect
18 that Ontario and Quebec use province-specific inflation
19 rates when setting their annual auction reserve prices.
20 Without the proposed amendment, in the unlikely event that
21 Ontario's auction reserve price were higher than both
22 California and Quebec's, this could prevent CARB executive
23 officer from certifying the auction result.

24 The proposed amendments do not change the
25 structure of the program. CARB staff will also continue

1 with the rulemaking process to propose more substantial
2 modifications to comport with the requirements of AB 398.
3 That process will conclude after the -- in -- over the
4 course of this -- this year.

5 And the third consent item concerns research
6 proposals. The research covered by the research proposals
7 before you today support the Board's regulatory priorities
8 related to health, environmental justice, air quality, and
9 climate change. The proposed projects will support
10 California's air quality and climate goals by evaluating
11 the effectiveness of multiple criteria pollutant emission
12 reduction programs, identifying high emitting vehicles,
13 measuring brake wear emissions, developing an instrument
14 to measure toxic metal aerosols, and creating a framework
15 to measure greenhouse gas emission reductions in zero net
16 carbon communities.

17 These research projects were presented to you as
18 concepts in the research plan, and have now been developed
19 into full proposals. They have been reviewed by CARB's
20 research screening committee, as well as by other State
21 agencies and funding organizations to promote coordination
22 and avoid duplication.

23 The majority of these proposals includes low
24 overhead rate and leverages the expertise of researchers
25 within the University of California and California State

1 University systems.

2 And we recommend approval of these proposals.

3 That concludes the summary.

4 CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you very much. Okay. Okay
5 No. Sorry.

6 Mr. Eder, would you please come forward.

7 MR. EDER: Good morning. My name is Harvey Eder.
8 I'm speaking for myself and for the Public Solar Power
9 Coalition. First, I have a process question.

10 Am I getting three minutes on each -- you know,
11 each of the three items?

12 CHAIR NICHOLS: I think three minutes total, sir.

13 MR. EDER: I protest that, and say that my time
14 is being cut. I don't know how the Brown Act fits in or
15 whatever.

16 Anyway, for the district on one again echoing
17 what the previous two speakers said there should be
18 zero-emission vehicles, trucks, battery. I incorporate by
19 reference the February issue of The Economist, the article
20 on electric vehicles, electric trucks. They're here
21 today. Anyway, it's cost effective, and whatnot. And
22 been looking at this and talking to manufacturers.

23 On greenhouse -- okay, first of all, for natural
24 gas, it's biased. This plan is a fossil fuel natural gas
25 plant. All the plants for the state have been. Ninety

1 percent of gas is imported into the state. Health and
2 Safety Code 530002(b) says the legislative intent is to
3 not use fossil fuels, especially non-renewable imported
4 into this State. This is not even published in the blue
5 book, this 53000. And it also includes for a solar
6 financing secondary mortgage entity. Anyway, this -- this
7 has been purged. This is 81 from Row Behrity[phonteic].

8 The particulate matter -- they have not looked
9 at -- talked with Dr. Linda Smith. There needs to be a
10 study on dirty gas as toxics, looking at formaldehyde
11 benzene deaths per million has never been done. NOx, SOx,
12 PM, that's where the body count is at \$9 million per. In
13 South Coast you say 4,000, that's \$36 billion per year, 10
14 years. Thirty years to 50 years life of a solar system.
15 You're talking over a billion to billion -- trillion to a
16 trillion and a half dollars. Anyway, the research should
17 be done on natural -- dirty gas as a toxic.

18 Also, there's a lot happening with --
19 concentrating solar and thermal storage at less cost and
20 more viability and options that it can perform, including
21 seasonal storage.

22 I don't see my time thing here is that -- oh,
23 okay. Well, it looks like I'm out of time. I am -- we
24 are litigating against you folks and had a tentative
25 couple days ago in court. And consider this part of

1 settlement discussions. Talk to me.

2 CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. Thank you. We had one
3 last late minute sign up from the Sierra Club -- or
4 someone representing the Sierra Club. Estrella Arana, if
5 you're here.

6 MS. ARANA: My name is Estrella and I am from San
7 Bernardino. I'm disappointed that 200 gas trash trucks
8 are being distributed to disadvantaged communities in the
9 Inland Empire. We don't need anymore gas. Purchasing
10 near-zero emission vehicles, natural gas vehicles, is a
11 half step that will achieve little, if any, environmental
12 long-term benefits in order to achieve California's
13 greenhouse gas targets, SB 100. We must push for
14 completely zero-emission vehicles, especially in areas
15 with the worst air quality.

16 Thank you.

17 CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

18 Okay. I think we agree with you on the drive to
19 zero-emission vehicles, but that's not specifically
20 covered in any of the items that we're voting on at the
21 moment.

22 I think we need to take them up in order. So
23 let's start with the first one, which is the incentives.
24 I'm sorry. I didn't -- I'm trying to learn how to use the
25 system. Okay. Got it.

1 BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: No problem. Thank you.
2 I'm glad actually we pulled some of the items. I would
3 like to ask staff and -- in the future, I know this item
4 on cap and trade is on consent. I'm just wondering, given
5 the timeframe of the legislation, given the ongoing
6 conversation in this realm, whether or not we should not
7 put cap and trade on consent moving forward, and for a
8 couple of -- couple of reasons.

9 You know, first, from my perspective only, and
10 maybe staff can delve a little more into this, the
11 resolution is to inform the Board on what specifically?
12 So I'm trying to understand what the resolution is
13 actually trying to accomplish?

14 DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER CHANG: Sorry. So
15 Senator Florez, the -- this is actually a regulatory
16 amendment, and it has two main parts.

17 BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Yes.

18 DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER CHANG: One piece has to
19 do with making sure that as companies are going through
20 bankruptcy that their emission obligations are passed on.
21 And we think that the regulation is clear on that, but we
22 wanted to clarify. So that's one piece, and it relates to
23 a current proceeding that is happening right now.

24 BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Okay.

25 DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER CHANG: The second piece

1 was an oversight in the drafting of the regulation when we
2 linked with Ontario. And currently, if the Ontario floor
3 price is the one that is -- is the floor price that we
4 should us, there's no mechanism in the regulation to
5 choose that. So these are very, very small surgical
6 changes that, as Mr. Corey said, don't affect the broader
7 structure of the regulation or the broader regulatory
8 changes that we are currently workshopping and having
9 conversations with stakeholders about.

10 BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Okay. I appreciate that.
11 Madam Chair, I don't know if there's, at some point -- you
12 know, the goal of the Board obviously is to hear the
13 public, but there's also this other sector called the
14 legislature that things bubble up over there. So maybe
15 staff can, on this topic, come back with three items
16 through the Chair, on the Chair's timing. One is what is
17 the status of the advisory board. I know the Senate made
18 an appointment. I know the Assembly has yet to make an
19 appointment to give us advice as we move through this.

20 So maybe we can get an update checking in with
21 the speaker on the timing of that. I think that's
22 important, only because I think it brings this advisory
23 board -- the purpose of that was to bring a little bit
24 more into this.

25 The other has to do with the treatment of

1 offsets. LAO did a pretty thorough job of trying to
2 understand and give some thoughts on this new rule or new
3 legislation instate/outstate. I'd like to know if, in
4 some sense, where that's going. Maybe just an update for
5 the Board, you know, what is instate what is outstate, how
6 are we thinking about it, how are we communicating with
7 the public. And, of course, the always -- the always
8 upfront conversation about oversupply, is there, is there
9 not? Again LAO opined on that.

10 And I would like to know from staff in this
11 particular realm, you know, what -- you know, how we are
12 looking at this issue kind of moving forward. And so I
13 appreciate that the resolution is very specific. It's
14 aimed at two items. I definitely will support it. And
15 that meant -- but I think on a larger scale these three
16 items continue to brew in the legislature. I think we
17 should be ahead of it with a Board conversation. And I
18 think we should, in some sense, have some Board
19 conversations on those three items: Again oversupply, you
20 know, some sense of where offsets are, and, of course, the
21 status of the advisory committee. So that would just be
22 my comment.

23 Thank you.

24 CHAIR NICHOLS: Yes. Well, I'm going to take
25 that as a Board member request of the staff, and --

1 BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: However, you'd like to do
2 it.

3 CHAIR NICHOLS: -- ask the staff to respond.

4 BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Yeah, I just wanted to make
5 sure at this point.

6 CHAIR NICHOLS: Yeah, absolutely.

7 BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Okay. Thank you.

8 CHAIR NICHOLS: I think it's a good -- a good
9 point that it's time for another update on how things are
10 going with the program and let's try to get that -- let's
11 try to get that scheduled. I know a little bit about too
12 much about all of those things, and I -- but I don't want
13 to start the conversation right now. I know.

14 BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: At some point.

15 CHAIR NICHOLS: No, no, it's for you -- for the
16 Board and for -- and for the public as well. So, yes, we
17 need to do that.

18 On these two items that are in front of us, I do
19 want to mention on one of them that it was actually in
20 response to a legislative issue about our authority to
21 require a successor company when somebody goes through
22 bankruptcy to continue to be responsible for the
23 allowances. And we were asked that question in a hearing.
24 And some doubt was raised about our position.

25 So we thought it was really important to get that

1 one fixed and clarified right away. So any other Board
2 members wanted to comment on item number 1? If not, we
3 can have a resolution.

4 I have a motion.

5 Yes. Sorry.

6 BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Hello.

7 CHAIR NICHOLS: Your yellow light is flashing.

8 BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: We need a technical
9 manual. Thank you. I just wanted to comment on the
10 public comments in regards to the need to go to zero
11 emissions. And I ask that question of the staff in
12 regards to item number 1. And my understanding, I just
13 want to clarify this, is that there is flexibility in that
14 incentive program, and that zero-emission trucks -- trash
15 trucks and drayage trucks could be -- would be eligible as
16 well. So I just wanted to confirm that, so that while I
17 know that there was a -- more of a focus on natural gas
18 vehicles, that there is the ability for the district to
19 utilize those incentive funds for zero emission. And I
20 just wanted to get that confirmation.

21 EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: That's correct. The
22 method -- it's a methodology for accounting. It does not
23 preclude zero at all. It's included.

24 BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Yes.

25 EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: Yes.

1 BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Thank you

2 CHAIR NICHOLS: Great. All right. May I have a
3 motion then?

4 BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: So moved.

5 VICE CHAIR BERG: Second.

6 CHAIR NICHOLS: All right. All in favor of Item
7 number 1, the South Coast heavy-duty vehicle incentive
8 measure, say aye, please?

9 (Unanimous aye vote.)

10 CHAIR NICHOLS: Opposed?

11 Any abstentions?

12 Okay. Great.

13 Let's then move to Item number 2, which is the
14 amendments to the cap and the market-based compliance
15 mechanism. And again, the only witness we had on that one
16 was Mr. Eder. I understand his basic issue is around
17 solar energy, and the need to be moving on solar energy,
18 which again we agree to, but I think it's probably not
19 going to affect this particular item. However, I will ask
20 for a motion and a second here.

21 BOARD MEMBER BALMES: So moved.

22 VICE CHAIR BERG: Second.

23 CHAIR NICHOLS: All in favor, please say aye?

24 (Unanimous aye vote.)

25 CHAIR NICHOLS: Opposed?

1 None.

2 And any abstentions?

3 Okay. Great.

4 Then on item number 3, which is the seven
5 research proposals, no one has addressed those seven
6 research proposals.

7 I don't know if any Board members have any
8 comments on them?

9 BOARD MEMBER BALMES: I think I have to recuse
10 myself as a UC employee.

11 CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. All right.

12 Any other?

13 BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: Likewise also.

14 CHAIR NICHOLS: So, all right, Dr. Sperling as
15 well. So our two -- our two actual researchers can't vote
16 on the research proposals, but I guess that's the --
17 that's the way it is.

18 With those two excepted, I'll ask for a motion
19 from --

20 BOARD MEMBER SHERRIFFS: Move approval.

21 BOARD MEMBER MITCHELL: Second.

22 CHAIR NICHOLS: Motion and a second. All in
23 favor please say aye?

24 (Unanimous aye vote.)

25 (Professor Sperling and Dr. Balmes recused.)

1 CHAIR NICHOLS: Opposed?

2 None.

3 And the two abstentions. All right. That
4 concludes the opening items.

5 We are now going to move on to the staff's
6 proposal for regional greenhouse gas emissions reductions
7 targets pursuant to Senate Bill 375, the Sustainable
8 Communities and Climate Protection Act of 2008. As we
9 discussed at our December meeting, SB 375 is an important
10 component of our State strategy for achieving our climate
11 goals through more sustainable land use, and
12 transportation planning.

13 Today, we will vote on a staff proposal for
14 updated regional targets. This proposal builds upon the
15 new framework that we discussed back in December. Since
16 December, there's been a lot of further discussion between
17 the staff, the MPOs, and members of the public. And I
18 particularly want to thank the MPO's who staff members
19 have worked very closely with our staff, as well as those
20 members of the public who took the time and provided very
21 substantive feedback on the new approach.

22 This is not simply an update to the numerical
23 targets. As we know, SB 375 was not intended to simply
24 lead us to develop better modeling, but also to prompt
25 changes in land use and transportation policy. This

1 update presents a new framework for SB 375 that brings
2 greater focus to tracking and monitoring the policies and
3 investments that are occurring at the regional level.

4 Today, we will take action on what can be
5 accomplished via SB 375 while recognizing the fact that we
6 all have more to do. SB 375 is not the final word on what
7 it's going to take to get to the kinds of land use and
8 transportation decisions, investments and plans that we
9 need to make lasting and serious progress on our
10 greenhouse gas and air quality problems, but it is an
11 important step in that direction.

12 We have several MPOs that are here to speak
13 today, and we look forward to hearing from them. But
14 first we will hear from the staff.

15 Mr. Corey.

16 EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: Yes. Thanks, Chair
17 Nichols. At the December 2017 Board hearing, as you
18 noted, SB 375 program staff reported on the target update
19 process to date, and presented initial thoughts on a new
20 framework for CARB target setting and evaluations of the
21 MPO strategies.

22 During that discussion, the Board expressed
23 interest in staff's proposed direction and provided
24 comments focusing on helping address challenges the MPOs
25 faced, as well as the importance of setting targets to

1 achieve concrete benefits for communities around the
2 State.

3 Since presenting at the December hearing, CARB
4 staff held four public workshops in Fresno, Los Angeles,
5 Sacramento, and San Diego. Staff also met individually
6 with staff from many MPOs. These meetings have allowed
7 staff to refine the approach to this new target paradigm.

8 In addition, staff has begun work to implement
9 Senate Bill 150 passed in 2017. SB 150, by Senator Allen,
10 requires CARB to monitor regional greenhouse gas
11 reductions under SB 375, and report to the legislature
12 every four years beginning with a report due later this
13 year.

14 The report must provide data regarding strategies
15 to meet the targets, a list of best practices, and
16 challenges faced by regions, including the impacts of
17 State funding and policies. Today's proposed target
18 update and staff's work to develop a monitoring program in
19 response to SB 150 are anticipated to work together to
20 strengthen the program implementation moving forward.

21 I'll now ask Heather King of the Air Quality
22 Planning and Science Division to begin the staff
23 presentation.

24 Heather

25 (Thereupon an overhead presentation was

1 presented as follows.)

2 AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST KING: Thank you, Mr.
3 Corey. Good morning, Chair Nichols and members of the
4 Board.

5 --o0o--

6 AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST KING: For today's
7 presentation on the SB 375 targets, I'll walk you through
8 staff's current proposal, which includes an updated
9 framework for how we at CARB approach our role in SB 375.
10 I'll share some of the stakeholder feedback that we heard
11 during our most recent series of workshops, and then I'll
12 talk about what's next for the program. I'll conclude by
13 summarizing staff's recommendation.

14 --o0o--

15 AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST KING: We came to you in
16 December with an informational update on staff's current
17 thinking on the SB 375 targets. These are, of course, the
18 per capita greenhouse gas emission reduction targets that
19 apply to passenger vehicles. At that time, we also
20 recommended a paradigm shift in how CARB evaluates the
21 sustainable communities strategies, the SCSs, that are
22 prepared by the state's metropolitan planning
23 organizations, the MPOs. And we also talked to you about
24 how we plan to approach tracking implementation moving
25 forward.

1 Staff is proposing three key elements as part of
2 the proposal before you today. The first is to adopt the
3 proposed higher numeric targets. This is the same
4 proposal you heard about in December. The second element
5 would direct staff to work with the MPOs to recognize and
6 isolate actual progress due to the land-use trans -- and
7 transportation policies and investments inside each of
8 their plans.

9 Our goal here is to overcome the effects of
10 assumptions about fuel price, vehicle fleet efficiency,
11 economic conditions, and other factors, and focus more
12 squarely on the efforts that jurisdictions are actually
13 making from one plan to the next.

14 So in other words, the MPO will be asked to show
15 us what is the increment of progress achieved through the
16 strategies in your plans from one plan to the next?

17 The third element of our proposal before you
18 today will be to direct staff to work with MPOs to
19 introduce a new additional reporting and data tracking
20 component to how the MPOs' investments and their project
21 lists support their commitments to greenhouse gas
22 reduction.

23 So in other words, what did the MPOs say they
24 would do, did they do it, and was it effective?

25 --o0o--

1 AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST KING: For the targets
2 themselves, this slide summarizes the existing and
3 proposed 2035 targets for the four largest MPOs in the
4 state. As we discussed with you in December,
5 preliminarily SACOG's target is going to be structured as
6 a pilot. Under this recommendation, SACOG's target is 19
7 percent with SACOG responsible for developing some
8 innovative programs to address challenges that are unique
9 to the SACOG region in its 2020 MTP.

10 If State funding and other commitments that are
11 necessary to support those programs are not secured, then
12 SACOG's target would be 18 percent. And James Corless,
13 Executive Director of SACOG, is here today and can talk
14 with us more about this project in more detail.

15 If adopted by the Board, the proposed targets
16 would take effect October 1st, 2018, which is exactly
17 eight years from when the original targets were
18 established. CARB is able to set targets for years 2020
19 and 2035, though not listed on the slide, the 2020 targets
20 would be brought in line with the existing anticipated
21 performance of the current SCSs, which we see as a
22 necessary clean-up step. And as 2020 approaches, it will
23 become the first milestone reporting year under SB 375 for
24 implementation.

25 --o0o--

1 AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST KING: Here are the
2 existing and proposed higher targets for the eight San
3 Joaquin Valley MPOs. These targets would apply to the
4 third round of SCSs prepared by the valley MPOs.

5 Next slide, please.

6 --o0o--

7 AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST KING: And here are the
8 existing and proposed targets for the six remaining small
9 MPOs in the State. The proposed new reporting framework
10 would be phased in to apply to these 6 MPOs for the SCSs
11 adopted after 2020.

12 Next slide, please.

13 --o0o--

14 AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST KING: Thank you.

15 This slide shows graphically the aggregated
16 statewide greenhouse gas reduction benefits of staff's
17 proposal. From left to right, the existing targets, what
18 MPOs' adopted plans would achieve in the center, which
19 outperforms the existing targets, and staff's proposal
20 shown in the right most bar.

21 As you'll recall from our discussion in December,
22 there's a gap between what the scoping plan scenario calls
23 for from this sector, and what the SB 375 Program can
24 realistically achieve. We did hear from stakeholders who
25 want SB 375 to be more ambitious. For example, several

1 stakeholders have said that targets should be set at 25
2 percent right in line with what the scoping plan calls for
3 from this sector.

4 So why not just make the targets 25 percent?

5 Let's talk about that. SB 375 allows the MPOs to
6 recommend their targets to CARB, which they have done so.

7 The MPOs' recommendations to CARB were very much
8 a continuation of what their existing SCSs would more or
9 less achieve, if they're implemented. And as we describe
10 in our final staff report, which we published in February,
11 we do believe that the MPOs can do more. Our proposal is
12 a push on the MPOs to do more than what they would achieve
13 on paper today.

14 And I say on paper, because the operative phrase
15 I keep using on whether the SCS meets the targets is, "if
16 implemented", if these plans are implemented.

17 Let's all remember that having an SCS is
18 voluntary. The RTP, the regional transportation plan, is
19 a federally required action, but having an SCS that hits
20 the targets as part of the RTP is voluntary.

21 Ms. Mitchell, you asked us, you know, a very good
22 question and made a good comment in December, very
23 accurate, that this is really hard, because the local
24 governments are the ones that implement the land-use piece
25 of SCS, not the MPO, and it requires them to work

1 together.

2 We've heard from several stakeholders during our
3 workshops about local land-use policies that can even
4 create particular implementation challenges with SCS. So
5 there are real and great challenges with this program.

6 The MPOs have all prepared SCSs that show meeting
7 their targets on paper, but there are a lot of questions
8 about whether we'll hit this 18 percent bar in the middle
9 when 2035 rolls around. And a lot of MPOs have these
10 questions too.

11 So our proposal before you today aims to take a
12 major step forward into making this less of a paper
13 exercise and getting at what we care about, which is
14 on-the-ground implementation of SB 375.

15 So CARB could most certainly ratchet the targets
16 all the way up to 25 percent, but what could that actually
17 look like?

18 One scenario is that we stop getting SCSs. And
19 in that scenario, we run a risk of going backwards. So,
20 you know, we have local jurisdictions that are starting to
21 use the streamlining provisions under SB 375 to build some
22 desperately needed housing that's affordable, that's
23 transit oriented, and those projects could be held up in
24 litigation for years to come.

25 There are disadvantaged communities who are

1 seeking certain pots of State funding to implement some of
2 the projects that are in today's SCSs. And those
3 jurisdictions could, in some cases, become effectively
4 ineligible overnight for that money.

5 And I haven't even brought up yet the new
6 challenges that are ahead for MPOs, which are total wild
7 cards, which is deployment of autonomous vehicles and new
8 mobility services.

9 Depending on how these new modes are deployed,
10 this could cause vehicle miles traveled and greenhouse gas
11 emissions to go up or down. Depending on the policies
12 that are rolled out with those. So we as the State and
13 local jurisdictions have to take responsibility for our
14 own roles in getting to where we need to go as partners
15 with the MPOs and provide policy direction that serves the
16 public interest.

17 CARB is fully committed to getting to 25 percent
18 as a state. The SB 375 targets are one tool to get there,
19 but it's not the venue to get all the way there, not based
20 on what we know today, but we do have a path forward to
21 close this gap, and I'll come back to that.

22 --o0o--

23 AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST KING: Over the last two
24 months, as you've heard, we've conducted four workshops
25 around the state to reach out to more of our stakeholders

1 about how to get more out of SB 375. We had 130
2 stakeholders attend in person.

3 One question we got, and we continue to get over
4 the years, is why are we doing this? Why are we doing any
5 of this? Why do we need to reduce vehicle miles traveled
6 through land-use change? Won't technology and fuels take
7 care of this for us? And the answer is simple, we will
8 not hit our climate goals without it.

9 And reducing VMT can solve problems that electric
10 vehicles can't. There are so many benefits with this
11 program. The narrative we heard from our stakeholders
12 explains the scope well. We've got many stakeholders who
13 took time out of their schedules to come to our workshops,
14 who took time to come travel and be with us here today,
15 who live in overburdened communities. They're
16 overburdened with pollution, daily stress, high rents, and
17 a general lack of access.

18 The transportation system isn't working in so
19 many of our communities. It literally takes a single mom
20 90 minutes one way by transit to reach her job only 20
21 miles away. She can't afford a home near her job. She
22 can't afford to buy an electric car. That's just a false
23 narrative for so many folks still in our communities in
24 California.

25 SB 375 was always about providing choices,

1 choices for where to live, choices for how to get around.
2 And today's proposal seeks to acknowledge the need for
3 further progress, not only on emissions, but for access to
4 choices, and providing those choices will lower VMT.

5 --o0o--

6 AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST KING: The other major
7 need we heard in our workshops is this hunger for
8 increased transparency and accountability in the process.
9 That is exactly what we're proposing by adding these new
10 elements to our evaluation process for SCSs moving forward
11 under SB 375.

12 Historically, CARB has based its determination of
13 whether an SCS meets the targets on results of travel
14 demand models, which reflect many confounding factors,
15 several of which have nothing to do with the MPOs' land
16 use and transportation strategies, and can even mask the
17 effects of those strategies, or work against them.

18 So we will still be looking at the modeling.
19 That will still be a part of the work we do at CARB, but
20 we're going to start asking the MPOs to report to us the
21 increment of progress in 2035 directly tied to their land
22 use and transportation strategies through a plan-over-plan
23 comparison.

24 In addition, just last year, SB 375 was amended
25 to add a third piece to CARB's role in SB 375. Until now,

1 we've been limited to setting targets and reviewing SCSs.
2 But this new piece calls for monitoring SB 375
3 implementation to date. So as part of this target update,
4 we're introducing a monitoring component.

5 We'll ask the MPOs to report on how far the
6 region has come on implementing their SCS, and whether
7 their strategies worked?

8 So simply put, we're monitoring compliance and
9 effectiveness, which completes the cycle in CARB's
10 evaluation process under SB 375.

11 --o0o--

12 AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST KING: In addition to
13 adding the new monitoring component, CARB will be
14 preparing a report to the legislature on the challenges
15 faced by the MPOs, and the best practices that exist.
16 We've collected a lot of challenges and barriers to
17 further progress under SB 375 through the target update
18 process. We've been in the collection phase for some time
19 now.

20 --o0o--

21 AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST KING: That serves as
22 the basis for this list of seven focus areas listed on
23 this slide. We're organizing around these seven topics:
24 healthy communities, land use and the struggles with local
25 control, the affordable housing crisis, access to

1 transportation choices, incentives and the price of
2 driving, next generation mobility, and the decision-making
3 process itself as to how the money gets allocated and how
4 do the projects get selected.

5 We heard in our most recent series of workshops
6 that these seem to be the right scope of the issues. But
7 the narrative I shared earlier explains the scope much
8 better than this slide. This system isn't working for
9 everybody. The choices of where to live and how to get
10 around are not equitably distributed.

11 The land value near transit of high quality is so
12 sky high that the people who rely on transit most cannot
13 afford to live near it. Transit ridership statewide is
14 going down, and we only partially understand why. And VMT
15 per capita, the most important measuring stick of whether
16 SB 375 is working, is recently starting to head in the
17 wrong direction.

18 Land use change take time, but we can't take a
19 wait-and-see approach either. So this is a call to action
20 to all parties involved that play a role in housing, land
21 use, and transportation policy to remove barriers, so we
22 can get to the desired outcomes in these areas. That is
23 to take the next steps in the scoping plan, to get to 25
24 percent, and to get the system working for everybody.

25 To do this, we'll need different tools. We'll

1 need stronger tools. We'll need stronger land-use tools
2 to produce more housing affordable to all income levels.
3 We'll need pricing tools that promote the public interest
4 as technology shifts towards new mobility services. And
5 we'll need to look at how resources get spent in a way
6 that can help improve the quality of life for those that
7 are most overburdened.

8 --o0o--

9 AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST KING: During the next
10 several months, we'll take what we learn, we'll extract
11 out what are the right metrics to track, what are the
12 actionable items and what are the best practices?

13 This spring we plan to conduct a public process
14 to solicit input on how we'll update our program
15 guidelines for evaluating the SCSs. We anticipate having
16 a draft available this summer, and we plan to finalize
17 those guidelines prior to when the new targets would take
18 effect later this year.

19 We've begun conversations and we anticipate
20 providing MPOs and stakeholders more details very soon on
21 the new metrics and the reporting we expect under the new
22 monitoring program. Next, we'll take our recommendations
23 forward in the SB 375 progress report to the legislature
24 due September 1st.

25 We'll update you, the Board, prior to your joint

1 meeting with the California Transportation Commission
2 later this year with some of these action items that could
3 potentially be brought to the table for those meetings.

4 --o0o--

5 AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST KING: A draft
6 environmental analysis was completed for the proposed
7 target update, which was released last June. Staff
8 determined that implementation of the proposed target
9 update may have potentially significant impacts for -- to
10 some resource areas. However, those impacts are mostly
11 related to short-term construction activities.

12 Staff determined that the overarching statewide
13 benefits of our proposal on greenhouse gas emissions would
14 be beneficial.

15 The draft EA was released for a 45-day public
16 comment period, which ended July 28th, 2017. Staff
17 prepared a final EA and written responses to all comments
18 received on the draft EA. And we posted those to our
19 website earlier this month.

20 --o0o--

21 AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST KING: As you've heard
22 today, our recommended proposal to update the SB 375
23 targets aims to achieve multiple goals, one of which is to
24 complete a statutory requirement to update the targets
25 every eight years. CARB may update the target every four

1 years, as conditions change. So your next opportunity to
2 revise the targets would be in 2022.

3 Staff recommends that the Board approve the
4 written responses to comments, certify the final EA, make
5 the required CEQA findings, and Statement of Overriding
6 Considerations, and approve the proposed target update.

7 Thank you. And staff would be happy to answer
8 any questions prior to moving to public comment and
9 discussion.

10 CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you. Thank you very much.

11 Dr. Balmes, just had a brief comment here.

12 BOARD MEMBER BALMES: Thank you, Heather. And I
13 think I can speak for Supervisor Serna as well, this is
14 the kind of staff presentation that really engages the
15 Board. I really want to compliment you, because instead
16 of just sort of going through reading, you engaged us in,
17 you know, a thought exercise.

18 And I would just say for future staff
19 presentations, you know, you set the mark.

20 AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST KING: Thank you.

21 CHAIR NICHOLS: Very good. Thank you. I agree.

22 So I guess this is a question or comment at this
23 point. One piece that seems to be missing from the
24 discussion, maybe it's included elsewhere, is the role of
25 funding. And the -- it gets brought up all the time by

1 the MPOs is, okay, so you've got a plan. Now, where's the
2 money going to come from to actually implement it?

3 And we now have, as a result of some legislation,
4 a process at least whereby CARB is going to be meeting on
5 a regular basis with the California Transportation
6 Commission, which is the entity that actually gets to
7 approve where all the money gets spent.

8 And I'm wondering if you can give us, or someone
9 can give us, a brief update how that's going, and what you
10 think is likely to come of that process.

11 Maybe, Mr. Corey, you want to take that one?

12 EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: Sure, Chairman.

13 So, the -- and I think it was AB 79, but it
14 basically called for twice-a-year meetings with the --
15 between the Board and the CTC. So I've been working with
16 the Executive Director of the California Transportation
17 Committee to get these discussions set. The first one is
18 set for June. We're working through the logistics.

19 But more substantively, I think this was really
20 at the core of the bill, presents an opportunity, for
21 instance, the conversations of the implementation of the
22 scoping plan, the implementation of 375, the intersection
23 of transportation policy and funding. Just as you said
24 Chair, that the CTC plays a significant role over in terms
25 of transportation funding and decisions that will be with

1 us for decades, and the opportunity to -- for the Board to
2 engage with CTC in terms of that decision-making process,
3 and how it comports with the State's long-term policies,
4 in terms of air quality, climate policy, and some of the
5 issues that are raised with 375.

6 So we are working through the agenda now and
7 really excited. I think it's going to represent really an
8 exceptional opportunity to put -- pull the pieces together
9 that really haven't been there substantially so far in
10 terms of the interaction with CalTrans, CalSTA, CTC.

11 CHAIR NICHOLS: I mean, it hasn't actually
12 happened yet. Obviously, it's just set for -- but the
13 fairly near future. But one of the things that I think is
14 frustrating to everybody who's been involved in this topic
15 from the environmental or health side is that
16 transportation projects, as projects, are put into plans,
17 and they live for decades, not just years.

18 And then they come up for funding, and they've
19 been on the books for so long, that they end up just
20 getting funded and going ahead, long after there's any
21 real desire or need to have those particular projects get
22 built, or least since they -- you know, they're no longer
23 a solution to an actual problem, let's put it that way.

24 And so I think maybe there's at least some hope
25 on the horizon that we may have found a new mechanism that

1 might -- that might help with that problem.

2 Okay. I've got several people who want to speak
3 starting with Supervisor Gioia.

4 BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: Thank you, and thanks to
5 staff. I'll just second my colleagues comment about the
6 nature of the presentation.

7 AGP VIDEO: The microphone is not on.

8 BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: Is says the mic is on
9 Can you hear me?

10 Here, we go. All right. There we go. That's
11 better.

12 So I wanted to ask staff about how we can
13 include - and I know we're going to hear about this issue
14 from a number of speakers - greater leverage in our
15 resolution requiring, encouraging, incentivizing social
16 equity analysis as part of the development of the SCS. We
17 have language in the resolution specifically that -- on
18 page five that acknowledges that -- that this target
19 approach quote "Is consistent with CARB's environmental
20 justice policies and does not disproportionately impact
21 people of any race, culture, or income.

22 And I think we know that as one implements these
23 plans, there is a great potential in some regions to
24 impact people who are living in these communities,
25 especially lower income communities. And I was involved

1 in the development of the first SCS in the Bay Area, Plan
2 Bay Area. And that issue was discussed frequently. And
3 there was a lot of thought given to that.

4 I am concerned that all the plans will not have a
5 robust discussion of that. And I'm not certain that folks
6 would agree with this statement in the resolution that
7 this approach does not disproportionately impact people of
8 any race, culture, or income. It depends how each plan is
9 developed. And that will vary widely around the state.

10 So I'd like to see us explore the greatest amount
11 of leverage we have to get a social equity -- a robust
12 social equity analysis in these plans, which could include
13 the directors when they come up making a commitment to
14 doing that or -- and/or including that in the resolution.

15 And so I'd like to hear the staff's thinking on
16 that, and ultimately to hear comments from the MPOs as you
17 come up and speak. Because I think it's going to be
18 approached differently around the state. And I'm not sure
19 I agree with the finding here that there is not going to
20 be a disproportionate impact. There is clearly a
21 potential that some of these plans will -- could.

22 DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER KARPEROS: Supervisor,
23 Gioia, Kurt Karperos, CARB staff.

24 We very much agree with you that there is a need
25 as we move forward with implementation of SB 375, and

1 particularly with the requirements that have been added
2 under SB 150 for the tracking that we're talking about --

3 BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: Right.

4 DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER KARPEROS: -- to fully
5 evaluate the social equity impacts of the SCSs.

6 This particular finding relates to the
7 target-setting process.

8 BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: No, I realize that.

9 DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER KARPEROS: Right.

10 BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: I realize that.

11 DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER KARPEROS: So in terms
12 of the finding, from staff's perspective, I think we're
13 square here. But going forward, as we examine the SCSs, I
14 think it's absolutely critical that we get a robust set of
15 metrics and analysis from the MPOs on the social equity
16 issues.

17 We've started that conversation already with the
18 MPO directors, and I know that they will be speaking to
19 that in their prepared remarks. And certainly, we'll take
20 the direction that you're giving us here, that we -- we
21 pursue this element of the SB 150 tracking with vigor.

22 BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: I mean, I know this is an
23 issue that my -- a number of my colleagues have raised as
24 well. And so what does it take to ensure that we're
25 getting a commitment to doing these things?

1 Because I'm not so certain that when folks walk
2 out of the room, that when push comes to shove, knowing
3 sort of the discussions that go on in each of the regions
4 that we -- that we would get those strong metrics.

5 So I'd like to consider how we would put that in
6 the resolution, and also hear commitments from MPOs, and
7 any other potential mechanism to enforce that.

8 DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER KARPEROS: So I
9 certainly think it's within the Board's prerogative to add
10 to the resolution specific direction in terms of the type
11 of metrics that you want to see when we report back to
12 you. And as we provide to the legislature through our
13 reports, the first one being done this summer, as we
14 listen to the testimony from the MPO directors, I think we
15 can probably help craft some language that could be added
16 to the resolution.

17 BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: And maybe as MPO directors
18 come up, they can give their thoughts on how to achieve
19 this as well.

20 Okay. Thanks.

21 CHAIR NICHOLS: Great. Professor Sperling.

22 BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: I just have a few short
23 comments, because I want to have a more robust discussion
24 later. But I first want to repeat what Professor Balmes
25 said, that was, I thought, the most brilliant, insightful

1 staff presentation I've heard in a very long time. It was
2 sophisticated, and clearly I agreed with it.

3 (Laughter.)

4 BOARD MEMBER BALMES: You made her blush.

5 (Laughter.)

6 BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: But I'm serious. And I
7 liked the statement this -- there has to be a call to
8 action. We've been doing this for almost 10 years now.
9 And frankly, we've not accomplished much, other than we've
10 created a discourse, which has been positive, and that's
11 good. But we need -- this is a -- has to be a call to
12 action now. And I think we start -- we're starting to
13 appreciate that.

14 And I want to reaffirm what Chair Nichols said is
15 that focusing on the funding, but I'm not clear -- I've
16 been one advocating for that a long time. But there is
17 funding out there through SB 1, through the transportation
18 programs. And I think the quick comment that was made in
19 the staff presentation about creating performance metrics
20 and being able to evaluate it, and those performance
21 metrics being applied with the CTC and the transportation
22 funding to actually accomplish the goals we're talking
23 about. That has not happened, and that would be a great
24 contribution.

25 And so I'm -- I think we're on the right path,

1 but we need to really up our game. And we can talk about
2 the details later.

3 Thank you.

4 CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. I think it's time then to
5 turn to our list of witnesses. And we have four MPOs.
6 I'm not sure if they want to just come in that order or --
7 is that how you'll do it?

8 MR. IKHRATA: (Nods head.)

9 CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. Great, starting with Hasan
10 Ikh rata from SCAG.

11 MR. IKHRATA: Thank you, Chairwoman, Board
12 members. Welcome to the SCAG region. This is part of the
13 SCAG region.

14 (Thereupon an overhead presentation was
15 presented as follows.)

16 MR. IKHRATA: We need the rain, so I'm not going
17 to say sorry for the rain, but I'm sure you probably were
18 expecting different weather here.

19 I'm going to add my voice to some of you, and say
20 that you have an excellent staff. Richard Corey, Kurt,
21 all the team has been working with us very closely, very
22 openly, very honestly. So I couldn't say thank you to
23 Richard, and Kurt, and the team.

24 We met several times. We talked about what's
25 happening, where we need to go. A couple of things I want

1 to mention and I want to commit to today. And my
2 colleagues from San Francisco, Sacramento, and San Diego
3 will also speak to that.

4 There is -- it's not a secret that per capita
5 vehicle mile traveled in the nation and in California is
6 going up. Going in the wrong direction. These are actual
7 data. You can't hide it. And regardless of how good your
8 modeling tools are with this trend, it makes you think,
9 okay, what do we need to do to reverse the trend, and make
10 these reductions that we need to make under -- under the
11 law.

12 SCAG in the last couple of weeks have done --
13 couple of months have done a major transit study. We ask
14 UCLA researchers to look at why transit ridership is down.
15 And they came back and frankly it was a bit surprising.
16 But between 2000 and 2015, the SCAG region added 2.3
17 million people.

18 The SCAG region also added 2.1 million vehicles,
19 which is four times the rates of the 1990s. The economy
20 has never been better, income in the Bay Area up by like
21 30 percent, up here but not as much. So people are buying
22 cars.

23 So with all of that, we've been discussing here
24 how do we reduce per capita greenhouse gas emission? Now,
25 the transit decline doesn't mean that transit is bad.

1 We're investing heavily in transit in Southern California.
2 L.A. County just voted \$120 billion to build more transit.

3 But that means we need to look at transit
4 differently. And like your staff presentation, Heather
5 indicated we are committing to look at the investment by
6 mode, including the underserved communities. The
7 supervisor mentioned -- Supervisor Gioia mentioned social
8 equity, environmental justice. We actually do that. And
9 at least at SCAG, we've been used as an example of how to
10 do environmental justice in the context of planning. And
11 we'll continue to do that, not just because we want to
12 comply with SB 375, because I think it's the right thing
13 to do.

14 So that reporting we commit to you today that
15 will be done by mode. When it comes to development,
16 Supervisor Mitchell's mention -- I mean, Board Member
17 Mitchell mentioned that land-use authority lies with the
18 cities. That's absolutely true. MPOs have no authorities
19 over land use.

20 Having said that, I think MPOs, with the help
21 from ARB and CTC, could bribe the cities to do the right
22 thing by providing them funding. And I think we have done
23 that in the past, and it works. I think many cities, if
24 you incentivize them, they'll be willing to do the right
25 thing. So we will be reporting in and tracking homes and

1 jobs being developed in underserved communities in high
2 quality transit areas, and making sure that we're not
3 driving the original residents out of their homes because
4 we're doing transit-oriented development. We will commit
5 to that, and we spoke to your staff about that.

6 The question in front of us is we need to reverse
7 the trend that's happening right now. I think I'm
8 supposed to push some buttons here to get --

9 --o0o--

10 MR. IKHRATA: Okay. We are supposed to reverse
11 the trends that's going in the wrong direction. We're
12 also supposed to reduce and get to the 25 percent. I
13 believe we can. And what the approach that your staff
14 proposing to you is a good one, it is not like us saying
15 let us go through our modeling exercise, but coming back
16 to you every year, and saying to you, hear what we did
17 differently, hear how it's working, and hear how it's
18 going to lead to us getting that 25 percent.

19 We have to be smart about, you know, the
20 Professor from -- I call him the Professor from Davis here
21 just published a book called the *Three Revolutions*. Now,
22 I would like to think that we're going to look at transit
23 differently to make it more effective in the context of
24 the shared, the autonomous, and the electric vehicle
25 that's coming. Do we have the right ARB policies to guide

1 us through that?

2 I do believe we can reverse the trend that's
3 happening right now, and we do need clearly to link
4 funding to that. But also we have to be very open about
5 the fact that a lot of funding is generated locally and,
6 specified what kind of projects you're going to have. So
7 somehow, we need to figure out how we overcome that.

8 And we're committing to you today that we're
9 going to expand our working with the stakeholders, we're
10 going to expand the ability to track things, and report to
11 you in our private -- and look, we might couple of years
12 into the reporting say, we can't do it. We need to do
13 something different.

14 I hope we never come to that. I hope we're going
15 to come to you together with your staff and figure out how
16 we're going to get there. But we have to do it
17 differently. You have to do it smartly. We can't just be
18 throwing money and saying let us do transit and stop.
19 Transit has to be looked at differently, land use has to
20 be looked at, funding has to be looked at.

21 And all of that should result in us hopefully
22 getting to where we want to get, which is 25 percent
23 reduction.

24 --o0o--

25 MR. IKHRATA: And with that, I'm going to turn it

1 to my colleague from San Diego.

2 BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: Madam Chair, I didn't quite
3 hear the details of the social equity metrics, or how you
4 were developing that. You indicated some -- you indicated
5 a commitment, but I guess I wanted to hear how you were
6 incorporating the social equity metrics.

7 MR. IKHRATA: Every plan scenario we run, every
8 plan scenario we run will have an environmental justice
9 social equity. Does it impact negatively, proportionately
10 by ethnicity, by race, by income. So every scenario that
11 we're going to put in front will have a full evaluation of
12 the social equity component of the plan.

13 BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: Okay. Thank you.

14 MS. KAWADA: Good morning. I'm Kim Kawada with
15 the San Diego Association of Governments, the MPO for the
16 San Diego County. We have listed here sort of a list of
17 all the things that strategies -- that the region will be
18 undertaking to meet the target, and hopefully exceed it,
19 and go beyond that.

20 If I could characterize it, it's really sort of
21 in three large categories. One is to plan for
22 transform -- to look at really transformative solutions,
23 to plan for them, to pilot and test innovative new
24 solutions, and then to actually implement them.

25 So on the planning side, the basis of our

1 regional plan has been on urban area transit strategy. We
2 adopted that with our last plan. And actually investments
3 really focus on those types of strategies in the urban
4 area where there's existing infrastructure and existing
5 population.

6 The other plans we're doing -- that's at the
7 regional scale. At the local scale what we've uses is the
8 power of the purse. Our sales tax dollars, our incentive
9 dollars. The 18 cities in the County of San Diego can now
10 only compete for those dollars if they have an adopted
11 Climate Action Plan -- local Climate Action Plan, and
12 Complete Streets Policy. So that's where we're trying to
13 drive -- use incentive to drive local infrastructure
14 investments and plan for clean transportation and clean
15 energy choices.

16 At the community level, we're piloting things
17 like mobility hub planning, which is really integrating
18 all modes, public transit, bike, walking, active
19 transportation and services. And, for example, we're
20 working in our -- one of our most vulnerable communities
21 in the mid-city area to actually try to get one of those
22 up and running in the next several years.

23 We're also working on things like regional clean
24 fuel infrastructure, chargers, fueling stations, whatnot
25 to promote a regional infrastructure to actually help meet

1 the state's goals and our local goals for that. So that's
2 on the planning side.

3 On the piloting side, we were one of 10 automated
4 vehicle proving grounds that this -- that the federal
5 government designated. There's two in California. We're
6 one of them. And really the promise we see there is to
7 look at how technology can help really change safety and
8 mobility options around the region. Now, it's not just
9 about just sort of new whiz-bang technology, because as
10 your staff has mentioned, not everyone can afford, you
11 know, knew Teslas or new Priuses even.

12 So that's something where -- we're looking at the
13 intersection of technology is also where we can help
14 support public transit, not detract from public transit.
15 Can technology provide those last mile solutions? Can we
16 make public transit even cheaper to operate, that we can
17 provide more public transit in the region?

18 And then finally, where can -- how can these
19 strategies, and these investments in these new
20 technologies really help our most vulnerable communities,
21 and our aging populations. We're seeing with the aging of
22 the Baby Boom population the needs to travel to health and
23 medical services and to meet with -- you know, stay
24 involved with the community is pressing.

25 Not everyone can afford Uber or Lyft. So we

1 really need to look at how you can transform, you know,
2 senior and para-transit services, and hopefully use
3 technology to support that.

4 And finally, what's unique about SANDAG different
5 from the MPOs is because we have some implementation
6 authority, we build public transit, we build active
7 transportation infrastructure. A major part of our
8 strategy is actually doing just that. We have a \$200
9 million early action program, where we're building more
10 than 80 miles of bikeways and urban communities. That's
11 underway. Our goal is to get those done in the next --
12 within 10 years. We have an Extensive network and we're
13 trying to build out our managed lanes, which really
14 prioritize public transit and HOV modes. And we charge
15 single-occupant vehicles a fee and reinvest that fee
16 raised into public transit, so that's another component.

17 And finally, while it's not technically counted
18 on our ledger, in terms of reducing -- the SB 375 ledger
19 of reducing vehicles and passenger and light-duty truck
20 emissions, our region has been sort of at the forefront in
21 terms of habitat conservation planning.

22 So local sales tax measure dollars are being used
23 to preserve open space, and preserve -- we've, to date,
24 preserved, and leveraged enough dollars, and preserved
25 about 8,600 acres of open space, real critical habitat in

1 the region. And what that does it also directs
2 development into the urbanized areas.

3 So 8,600, if you -- to get to some sort of scale,
4 that's about the equivalent of about 10 Central Parks,
5 which we've done to date, since the sales tax measure was
6 adopted back in 2004.

7 The next slide --

8 --o0o--

9 MS. KAWADA: -- excuse me, really looks at in
10 terms of performance monitoring. We do this on a regular
11 basis. We produce an annual State of the Commute Report,
12 we do regular performance monitoring of our regional plan.
13 So you can see here some of the types of metrics.

14 To answer Supervisor Gioia's questions, we do
15 have with our plan update a set of performance measures
16 for the plan overall. We've worked with our community
17 based organization groups, which are 13 community based
18 organizations from around the region, around the county,
19 and really worked on a set of meaningful performance
20 metrics, in terms of social equity, environmental justice,
21 and Title 6.

22 SO we've worked with those groups to identify
23 those. We've also done statewide working with our
24 partners to develop a social equity analysis tool that
25 could be use statewide.

1 BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: And I'm sure my colleague
2 from San Diego will comment about that, since you're in
3 San Diego.

4 BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: You can count on it.

5 MS. KAWADA: So with that, I'm going to turn it
6 over to Alix Bockelman from MTC.

7 CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. I think I'm just going to
8 let -- ask that each complete their presentations and then
9 we'll have some discussion and questions. I know
10 different Board members have different things they'd like
11 to say about all of this.

12 MS. BOCKELMAN: Good morning, I'm just trying to
13 get this device to work.

14 Here we go.

15 Good morning, Chair and Board members. My name
16 is Alix Bockelman. I'm with the Metropolitan
17 Transportation Commission. And I did want to echo the
18 appreciation of staff and the Board in working with us on
19 the target setting recommendations.

20 MTC appreciates the introduction of best
21 practices into the target-setting recommendations and the
22 focus on elements of the SCS, where MPOs have more
23 control, and can take bold steps at the regional level,
24 and also working in partnership with the State.

25 In terms of how MTC will approach the more

1 ambitious targets in the next round, we will need to
2 double down on our focused growth development approach.
3 As discussed in the staff report, this is made more
4 challenging, given the loss of redevelopment, housing
5 construction costs, and the very real threat of
6 displacement.

7 We're in the midst of a major effort to look at
8 housing crisis in the Bay Area called, CASA, the Committee
9 to House the Bay Area, to agree at a multi-sector level on
10 actionable and meaningful changes to address and stem the
11 tide on the housing crisis.

12 We will also continue to incentivize, through our
13 One Bay Area Grant, or OBAG, program housing. In the last
14 two cycles, or 10 years, we have invested \$700 million
15 supported -- to support the county OBAG program. And that
16 rewards jurisdictions based on housing and also ensures
17 that those dollars are invested near -- in priority
18 development areas or near high quality transit.

19 Our commission has also asked to return back in
20 the summer to talk to them about more areas where we can
21 further leverage transportation dollars to link with
22 housing outcomes.

23 The second area is really the Bay Area will also
24 have to continue to encourage pricing strategies where
25 they make sense. This will include a planned 550 mile

1 express lane network, and could include a bridge toll
2 hike, if the voters approve it this June, as well as
3 further additional cities rolling out demand-based pricing
4 concepts, parking pricing.

5 Also, in the third area, the Bay Area must
6 continue to support robust, innovative, and low-emission
7 mobility options. This could include ride hailing, car
8 sharing, and future AV options that reduce emissions. It
9 could also expand and make more universal bike and car
10 share programs.

11 Through our climate initiatives program, we will
12 continue to foster various TDM strategies from
13 trip-based -- from personalized trip -- sorry. Trip
14 planning to trip caps in various jurisdictions. And we'll
15 also continue to accelerate electric vehicle adoption, an
16 area that MTC has partnered closely with the Bay Area Air
17 Quality Management District to set ambitious goals, and to
18 leverage both transportation and air quality dollars
19 toward vehicle, infrastructure, and education programs.

20 And transit is also an area of plan where we
21 invest 60 percent of our dollars just to make sure that we
22 are modernizing and keeping up on transit. And this will
23 continue to be a major focus area, as well as we invest
24 significant dollars to expand the transit system, but
25 we'll also need to continues to invest in this high

1 quality transit and focus very much on the first and last
2 mile connections as those are very important.

3 --o0o--

4 MS. BOCKELMAN: In terms of performance
5 monitoring, MTC has long championed performance-based
6 planning. Performance based analysis is fundamental to
7 our planning approach with a detailed project assessment
8 that we do for all of our mega projects.

9 Also, to inform planning and to provide the
10 public with details on how the region performs in various
11 areas, we have a real-time performance monitoring system
12 that we called Vital -- we call Vital Signs. And it tracks
13 key indicators in the areas of environment, land and
14 people, equity, economy, and transportation.

15 To Board Member Gioia's comment on social equity,
16 MTC has several specific performance targets focused on
17 equity, such as housing affordability, equitable access,
18 and economic vitality. We conducted a detailed and will
19 continue to do a detailed and in-depth equity analysis as
20 part of our plan.

21 And also in this last plan, we also developed an
22 action plan, because we found that in some of the areas we
23 were moving off target, in particular on housing
24 affordability. And that has led to some of our other
25 initiatives such the CASA initiative I mentioned earlier.

1 Vital Sign also tracks health, housing
2 affordability, and other real-time indicators related to
3 social equity.

4 And I'll now it over to James Corless to give you
5 the SACOG perspective.

6 MR. CORLESS: Well, Thank you, Alix, Chair
7 Nichols and the Board. Thank you again for having us
8 here. We just wanted to kind of wrap this up. I was
9 going to give a couple more slides about SACOG and then
10 talk a little bit about sort of statewide how we are
11 enthusiastic about partnering with the State and your
12 agency and many others.

13 --o0o--

14 MR. CORLESS: The Sacramento region is considered
15 one of the big four, but in many ways, we have sort of a
16 foot in the Central Valley economy and a foot in the Bay
17 Area economy. We in an interesting in-between place. We
18 are not participating in the infill, and, affordable and
19 attached housing boom that's hit the coastal markets.

20 Yet, we have commercial corridors that are
21 struggling, and retail that's going empty that is the
22 perfect place to put affordable housing and mixed use
23 services, and frankly high frequency transit. That's one
24 of our strategies we're looking at to get to 19 percent.

25 Our public transit numbers are dropping like

1 everybody else's. And the good news is our region and our
2 board is really open to rethinking how we are providing
3 service. RT, our main service provider in the county of
4 Sacramento, is about to embark on a restructuring
5 analysis, where we have software that is actually open to
6 the public. And you can change routes and see ridership
7 and equity in low income and communities of color.

8 But we're also looking at micro transit and
9 first/last mile solutions. And one program, the staff
10 mentioned a pilot program that we would love to basically
11 open source, and be the front yard of the State Capitol,
12 and try things in experiment.

13 We are ready to try and fail. We have a program
14 called Civic Lab, which is a nine-month program. We have
15 nine teams, city, county, staff, transit agencies, where
16 we're trying solutions. We're going to fund those pilot
17 projects. We're going to get some of the universities to
18 come in and evaluate those projects, and we're going to
19 see if they work or they fail, because the future has
20 never been more uncertain, and so we want to begin to
21 embrace that. In terms of monitoring and data, we just
22 last year released our regional progress report, sort of
23 getting ahead a little bit on the SB 150, perhaps not as
24 deep as we'll get into in SB 150 in monitoring.

25 Some of our numbers look good and others do now,

1 and we want to be very honest with both our public, and
2 you all about where those trends are heading.

3 And then finally just on the SACOG side, I just
4 want to mention a couple of things of again areas in which
5 in addition to Civic Lab we're really excited about, but
6 we're willing to experiment on.

7 The first electrification and EVs. We're
8 thrilled to have Electrify America investment in the City
9 of Sacramento. We're taking to our board a bigger green
10 region framework next month. And we're really looking at
11 how we can make sure that everybody has access to those
12 electric vehicles, putting them in public housing
13 facilities, and making sure that the unbanked have access,
14 not just to electric vehicles, but we're rolling out
15 electric bike share this summer as well, and we're going
16 to be doing a lot of monitoring of that.

17 We have a very unique rural urban connection
18 strategy program. We have a huge ag area, and we're
19 making sure that we don't pave over some of the nation's
20 prime farm land, and that we actually bring back some of
21 the -- our ability to actually use more of our food
22 locally, so we're not trucking it to out of state and
23 trucking it back in. That's a big part of our RUCS
24 program. And then finally, we've got a lot on data and
25 zero emissions.

1 Supervisor Gioia, you mentioned the equity
2 question. And I -- and I want to put at least -- I've
3 been out of California for 10 years. I've sort of come
4 back. I worked at MTC for quite awhile. I would just say
5 to you, I'm -- we are, I think, in a really interesting
6 and challenging place, which is you're asking us to
7 predict the future, and we are up to that challenge, but
8 we also understand that future has never been more
9 uncertain.

10 And from an equity analysis perspective, we are
11 absolutely going to run that through our long-range model,
12 and look at everything we can look at within the model.
13 But I'm going to tell you I don't think the models are
14 good for many things. I worry they're not as good for
15 your equity question.

16 What we would like to do is actually look at
17 testing and implementation of things on the ground. So,
18 for instance, in our Civic Lab Program, we're looking at
19 high school -- low-income high school youth who get summer
20 internships. The first job they've ever had. They are
21 showing up late, an hour, two hours late to -- why?
22 Because they can't take three buses and make it work, and
23 they're relying on family members for rides. So can we
24 actually look at a micro transit solution that goes door
25 to door, multiple kids in one vehicle, and get them to

1 that work site on time?

2 I don't know how we can measure exactly that into
3 the 20 year plan, but I am more interested in trying to
4 figure out this access to opportunity question, and how
5 transportation remains a barrier in the short term, and
6 testing ideas and solutions that might overcome that. So
7 that's, I guess, one thought on your equity question.

8 And just finally, I wanted to kind of wrap for
9 all of the MPOs here, we understand -- your staff again
10 did an excellent presentation. There is a gap, we get
11 that, between 19 and 25 percent. We want to help fill
12 that gap. And we're excited about SB 150 in terms of
13 performance monitoring and really looking at kind of
14 testing what works, but we also think that we can't just
15 be doing these things in isolation.

16 We need more partnerships with universities and
17 higher education institutions in terms of evaluation. And
18 we think that statewide, we ought to be leading the charge
19 as we are on climate change to be looking at and
20 implementing some of these new forms of autonomous and
21 shared electric mobility. We ought to be the global
22 leader in this. And frankly, we're not yet.

23 But we stand ready to work with you, to work with
24 State agencies to make sure that we can actually
25 reestablish ourselves as that world leader in these forms

1 of mobility as this disruption only accelerates.

2 So again thank you for your time. I think all
3 four of us are happy to answer any questions.

4 Thank you, Madam Chair.

5 CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you. I think before we
6 proceed with the rest of the witnesses list, if there are
7 really specific targeted questions just for the MPOs on
8 their presentations, let's do those now.

9 Dr. Balmes.

10 BOARD MEMBER BALMES: Yes. Thank you, all. I'm
11 particularly interested in active commuting, active
12 transport. And I think almost all of you mentioned
13 something about that.

14 And it's not just reduced vehicle miles traveled
15 that I'm interested in, but also co-benefits in terms of
16 health. And there's now modeling -- models available to
17 do that kind of projection with regard to health benefits
18 of active transportation, biking, walking. And I'm just
19 wondering if you -- if any of you have used those models
20 or are you just looking at reduced vehicle miles traveled?

21 MR. CORLESS: We going to awkwardly look at each
22 other.

23 (Laughter.)

24 CHAIR NICHOLS: Sure. You can all come up and
25 just speak briefly. That's fine.

1 MS. BOCKELMAN: Alix Bockelman again, MTC. We
2 did look at health benefits associated with active
3 transportation I think using the -- an ITHIM model.

4 BOARD MEMBER BALMES: Yeah.

5 MS. BOCKELMAN: But I'm not very familiar with
6 the details of it, we did do that in our last plan.

7 BOARD MEMBER BALMES: That's the kind of thing I
8 was looking for, yeah.

9 MS. KAWADA: We did not use that model. We're
10 still -- we're using our AB -- AB ABM model. And so it's
11 not, I guess, the most ideal, but we are quantifying how
12 much time is spent -- one of the measures that we're
13 tracking metrics for our next plan update is tracking the
14 amount of time spent walking and using active modes. And
15 I just want to quantify that at least. So when we compare
16 scenarios, we know which ones do better than others.

17 I would say it is incomplete in this area with
18 this -- with, you know -- with an ABM model. I don't
19 think it's perfect, but it's a tool that we have to
20 measure.

21 BOARD MEMBER BALMES: I would just say that the
22 ITHIM model is actually pretty decent and staff -- CARB
23 staff are working to make sure that it's well validated
24 for use in MPO planning.

25 CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. Thanks.

1 Any other quick -- yes, Supervisor Serna.

2 BOARD MEMBER SERNA: Thank you, Chair. This
3 question I posed to any of the executive directors of the
4 MPOs that are here. I think it's a really important one,
5 and it goes to the point that was stressed during the
6 staff report. There's been a lot of advocacy and strong
7 intent and focus on, well, you know, trying to get to that
8 25 percent or perhaps even higher reduction of VMT.

9 What are we doing to educate folks that may not,
10 you know, be steeped in understanding modeling, the
11 connections between land use and transportation, growth
12 projections, the stuff that professional land planners and
13 transportation Experts know very well, but perhaps the
14 layperson who, you know, really is passionate about
15 reducing VMT, and reducing greenhouse gas emissions may
16 not have that sophisticated understanding of that subject
17 matter. What are we doing to reach out to those groups,
18 those people to do our best to educate them on the
19 challenges that we have in just getting to the levels that
20 we have now?

21 MR. IKHRATA: Well, that's a great questions.
22 And I think -- I mean, we met with the advocates, the same
23 one that come and says you need to do 25 percent. This is
24 the wrong argument to have. This is the wrong approach to
25 be arguing 19 or 25 or 15.

1 Right now we have a trend that's going in the
2 wrong direction. How do we make it go in the right
3 direction? How do we report to you, so you have a comfort
4 level, you have a call to action that we are going in the
5 right direction?

6 To that end, how do we do that? We need to do a
7 lot more public outreach to those advocates. We need to
8 include them in our planning. We need to talk about, and
9 be very honest about the trends. I mean, people -- people
10 says, oh, we need to build transit. And transit is great,
11 we should build transit, but when you look at the transit
12 ridership and it's declining, what do you do?

13 You stop listing transit? No, you look at
14 transit differently. You try to do transit in the context
15 of how do I make transit convenient for people to compete
16 with the vehicle? With the rising incomes, with the good
17 economy, that's a good discussion to have.

18 A lot of it need to take place. And is like we
19 talked to your staff about, the new approach that Heather
20 just spoke to you about is about reporting those things.
21 And, you know, we might come to a point where we come to
22 you a year or two years from now and say we're still going
23 in the wrong direction. Then at least that gives you a
24 chance to say, okay, let us -- let us do it differently.
25 And for that, we need to educate a lot of the stakeholders

1 and advocates. And we do that through our planning, but
2 we need to do more of it.

3 BOARD MEMBER SERNA: Can I ask a follow-up.
4 So what -- so I understand and appreciate the expression
5 of need to do more, but what -- what is the plan? What --
6 is there a common one for all the big four MPOs? Is --
7 are there individual plans and process? What has been
8 done to date to really be transparent and intentional
9 about - not from a top-down, let me, you know, sit you
10 down and tell you how it is approach, but doing your best
11 to distill down the important elements that go into these
12 types of considerations outside of the elaborate models.

13 MR. CORLESS: Supervisor Serna, honestly, I think
14 we've spent a lot of time this last 12 months working with
15 your staff to try to figure out how we can reach the 19
16 percent targets for the big four. I think SB 150, I
17 think, should provide a beginning forum for that
18 discussion on that kind of gap and how we fill up to 25.

19 And so I think we are -- we're willing to commit
20 to figure that out. I can't say necessarily that we -- we
21 are worried about going in the wrong direction, if that
22 wasn't clear from the four of us.

23 BOARD MEMBER SERNA: And I -- and I get that. I
24 guess what I'm -- maybe I'm not communicating this as well
25 as I could. I'm -- my concern is really focused on how

1 are we working with the public, so that they understand
2 outside of the language of professionals --

3 MR. CORLESS: Right.

4 BOARD MEMBER SERNA: -- in the realm of land use
5 and transportation, the hurdles, and why it's so
6 challenging just to get to the targets that we have today.

7 MR. CORLESS: A couple of quick thoughts. First
8 of all, I'm not sure we're doing the best job that we can
9 do to work with the public to make this meaningful. I was
10 over in London early -- late last year, where they've
11 actually translated all of their greenhouse gas emission
12 stuff into health. I mean, the public understands the
13 health impacts of all this stuff, and it seems to be more
14 motivated to work with that. And it's about kids.

15 I mean, you all know this. I don't have to tell
16 you, number one. And number two, I think that we have a
17 lot of programs rolling out around shared, shared electric
18 bike, shared electric vehicles. We have to do our part in
19 terms of getting folks to understand how to use those
20 things, working especially in disadvantaged communities.
21 And then I think, you know, we have other -- we have other
22 programs that actually are around gamification frankly
23 to -- for having younger folks get excited about trying
24 new transportation modes, and so there's a tool, and a
25 whole suite of strategies. In order to connect this

1 discussion to the general public, I think we have a lot of
2 work to do.

3 BOARD MEMBER SERNA: Thank you.

4 CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

5 Yes, go ahead.

6 MS. KAWADA: I can just briefly talk about it
7 from a -- from a engagement -- community engagement place.
8 We have used community based organizations. So partnered
9 and basically hired community based organizations in, you
10 know, representing kind of, like I said, the most
11 disadvantaged and vulnerable communities from around the
12 county.

13 And one of the things they do, they do meet with
14 us as a staff on a monthly basis with actually Board
15 members that Chair the Committee. My chair basically is
16 committed and he's going, as an elected official to listen
17 to these voices. The charge of the -- we've given them
18 for the community based organizations is to take the
19 information that we get, this, you know, very technocratic
20 kind of language that we speak, and we understand, and
21 then help us. And they're responsible for translating
22 that and understanding it enough to take it out to their
23 communities, and push that information out, and basically
24 solicit the information back in from their own communities
25 in their language, in their -- in the ways that are

1 meaningful to them and then bring back -- that back to us.

2 So where we've seen progress in terms of that is
3 things like we -- we can measure mode share. We can
4 measure VMT and we're committed to doing that as part of
5 our metrics for the regional plan, but it wasn't -- those
6 weren't the only metrics that meant something, because
7 people -- how do you translate it as someone struggling to
8 get to work or struggling to get to school? What does VMT
9 mean to them?

10 It doesn't mean anything to them. They're
11 looking at how quickly can I get, you know, on any kind
12 of -- whether it's transit, driving, carpooling, within 30
13 minutes? Do I have access to food? Do I have access to
14 health care within 15 minutes. So there -- that's where
15 we've had meaningful back and forth in dialogue in terms
16 of what metrics are meaningful to people in our
17 communities.

18 CHAIR NICHOLS: Question?

19 BOARD MEMBER SHERRIFFS: Thank you.

20 Kim, you had mentioned Climate Action Plans from
21 cities. And I guess one question I have is does every
22 city have a good Climate Action Plan that helps you do
23 your work, and how could we better those? Would it be
24 helpful to have guidance the way we're talking about
25 developing guidance documents for freight facilities to

1 help communities, to help local governments in this
2 process?

3 MS. KAWADA: So we've used -- we've had some
4 cities, even -- so right now, we're getting ready to
5 release about twenty to thirty million dollars of
6 competitive funding for local governments to do things
7 like planning for smart growth, planning for infill
8 development. And we've done that for a number of years.

9 This year that's different is we're requiring
10 them to actually have, and we're funding them, but
11 requiring them to have Climate Action Plans and Complete
12 Streets policies to be -- in order to compete for funding.

13 To ask whether we need regulation, I'm not quite
14 there yet. Because even before we have this sort of
15 incentive stick, if you will, we've had cities on all --
16 across the spectrum that have done it on their own. So
17 the City of San Diego, for example, the first, you know,
18 enforceable, actionable, Climate Action Plan, they've come
19 up on their own, and other cities have followed suit.

20 We have, you know, the whole spectrum. It's sort
21 of like with housing you, have the whole spectrum, right?
22 So I don't know if -- I mean, what I'm hopeful is that I
23 think if we can do this incentive approach first and to
24 see, you know, can they achieve certain targets, or
25 measurable things in mobility, in terms of clean energy,

1 clean choice, because I think we need them to -- and it
2 needs to -- it needs to boil up from the bottom from
3 listening to their communities, and see what's really
4 reasonable and, you know, actionable for them.

5 So I would, I guess, maybe some -- a framework
6 for it, but I wouldn't say real specific requirements
7 quite yet, because I think they're still -- they still are
8 experimenting, and figuring out what works for them in
9 what areas.

10 BOARD MEMBER SHERRIFFS: Yeah, and I was seeing
11 these documents as guidances, guest -- best practices.
12 And you've talked about San Diego, what about the other
13 MPOs? Is this something that's everywhere in the State,
14 or is...

15 MS. BOCKELMAN: In the MPO --

16 BOARD MEMBER SHERRIFFS: Looking for ways to help
17 you get your job done.

18 MS. BOCKELMAN: Right. In the MTC region I know
19 a lot of the cities obviously adopt Climate Action Plans.
20 It's not something that we have required. We've required
21 other things as -- in terms of when we provide funding,
22 we've required all the cities to have Complete Streets
23 adopted policies. We've required every city to have a
24 housing element adopted. We think that really strengthens
25 the ability to get SB 375.

1 So this is an area where we probably can partner
2 better with the cities, because they are doing a lot in
3 this area with the Climate Action Plans.

4 MR. IKHRATA: And we're the same as San
5 Francisco. We don't require, but we encourage. You know,
6 we obviously do the regional housing need assessment. We
7 ask them to tell us how they're going to zone for all kind
8 of housing. We -- we have a sustainability program, where
9 we provide funding for cities to do, but we don't require
10 it.

11 But, you know, back to the -- how do you -- even
12 with the local city or the public at large, how do you get
13 them to understand the world we're talking about?

14 SCAG region is about 19 million people. And when
15 we hold workshops that we're required to hold for the
16 regional transportation plan, we're lucky if we have 10
17 show up.

18 You know, if you ask -- if you ask 100 people now
19 on the street, how your transportation funding gets done,
20 you probably get one person to give you an answer.

21 So this is -- I mean, we could feel good about
22 say we're going to reach people, but this is a language
23 that very few understand. And we have an obligation to do
24 the outreach and to encourage cities to do Climate Action
25 Plan. But frankly, we have to be very clear about what's

1 happening. The trend that we're facing. How the land use
2 in California lends itself to where we're going.

3 And so but we do -- we do encourage cities to do
4 Climate Action Plans.

5 MR. CORLESS: Dr. Sherriffs, I don't know how
6 many of our jurisdictions. I can check on that for you.
7 I'd imagine a majority do not. And this gets a little bit
8 back to what Supervisor Serna was saying earlier. Our
9 jurisdictions, many of them, are struggling economically,
10 as many cities across the State are. So we've actually
11 used a Strategic Growth Council grant to provide technical
12 assistance to do main street revitalization, small
13 business incubation, and we think there's many climate
14 benefits to those kinds of things. But the thing that our
15 jurisdictions want is an economic plan that then ideally
16 has environmental and equity benefits.

17 BOARD MEMBER SHERRIFFS: Well -- and again, I was
18 asking not to burden anybody with more work, but hey, if
19 this is a useful tool to doing your work, well, then we
20 ought be thinking about do we promote that, how do we get
21 it happening, yeah.

22 CHAIR NICHOLS: Ms. Mitchell.

23 BOARD MEMBER MITCHELL: Thank you, Madam Chair.
24 Welcome. Thank you all for coming today and presenting
25 your ideas to us.

1 A couple of things that I want to touch on and
2 ask your comment on. When we started this process back in
3 2008, 2010, the nation was in recession. And so what we
4 have seen over the last 10 years or so is a nation
5 recovering. And so part of that is that the unemployment
6 rate, which was very low back then, is now -- or very high
7 back then has now become very low, and we have -- most of
8 our population is employed.

9 We've also seen, as Hasan mentioned, increase in
10 population, so that we're seeing impacts from a recovering
11 and thriving economy now. And we're going to have to
12 address that when we look at what we're doing with this
13 program.

14 So I'd just like maybe your input on that aspect
15 of what we are dealing with. It's an un -- it's to some
16 degree uncertain, but we see ourselves recovering now, and
17 we have to deal with it now.

18 So, first of all, your comments about that aspect
19 of what we try to accomplish here.

20 MR. IKHRATA: So I think you, more than anybody,
21 you sit in the SCAG board. You're familiar with kind of
22 the discussion. The economy recovered, incomes are
23 rising, people are buying cars. You know, at one point,
24 we need to figure out how we have -- it's not the car
25 versus the transit or versus the bicycle or the walking,

1 it is how you make a transportation system work for
2 everybody, and how you price it in such a way that it
3 works for everybody, and how you develop policies that's
4 really for the revolution that's coming in the near
5 future.

6 But I can tell you right now, like your staff
7 very clearly indicated, we're going in the wrong
8 direction. That should not discourage us, and we said
9 very clearly, we're going to come back to you in the
10 interim and report to you about not only what action we
11 take, but progress we make. And we might come -- I might
12 stand in front of you or somebody from my agency stand in
13 front of you a year from now and tell you, you know, we're
14 trying, but it's not working. We need to do something
15 else.

16 And we need to factor in these cycles, the
17 recession, when a lot of people weren't working. When
18 actually we've seen a decrease in absolute number in
19 vehicle mile traveled. And in a good economy like now --
20 and frankly, right now, we do have a lot of questions to
21 be answered in how we factor these cycles into our work
22 moving forward.

23 And I think we discussed with Richard and Kurt
24 and the staff about maybe, in our performance reporting,
25 to be very specific, the modes, about the social equity,

1 disadvantaged communities, where are the housing getting
2 built, what did it do to the original residents. And all
3 of that has to come together in a annual or biannual
4 reporting, so we can be educated in the cycle's impact.

5 CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. Come on.

6 MS. BOCKELMAN: Well, I think in the MTC region
7 we feel this point very acutely. We've added 500,000 jobs
8 in a time when we've added 60,000 housing units, and that
9 is a huge problem for us. So some of my comments earlier
10 really focused on the fact that, you know, we have a
11 housing crisis. I know California does. We really have
12 it as well, and we are trying to do everything we can to
13 figure out how to really get housing built and also do it
14 in a way that we're not displacing residents. And it is a
15 real challenge.

16 And so we're trying to bring together all of the
17 smart minds from all the different sectors, the business
18 community cares, everybody cares. We've got to do
19 something very different. So it is a huge challenge.

20 In terms of our transit system, I think while
21 there may have been pretty big declines in parts of the
22 state, I mean our rail systems have seen huge increases in
23 ridership. We may have reach a plateau, because we're at
24 the point where people -- you know, can't really get on
25 the system. So we're really trying to continue to invest

1 in core capacity improvements to our transit system.
2 Ordering new BART cars are kind of rolling in. They need
3 to roll in faster. New train control system to increase
4 the frequency through our Transbay Tube by 30 percent.
5 We're electrifying Caltrain or extending BART to San Jose.
6 We need all of that.

7 And we are trying to make sure -- I mean, the
8 dollars in cap and trade and SB 1 are -- can be very
9 helpful to making sure all these projects stay on track,
10 which are really important for us to be able to just keep
11 what we have said that we are doing in our plan.

12 CHAIR NICHOLS: That's an important point. You
13 have to look more specifically at the different regions.

14 I -- thank you. I think what we should do
15 actually is take a 10 minute break for the court reporter.
16 Obviously, we've got a lot of people signed up who want to
17 speak on this item, but I think this could conclude our
18 colloquy with the MPOs, and everybody could use a brief
19 comfort break.

20 So we will break for 10 minutes and be back at
21 11:10.

22 Thank you.

23 (Off record: 10:59 a.m.)

24 (Thereupon a recess was taken.)

25 (On record: 11:09 a.m.)

1 CHAIR NICHOLS: Our next witness is Matt Regan
2 from the Bay Area Council. I don't that we've posted the
3 list of speakers anywhere.

4 MS. JENSEN: Mary, one minute. It will show up
5 on your screen in one minute.

6 CHAIR NICHOLS: Can the people in the audience
7 see the list when it gets posted?

8 DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER CHANG: Yes.

9 CHAIR NICHOLS: Yes. Okay. Good. Thank you.
10 Excellent. Okay. So we have 34 witnesses before lunch.

11 I think many people do not have a lengthy
12 testimony, but if you could try to get it down to two
13 minutes, that would be terrific and much appreciated.

14 Mr. Regan, hi.

15 MR. REGAN: Chair Nichols, Board members, thank
16 you for the opportunity to make public comment today. To
17 be honest, I was expecting to be disappointed by this
18 hearing. I was expecting to hear a wonkish, navel-gazing
19 discussion about 19 percent versus 25 percent. And it has
20 been actually quite different than that.

21 To hear staff make a call for tools -- land use
22 tools in our to make these plans successful. And Board
23 Member Sperling to hear him make a call for action rather
24 than just more plans is very encouraging. And to hear our
25 MPOs say that, you know, things cannot stay the way they

1 are, that the status quo cannot remain, and we cannot
2 expect to meet our goals in terms of greenhouse gas
3 reductions, unless we -- something changes.

4 I should begin by saying I'm here from the Bay
5 Area Council representing about 300 of the largest
6 employers in the San Francisco Bay Area. We were the
7 first business group in California to support AB 32. We
8 were early supporters of SB 375. I was actually on the
9 rooftop of that Sacramento parking garage 10 years ago,
10 when Governor Schwarzenegger signed the bill. I always
11 find that somewhat of an ironic place to sign this
12 legislation, but -- and I also sit on ABAG's Regional
13 Planning Committee, and MTC's Planning Advisory Committee.
14 So I know way too much about this law than any human being
15 should.

16 But I also know that, particularly in our region,
17 it's not working. Alix Bockelman mentioned some
18 statistics. In 2015 alone, we created 133,000 jobs, and
19 permitted 16,000 units of housing. That is not
20 sustainable. And what we need, as has been mentioned, we
21 need the tools in order for these plans to succeed.

22 Plan Bay Area is a good plan, but it's based on
23 the premise, on the supposition, on the assumption that
24 the cities in our region, our 101 cities and our nine
25 counties have bought into the plan, that they understand

1 that their -- they have a responsibility and a role to
2 play in reducing VMT, reducing greenhouse gases. But my
3 experience, spending way too many Tuesday nights, and
4 planning commissions is that they have not bought into the
5 plan, and they do not understand that they have a
6 constructive role to play.

7 And unless this body and others like it bring the
8 hammer down on noncompliant cities, we cannot ever meet
9 those goals. So thank you. Looking forward to working
10 with you in the future on this goal.

11 CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you very much.

12 MS. HOLMES-GEN: Okay. Good morning, Chair
13 Nichols and Board members. Bonnie Holmes-Gen, American
14 Lung Association in California.

15 The Lung Association has been a key partner with
16 you working toward healthy sustainable communities over
17 the nine years of the implementation of 375. We still
18 believe this program has potential for transformative
19 healthy climate benefits at the state level, local level.
20 We still have a long way to go, given the need to achieve
21 the 25 percent GHG reduction, and seven percent VMT
22 reduction by 2030, and appreciate all the discussion and
23 recognition of that robust goal that we have, and the
24 challenges of getting there.

25 Much is at stake. We don't have time to lose in

1 our climb efforts. And stronger targets, together with
2 strong State and local partnerships, and along with
3 measurable VMT reduction strategies, more active
4 transportation, focused investment programs, and health
5 metrics will not only help clean up the air, but will --
6 but the increased physical activity and -- will bring us
7 tremendous public health gains and reduction in chronic
8 disease rates.

9 And your staff analysis cites the tremendous drop
10 in chronic illness, early death, drop in cardiovascular
11 and other diseases that we can achieve from even very
12 modest increases in physical activity.

13 We submitted a health letter. I have -- had a
14 copy of it. It's not right here with more than a dozen
15 health organizations, state and local groups calling on
16 you for action, underscoring the importance of stronger
17 regional targets, and the pathway to getting to the 25
18 percent GHG reduction, asking CARB to be vigilant in
19 utilizing new funding resources to better assist local and
20 regional agencies, and communities in getting to these
21 goals.

22 And we've asked also -- we've asked the Board to
23 support and elevate ongoing health analysis. And I
24 appreciate Dr. Balmes bringing this up. I know Dr.
25 Sherriffs has been very active in this. Several regional

1 planning agencies have begun integrating health into the
2 planning efforts, and you've heard some of that today.

3 There has been health analysis on a regional
4 level, MPOs and COGs have hired public health and active
5 transportation staff, integrated their work with county
6 health departments, and taken other steps.

7 But there is more to do. We're not at the level
8 we need to be yet to truly flesh out the health benefits.
9 We need to do more than regional analysis of health, but
10 be looking at more the neighborhood, subregional level to
11 truly flesh out and show these health benefits that will
12 help excite our communities and cities about what we can
13 accomplish.

14 And we need to be able to really show the
15 benefits of innovative projects, like we've been
16 discussing, widespread bike share, widespread innovative
17 transportation.

18 We agree with the call to action, and let's focus
19 on elevating health as we move.

20 Thank you.

21 CHAIR NICHOLS: Thanks.

22 MS. TREMONTI: Hello, Chair Nichols and members
23 of the Board. I am Ashley Tremonti with the City of San
24 Diego here today to express our support for the targets
25 set forth in the proposed update to SB 375, and to suggest

1 that the Board consider revisiting these targets on a more
2 frequent basis, possibly every two to four years.

3 Additionally, we support an increased focus on
4 performance metrics, including regular reporting and
5 monitoring of these metrics. The shortfalls associate
6 with greenhouse gas modeling and calculations can be
7 lessened by supplementing with analyses of performance
8 metrics to ensure real progress and success is occurring.

9 The City of San Diego requests that CARB monitor
10 funding distribution across the state to ensure that these
11 ambitious targets are being met. However, we need the
12 financial resources and investment to accomplish them. So
13 we would like to see a more equitable distribution of
14 funds, including in the San Diego region.

15 And lastly, I wanted to address Board Member
16 Sherriffs' comments about a potential regulation with
17 Climate Action Plans. And I would invite you to come and
18 talk to the City of San Diego or SANDAG as we are
19 preparing a regional greenhouse gas framework for Climate
20 Action Planning, for monitoring, for reporting that I
21 think would be of interest to the Board.

22 So thank you, and that is all.

23 CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

24 BOARD MEMBER SHERRIFFS: And I just want to
25 clarify. I wasn't asking for a regulation. I was asking

1 if it would be a useful tool, and then how we could
2 promote that. So I'm glad to hear that you're working on
3 that.

4 MR. TREMONTI: Yeah, so that's what -- we're
5 basically trying to develop a useful tool.

6 BOARD MEMBER SHERRIFFS: Great.

7 MS. TREMONTI: And SANDAG has been coordinating
8 cities across our region for many months to prepare this
9 documentation that hopefully our region will follow and
10 will have a consistent greenhouse gas reporting and
11 monitoring framework moving forward.

12 BOARD MEMBER SHERRIFFS: Thank you.

13 CHAIR NICHOLS: Thanks.

14 Sorry, question?

15 BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: I keep doing that. I
16 keep wanting your microphone.

17 I just had a question for you.

18 If I might --

19 (Closer to the microphone.)

20 BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Here we go.

21 I'm just a little bit confused, because my
22 understanding is that the revelation at the end of last
23 year in regards to vehicle miles traveled miscalculation
24 puts the San Diego Climate Plan's ability to reach its
25 goals at a great risk, that VMT was grossly overestimated

1 in 2010. And as a result, it appeared that there was
2 great reduction in VMT. We find that to not be true as a
3 result of SANDAG's Calculations.

4 And my understanding that the city was quite
5 concerned about that. So how -- how does that square with
6 your support for the target and what you're going to do
7 going forward. Maybe you could let us know about that.

8 MS. TREMONTI: Yes. I was not prepared to
9 respond to that question specifically, and that's a bit of
10 a loaded answer in response. There was no miscalculation
11 in 2010 in regards to VMT. We used the best available
12 data at the time, which was derived from SANDAG modeling
13 of VMT. Those numbers were subsequently updated, and we
14 have since updated our inventory to reflect those updated
15 VMT numbers.

16 BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: So are you saying the
17 City is not worried about meeting its 22 percent of all
18 commuters' goal of getting them on transit?

19 MS. TREMONTI: Our goal is 50 percent of
20 commuters by 2035.

21 BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Right.

22 MS. TREMONTI: And we are still on track to meet
23 that goal. We're still developing programs around
24 increasing the number of mode shift or increasing mode
25 shift.

1 BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: I'm speaking of the 2020
2 goal, and the fact that -- so are you saying you're on
3 track to meet that?

4 MS. TREMONTI: At this time, I'm not really
5 prepared to go that deep into this. I just wanted to
6 provide comments on SB 375.

7 BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: No, I appreciate that.
8 I just -- I want to make sure that we're aware of what the
9 current conditions are. And you are in the best position
10 to give us that information.

11 MS. TREMONTI: Yeah. So for now, I would
12 encourage you to look back at our annual report. So each
13 year we provide updated numbers on where we are in regards
14 to all of the goals we've set forth in our Climate Action
15 Plan, transportation included. And if you'd like to have
16 a more deeper conversation with that, the city would be
17 happy to talk to you.

18 BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Yeah, I know where to
19 find the city. Thank you very much.

20 MS. TREMONTI: Right.

21 (Laughter.)

22 BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Thanks for being here.

23 CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay.

24 You don't have to wait. It's not like TSA.

25 (Laughter.)

1 CHAIR NICHOLS: You just come on up.

2 MS. REYNOSO: Okay. Thank you.

3 Can you hear me?

4 Okay. My name is Ana Castro Reynoso. And I'm
5 here on behalf of over 5,000 members of Environmental
6 Health Coalition, or EHC. EHC is a 38-year old
7 environmental justice organization based in San Diego,
8 California.

9 EHC strongly urges the California Air Resources
10 Board to require an emission reduction target of 25
11 percent for the San Diego Association of Governments. The
12 system SANDAG has built and has worked to maintain is
13 expensive, car centric, increases toxic pollution, and
14 contributes to climate change. A 25 percent emission
15 reduction target would change that.

16 Low income communities of color suffer the most
17 from SANDAG's focus on freeway expansion. Residents from
18 disadvantaged communities like Barrio Logan and West
19 National City rank in the top 10 percent of the most
20 impacted census tracts for pollution in the entire state,
21 due, in significant measure, to their proximity to
22 freeways.

23 San Diego is the eighth largest city in the
24 country. Yet, it's transportation system lags behind
25 cities with much smaller populations. As a result, low

1 income communities of color are fronting the impacts of
2 high levels of pollution, and can only reach 29 percent of
3 jobs within 90 minutes on public transit.

4 On top of that, SANDAG is not accountable to the
5 people of San Diego. It has a long history of misleading
6 San Diego residents. In November of 2014, the California
7 Court of Appeal held that SANDAG violated CEQA by
8 approving a defective Environmental Impact Report in
9 connection with its 2011 Regional Transportation Plan.

10 And this past summer, Voice of San Diego exposed
11 SANDAG for wrongly projecting revenue from tax measures
12 during the last election cycle. One thing is clear,
13 SANDAG is not doing their part as one of the large four
14 MPOs to achieve a real paradigm shift in San Diego's
15 transportation planning. We need them to do more.

16 Lumping SANDAG as part of the large four MPOs
17 provides cover for their mismanagement, and further
18 silences the community members and stakeholders that are
19 here today asking for ARB's help.

20 We are asking that based on the community stories
21 and testimony brought forth today that you ensure SANDAG
22 is held more accountable with a 25 percent emission
23 reduction target. These pieces of data and stories of
24 scandal are not anomalies. They are SANDAG's status quo.

25 CARB staff's proposed target means more of the

1 status quo for San Diego. A 25 percent target is not a
2 paper exercise. It gives us a more ambitious target to
3 push for. And finally, the passage of Assembly Bill 805,
4 or the SANDAG reform bill --

5 CHAIR NICHOLS: You can finish your -- finish
6 your sentence.

7 MS. REYNOSO: Okay. Thank you -- clearly
8 demonstrated that we need strong enforcement from CARB to
9 truly reduce greenhouse gas emissions and serve the
10 community members that suffer the most from the pollution
11 plaguing their communities, homes, and lungs.

12 A 25 percent emission reduction target would
13 truly meet the intended purpose of SB 375, and the CARB
14 staff's adjustments to target frameworks and SCS
15 evaluation process.

16 Thank you.

17 CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

18 MS. CEVALLOS (THROUGH INTERPRETER): Hello. Good
19 morning. My name is Llesenia Cevallos and I live in
20 National City. I'm also a member of the National
21 Coalition Environmental. I'm here to ask that the ARB
22 vote for 25 percent emission reduction target for SANDAG.
23 It is very important to me that we address the inadequate
24 transportation system in San Diego, because I am concerned
25 with the health of my children.

1 And I am concerned that we are flooding the
2 street -- the streets with cars and the freeways and we
3 are producing more pollution. I have three children and I
4 am worried about the future that awaits them. The main
5 issues that I have, the Interstate 5, at only 600 feet
6 away from my home. The window in my room faces the
7 freeway. When I open the window, pollution comes in and
8 marks the walls of my room with a black and sticky
9 substance.

10 This is quite concerning then, since my children
11 have breathe this black sticky substance. I also ask
12 myself how Kimball Elementary, which is also quite near
13 the freeway. The children in community breathe this each
14 day when -- whenever they go to school. The Board needs
15 to ensures that SANDAG complies with the intentions of the
16 law, and they truly reduce the emissions by 25 percent.

17 We need a firm solution that generates an
18 efficient and low cost public transport system. We need
19 your support to have a SANDAG that takes into account the
20 health of my community and our families. We expect a 25
21 percent reduction and we want SANDAG to take action to
22 reach a real reduction. The health and the -- of my
23 children's lungs are in your hands.

24 Thanks for your time.

25 CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

1 MS. MARGANO (THROUGH INTERPRETER): Good morning.
2 My name is Margarita Margano and I live in National City.
3 I'm a promoter of the Environmental Health Coalition. For
4 my family and my community, it is important that SANDAG
5 reduce transportation emissions by 25 percent. The
6 problem in my community is that SANDAG has not created a
7 transportation system that takes into account my community
8 and its needs.

9 I have a son who has asthma, and pollution
10 damages him a great deal, which causes him -- causes for
11 his lungs to always be swelled up.

12 The solution is a transportation system that does
13 not contaminate the communities. And this is only
14 possible if the Board requires a 25 percent emission
15 reduction target from SANDAG. The Board needs to ensure
16 that SANDAG complies with the law and that it actually
17 reduces pollution emissions.

18 Please demand a 25 percent emission reduction for
19 SANDAG. Thanks for your time.

20 MS. MARTINEZ (THROUGH INTERPRETER): Good morning
21 to everyone. My name is Carmina Martinez and I live in
22 Logan Heights. I've been living in this community for 18
23 years, and I am a mom of three children. It's very
24 important for me to -- and my family to reduce pollution.

25 I'm here to ask the Board to give priority to the

1 communities that are mostly impacted by these harmful
2 emissions. The problem in my community is the pollution
3 produced by the transportation system. SANDAG gives
4 priority to the freeways. In my personal experience, I
5 have suffered for eight years of an allergy in my skin
6 caused by the environment.

7 The proof of this pollution is in our own bodies.
8 The solution to this problem is to reduce the emissions.
9 There are contaminants. To really achieve real change,
10 the Board needs to demand a reduction of emissions of 25
11 percent. We need your support to have a SANDAG that
12 supports our communities and our families.

13 Please demand a 25 percent reduction of emissions
14 for SANDAG. Thank you very much for your time.

15 MS. GONZALEZ (THROUGH INTERPRETER): Good morning.
16 My name is Esperanza Rosales -- Gonzalez.

17 I'm a resident of the community of City Heights
18 of San Diego. I'm a promoter of the Environmental Health.
19 For me, it's really important to have a -- in my community
20 an efficient transportation system of lower cost, and that
21 reduces emissions.

22 We need that the Board -- the ARB Board assure us
23 that SANDAG will achieve this type of transportation
24 system. The problem in our communities that there is
25 no -- not enough transportation -- public transportation

1 to travel that -- without taking a long time. It's very
2 difficult to use the public transportation to be able to
3 raise your job, go shopping, go to school and other places
4 in San Diego.

5 We have worked for a long time, many years, in
6 our community to improve the transportation system. But
7 we haven't seen enough change. SANDAG doesn't hear the
8 needs of our communities. The solution is a higher goal
9 for SANDAG, one that assures that really is inverting in
10 the more -- the communities are in greater need.

11 As well as my friends and companions, we need the
12 Board -- the ARB Board to demand lower of emissions of 25
13 percent for SANDAG.

14 We need your support to have us -- we need your
15 support to have a SANDAG that takes into account our
16 marginalized communities and our families.

17 Please demand lowering of the emissions to 25
18 percent. Thank you very much for your time.

19 MS. PRATT: Honorable Board members, my name is
20 Linda Giannelli Pratt, and I reside in San Diego,
21 California. Prior to retirement, I was part of the City
22 of San Diego's team that developed their Climate Action
23 Plan. And so I do understand the complexities and the
24 opportunities inherent in this planning process.

25 I am now on the advisory council for Stay Cool

1 for Grandkids, which is a non-profit organization of
2 volunteer grandparents, elders, and other citizens in San
3 Diego region dedicated to preserving a livable community
4 in the name of those too young to have a voice, our future
5 generations.

6 We recommend adopting a more ambitious target for
7 SB 375, specifically 21 to 25 percent GHG reduction by
8 2035. We believe it is unconscionable for any of us to
9 leave the burden of mitigating and adapting to dangerous
10 climate change on the shoulders of young people.

11 According to a recent report, we are handing
12 young people alive today a bill of up three -- \$535
13 trillion just to cover the cost of quote "negative
14 emission technologies" that would be required to remove
15 atmospheric CO2. And that does not include the cost for
16 the severe health impacts, food and water scarcity,
17 irreversible damage to the natural environment, including
18 wildfires and drought, and untold degradation of life --
19 of the quality of life for future generations.

20 Intergenerational equity is at the heart of the
21 lawsuit Juliana versus United States. The 21 plaintiffs,
22 ranging in age from 10 to 20 years old, state that the
23 federal government's refusal to take serious action
24 against climate change unlawfully puts the well-being of
25 current generations ahead of future generations.

1 And so far, the courts agree, despite attempts by
2 the Trump administration to have the case dismissed. In
3 March 2018, the 9th Circuit Court of Appeals allowed the
4 suit to go to trial. This followed an earlier decision in
5 November of 2017 when the District Court Judge Ann Aiken
6 sent -- set a judicial precedent ruling that climate
7 change may pose an unconstitutional burden for younger
8 generations.

9 We believe that the California Air Resources
10 Board has the opportunity, and the obligation, to adopt
11 ambitious greenhouse gas emission targets -- reduction
12 targets pursuant to SB 375 and to provide guidance to
13 state, regional, and local governments on how to
14 effectively implement plans and strategies that will lead
15 to meeting these targets.

16 There are over nine million children under the
17 age of 18 living in California today, who are depending on
18 us, and there is no time to delay. With that in mind, I
19 will turn the podium over to Bob Leiter who will deliver
20 our specific recommendations.

21 After more than 30 years in public service, I
22 still believe that the noblest motive is the public good,
23 and that should include those future generations.

24 MR. LEITER: Hi. I'm Bob Leiter. I'm a retired
25 urban planner, living in -- live in Poway, California. So

1 I'm focusing my comments on the San Diego region. And
2 I'll just mention I've met many of you or worked with many
3 of you. I was a city planner for the Cities of Escondido
4 and Chula Vista in San Diego County. Then became the
5 planning director for SANDAG. And I was the SANDAG
6 planning director for about seven years, including the
7 start-up of SB 375 planning.

8 Since -- when I retired from SANDAG, I worked as
9 a consultant with four other MPOs on their Sustainable
10 Communities Strategies, and have worked with other public
11 agencies on plans to promote sustainability, so -- but I'm
12 speaking as a retired urban planner.

13 And I want to emphasize that the recommendations
14 that we're making from Stay Cool reflect our understanding
15 of the long discussions that have been held among the
16 various staff and elected officials about these targets.

17 And I'll just briefly highlight our
18 recommendations. We had -- submitted a letter to you
19 dated March 19th. Our first recommendation is that CARB
20 should adopt a 2035 GHG emission reduction target for the
21 San Diego region that is no less than 21 percent, and
22 preferably up to 25 percent.

23 We understand that CARB and SANDAG staff believe
24 it would be difficult to replicate the 21 percent GHG
25 reduction that was shown in SANDAG's most recent Regional

1 Transportation Plan. But we believe that by working
2 together, CARB and SANDAG staffs would be able to identify
3 opportunities in the San Diego region to receive GHG
4 reduction credit for future, what we call, multiple
5 benefit projects, and also for multi-jurisdictional
6 projects.

7 And I'll go back to that a little bit more with
8 my other comments. We also think it's extremely important
9 for the Air Resources Board to weigh-in on the
10 implementation of Senate Bill 743, and will -- we can
11 explain that in a little more detail. But that is a
12 critical component of the legislation that's been enacted
13 to help implement SB 375, and we think that's important to
14 follow through on.

15 So I'll go back to our individual recommendations
16 with the remaining time available. First of all, we
17 recommend that the ARB staff work with SANDAG to provide
18 guidance on the use of multiple benefit plans. And we've
19 provided a good example of that in our letter. The idea
20 of complete streets has been well accepted as a way to
21 reduce vehicle miles traveled and greenhouse gas
22 emissions.

23 The idea of Green Streets is that you can design
24 Complete Streets that also reduce stormwater pollution
25 runoff, and promote water conservation, and still reduce

1 greenhouse gas emissions. And the advantage of taking
2 that approach is now you qualify not just for
3 transportation funds like SB 1 funds, you also qualify for
4 a number of other State sponsored grant programs. And I
5 can give you examples of that, but I know that time
6 doesn't permit that.

7 I would just add that our other recommendations
8 are that you really take a closer look at multiple
9 jurisdictional efforts, including city and county Climate
10 Action Plans. We think there's a lot of opportunity to
11 more clearly understand the relationship between the
12 regional targets and the local implementation plans. And
13 then again, we think SB 743, which is the law that says
14 that under CEQA now, you focus on vehicle miles traveled
15 and GHG reductions, rather than on traffic congestion.

16 We think that every city and the County of San
17 Diego should already be implementing that. And we think
18 ARB can give a gentle shove to the State agencies, and the
19 local and regional agencies that are -- that are trying to
20 figure that out.

21 Thank you.

22 CHAIR NICHOLS: Would you wind up, please. I'm
23 being a little generous here with the timing, because we
24 shortened it, but we do have a lot of people waiting to
25 testify.

1 So if you can try to condense your remarks and
2 get to the bottom line, we would appreciate it.

3 MR. COURSIER: Chair Nichols and Board members,
4 my name is George Coursier. I'm a volunteer for the
5 Sierra Club. I'm the Conservation Chair for the East San
6 Diego group. And I attended the San Diego meeting, which
7 was outstanding from the CARB staff.

8 My takeaway was that the San Diego meeting was
9 the targets proposed by the MPOs, and by my own MPO SANDAG
10 were consistently below the GHG reduction threshold is
11 required. The very agencies here responsible for reducing
12 pollution and GHG were willing to fail that mission.

13 This is unacceptable for residents of San Diego,
14 and it must be unacceptable for CARB as well. Rather than
15 missing scoping goals and standards, Sierra Club
16 encourages CARB to make this a turning point, when
17 required by legislation, and demand a 25 percent reduction
18 in the pollution of greenhouse gases that the MPO's are
19 not working with at this time.

20 It's surprising and shocking that my own MPO in
21 San Diego does not meet these standards and is not willing
22 to. You know, it's time to stand up for disadvantaged
23 communities. These are impacted by vehicle pollution.
24 Stand up for the public transportation, and against trying
25 to build more freeways near our schools and homes.

1 And the fact that freeways, you know, are so
2 congested and failing on a daily basis should really be
3 kind of a bright light to all of us here that this is not
4 working. And I assure you in San Diego, it is not.

5 Vehicle miles traveled are increasing in
6 California, and this should be the call to action for the
7 MPOs for SANDAG to take cars off the road, find public
8 transit incentives, and remove the vehicles. The present
9 efforts are failing.

10 Today is the opportunity to break the cycle of
11 GHG pollution and failed freeways. Please act on the
12 scoping report gap. And that would demand a 25 percent
13 GHG reduction. Social equity and environmental justice
14 are at stake just as much as the GHG requirements. Please
15 consider your voting impact on the people of California.

16 And thank you so much.

17 CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

18 MR. GRUBB: Good morning, Chair Nichols and
19 Commissioners. My name is David Grubb. I'm
20 Transportation Chair of the San Diego chapter of the
21 Sierra Club. My colleagues in the environmental community
22 have done a wonderful job of presenting the arguments. So
23 I'll be very brief, and just ask you to please set the
24 targets for the big four MPOs at 25 percent for all of the
25 reasons that you've already heard. Thank you.

1 MR. RENTSCHLER: Good morning. My name is Kyle
2 Rentschler, and I'm a conservation organizer at Sierra
3 Club San Diego. I'm here, along with our partners at
4 Climate Action Campaign and Environmental Health
5 Coalition, to speak in support of higher greenhouse gas
6 emissions reduction targets in the San Diego region.

7 As you well know, on-road transportation is the
8 greatest cause of greenhouse gas emissions throughout the
9 country and throughout California. But it's particularly
10 high in San Diego, where transportation accounts for 55
11 percent of our total emissions. Decades of reckless
12 sprawl development have encouraged reckless freeway
13 development alongside it. And it is crucial to
14 acknowledge at this pivotal point in our history that this
15 is not the time for continued recklessness.

16 And that's really the point of SB 375 to
17 integrate planning for transportation, land use, and
18 housing, and to fundamentally reshape our communities to
19 reduce greenhouse gases and improve quality of life.
20 Continued recklessness will poison our lungs and drown our
21 coastline even more than current projects predict.

22 This is also not the time to abide by one-sided
23 accounts put for by San Diego, especially when that
24 agency's leadership has demonstrated time and time again
25 that emissions reductions, public health, and equity are

1 nowhere near the list of their top priorities.

2 I wouldn't chose SANDAG as the governing body
3 that determines the future of planning and transportation
4 in San Diego County, but I don't have a choice. So I need
5 your strong leadership and your oversight to make sure my
6 region's future is safe and healthy for all communities
7 and mine and future generations.

8 That's why we need a 25 percent greenhouse gas
9 reduction in San Diego region. We are behind and we need
10 to catch up. You're not going to hear it from SANDAG, but
11 you're hearing it from all of us. And as much as the
12 region as a whole needs action, health disparities from
13 poor air quality and lack of access to mobility options
14 strike hardest in low income communities of color.

15 CARB said despite California's market progress,
16 greater innovation and effort is needed to avoid the worst
17 consequences of climate change. That's a statement we can
18 all get on board with. The people of San Diego live
19 between and ocean and a desert. We don't want our sea
20 level, nor our temperatures to rise, but a 19 percent
21 target is a lazy goal that does not require innovation nor
22 effort, nor is it enough for the people of San Diego to
23 avoid the worst consequences of climate change.

24 Thank you for your time.

25 MS. WOLFRAM: Good morning. My name is Sophia

1 Wolfram and I work with Climate Action Campaign, an
2 advocacy organization that advances policy across the San
3 Diego region to stop climate change and improve quality of
4 life, especially through the adoption and implementation
5 of local Climate Action Plans.

6 While we support a greater focus on tracking and
7 monitoring, I'm here today to ask this Board to set a 25
8 percent emissions reduction target for SANDAG, which is
9 what is needed for the San Diego region simply to catch up
10 to the rest of the state.

11 This is no time for compromise between the
12 top-down and bottom-up approaches to target setting cited
13 in the staff report. We're asking for your leadership to
14 help wake up our region's leadership, and finally shift
15 their thinking from tinkering with the status quo to
16 flipping the script and putting core outcomes first,
17 equity, public health, and greenhouse gas reduction.

18 The staff report highlights the importance of
19 additional local and regional action on transportation and
20 land use. But the fact is in the San Diego region, the
21 City of San Diego has already set targets far surpassing
22 those that SANDAG has been willing to commit to.

23 Our cities are working hard to do their fair
24 share to meet State climate targets, and they need support
25 from this body to meet those targets.

1 San Diego's legally binding Climate Action Plan
2 calls for 50 percent of commuters in the urban core
3 walking, biking, or taking transit by 2035. AB 805,
4 passed last year, requires that SANDAG seek to harmonize
5 the upcoming regional transportation plan with local
6 Climate Action Plans.

7 Yet, members of SANDAG's Board of Directors have
8 openly stated that they don't believe the RTP should be
9 consistent with Climate Action Plans, and that reducing
10 vehicle miles traveled, a core focus of SB 375, is a
11 irrelevant to climate goals.

12 And it's not just idle comments that demonstrate
13 SANDAG's indifference. San Diego dedicates a
14 significantly smaller chunk of its funding to transit than
15 MPOs elsewhere in the State do. And in RTP after RTP,
16 SANDAG fails to seriously consider scenarios that would
17 prioritize transit and infill development over freeway
18 expansions and sprawl. It has ignored its own urban area
19 transit strategy, which would maximize transit ridership
20 and reduce VMT in favor of more of the same.

21 Also, since 2013, the Early Action Program, which
22 is meant to build out the backbone of the bike system in
23 the county, has spent \$61 million and completed just four
24 miles of bike facilities. Our cities need your leadership
25 to meet the reduction targets, which are aligned to State

1 targets. And our communities need your help to shift the
2 direction in which our region is headed toward a more
3 equitable, a healthier, and a safer future.

4 We implore you to set the highest possible
5 target, 25 percent for the San Diego region. Thank you
6 for your time.

7 MS. NERI: Good morning. My name is Alli Neri
8 and I'm a volunteer with Climate Action Campaign.

9 I'm here to echo the call for stronger greenhouse
10 gas reduction targets for the San Diego region. CARB's
11 own analysis has found that a 25 percent emission
12 reduction is needed to be on track to meet the State's
13 climate targets. California rightly prides itself on
14 leading the way on environmental policy for the nation.

15 But what kind of precedent would we be setting by
16 compromising targets that we need to hit to avoid the
17 worst impacts of climate change, and who's really
18 benefiting from that compromise?

19 Not us, not our communities, and not future
20 generations.

21 What SANDAG claims is about lack of revenue and
22 the VMT rebound effects is in reality about lack of
23 political will and unwillingness to innovate and apply
24 bold and creative strategies to advance transit, walking,
25 and biking, and to shift away from the stereotype of

1 southern California sprawl.

2 We need strong targets to put us back on the
3 right track. The kind of leadership that's going to solve
4 the greatest crisis facing humanity is not going to come
5 from SANDAG, not in 2018 at least.

6 And that's why we're here today. The families
7 and communities that we work alongside are ready for
8 change, and we're asking you for your leadership and
9 support to help us realize the vision of sustainable
10 communities for the San Diego region.

11 Thank you.

12 MR. TIPPETS: Good morning, Chair and Board.
13 Bill Tippets, Southwest Wetlands Interpretive Association,
14 a small organization in southwest corner of the state,
15 Imperial Beach.

16 Our main interest is conservation and
17 preservation of wetlands. Southern California has lost 75
18 percent due to development, and without significant and
19 rapid reduction of greenhouse gases, we'll lose the other
20 25 percent. We've got plenty of resources. We can show
21 you the literature that shows this. We're really
22 concerned about it.

23 We also support all the recommendations of our
24 sister environmental, transportation, and social justice
25 groups that are talking to you. We believe that it's

1 feasible for SANDAG region to achieve at least a 21
2 percent reduction in GHG, which they have in their current
3 RTP, and potentially up to 25 percent that would be needed
4 to close the GHG emissions gap in your own scoping plan.

5 And we believe that SANDAG, working more closely
6 with the local jurisdictions, can do that through improved
7 land use and transportation strategies. Another big point
8 of ours, that there are several reputable transportation
9 experts have examined SANDAG's approach to scenario
10 development and land use transportation and trip modeling,
11 which they believe have either misleading, or incorrect,
12 or wrong assumptions and approaches.

13 And we've got information and documents that can
14 show better ways to do transportation planning in San
15 Diego. The fact that total VMT continues to increase
16 within SANDAG region, and other places in California,
17 strongly supports the call for changes in SANDAG's
18 approaches, and that it must aggressively pursue new
19 strategies and new technologies.

20 Just as a rational GHG reduction strategy
21 requires reductions in both total and per capita GHG
22 emissions, a land use and transportation strategy must
23 also include required reductions in total and per capita
24 VMT. It has to do that. It's the only way it's going to
25 work.

1 And a tighter linkage between SB 375 plan
2 measures and SB 150 monitoring is absolutely needed. A
3 lot of the suggestions that the staff presented in this
4 overview are very good. We completely support them and we
5 like the idea of separating monitoring from compliance
6 monitoring, did you do it or not, to effectiveness
7 monitoring, which is the most important thing. That's
8 what we really want, reduce greenhouse emissions, and show
9 that the co-benefits are being produced that the plans
10 propose.

11 Also, a rapid turn around information system will
12 allow us to adaptively change the measures we're using,
13 incorporate our advanced measures that may have been
14 project -- put down later in the sequencing, and include
15 and consider new measures that are comparable that could
16 still be implemented under CEQA. You don't even -- SANDAG
17 doesn't even have to recirculate the EIR. If they
18 comparable measures, that would be fine. We think that's
19 absolutely necessary and possible.

20 Thank you very much.

21 MS. WISE: Hello. My name is my Ella Wise. I'm
22 the State Policy Associate from Climate Plan, a network of
23 more than 50 organizations across the state committed to
24 sustainable and equitable communities.

25 We submitted two letters on SB 150 and 375

1 recently, signed by more than 20 organizations. And I'll
2 go over a few key points of those. We want to thank so
3 much our partners from the San Diego region who have a
4 strong message here today.

5 The key message is the proposed targets are not
6 enough to meet the goals of SB 32, and we know that. We
7 want to thank staff for their hard work. We appreciate
8 working with them. But unfortunately, we all know that
9 these targets do not go far enough to meet the State's
10 goals.

11 According to the scoping plan, we need a 25
12 percent reduction from land use and transportation. The
13 proposed targets will achieve a 19 percent reduction. The
14 State has a VMT gap that we need to close as Madam Chair
15 stated before.

16 So what do we recommend in terms of 375?

17 One, ambitious targets. ARB should adopt more
18 ambitious targets that require a change from business as
19 usual. A currently -- the currently adopted plans would
20 achieve an 18 percent reduction in GHGs. We're proposing
21 a 19 percent reduction. That's a one percent change. We
22 can do better, but we'll only do better if we overcome a
23 fear of failure, and if we set our aims higher.

24 Two, improve trans -- improve transparency. We
25 appreciate the State's -- staff's proposal to improve

1 transparency. Right now, it's very hard to understand how
2 these plans will translate to changes on the ground and to
3 meeting the actual targets.

4 So we recommend that staff go further to improve
5 transparency. And distill the plans to shift power to the
6 public and the communities, so that we all know what is
7 actually in the plans and how those translate to meeting
8 the targets.

9 Third, accountability. ARB staff is currently
10 working on SB 150 tracking, and we need to align those
11 metrics directly with 375, so that we can use those 150
12 reports to measure the actual reductions compared to the
13 anticipated reductions.

14 Two more things. We strongly support equity, and
15 we appreciate that that's been discussed here today. We
16 need a commitment to social equity analysis, both in the
17 plans and in the 150 tracking of implementation. So both
18 in the SCSs and in the metrics.

19 And fifth, prioritizing VMT reduction. We ask
20 that the Board use the resolution language to make clear
21 that the main purpose of SB 375 is to reduce VMT and to do
22 it equitably, and we have proposed specific language in
23 our letter.

24 Thanks very much.

25 CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

1 MR. RUBIN: Good afternoon, Board members, Carter
2 Rubin, Mobility and Climate Advocate with the Natural
3 Resources Defense Council. I'm here to echo the comments
4 from Climate Plan and my colleague Ela. We are part of
5 that coalition, and sign onto and endorse their comments.
6 I will briefly put a point of emphasis that it's
7 unacceptable in this era of climate urgency that we plan
8 for anything less than what's needed to reach our
9 greenhouse gas emissions goals.

10 We need to adopt a 25 percent goal and force a
11 conversation with local agencies and our regional planning
12 organizations about land use and transportation, and
13 ensure that our current plans are in alignment with our
14 climate goals. As the Chair said, we have decades old
15 highway projects that are still on the books, these zombie
16 projects, that stumble forward, and that we need to put an
17 end to in order to reach our climate goals.

18 The 25 percent goal will shine a light on these
19 bad projects and policies in place, and allow us to
20 grapple with them in a way that let's us move forward and
21 reduce our greenhouse gas emissions.

22 Thank you.

23 MS. LINDBLAD: Hi. Good afternoon. I'm Bryn
24 Lindblad, Associate Director of Climate Resolve, a
25 nonprofit in Los Angeles focused on advancing local

1 solutions to climate change, and also part of the
2 ClimatePlan Network and signed on to that letter.

3 I don't -- I don't think I need to tell you
4 members of the Board how critical it is for the health of
5 our planet that we act with urgency to address our climate
6 crisis. I think you know that the consequences of
7 inaction, how scary that future could be that we'd be
8 leaving for generations.

9 And sort of on a note of inspiration, I think you
10 also realize that if we're able to figure this out and get
11 an institutional framework that really works to wean us
12 off of our bad climate-polluting habits, that the world is
13 watching, and we can inspire action cross the globe.

14 And I'm afraid -- I hate -- I hate to say it, but
15 I think the current proposal is really -- it's a kicking
16 the can down the road kind of move. It's a one percent
17 increased GHG reductions from what our current plans have
18 on the books, is essentially a continuation of business as
19 usual.

20 And our communities deserve better. They deserve
21 safe access to our streets, as pedestrians, and as
22 cyclists, as -- in wheelchairs, and transit commutes that
23 don't take them two hours to get to work.

24 And so I'll speak from experience in the SCAG.
25 The current RTP SCS in the SCAG region, we're still seeing

1 50 percent of growth outside of transit priority areas. A
2 lot of that is green field development. There's still
3 highway capacity expansion happening in there.

4 So when we kind of -- when we say we're doing all
5 we can do, when 19 percent is as high as we can go, I
6 don't quite buy it. So I want to mention one new freeway
7 proposal that's in that plan, the High Desert Corridor
8 Freeway, you heard earlier of the \$120 billion that L.A.
9 county is putting into transit, most that is into transit.
10 \$118 billion worth is doing -- is doing a lot to reduce
11 daily VMT by 7.8 million, but two billion of that package
12 is going to this new freeway. It's a sprawl -- it unlocks
13 sprawl development.

14 And that 2 billion it cuts in half all the VMT
15 reductions that the rest of that package of investments
16 would achieve. So it's -- you know, to draw an analogy,
17 it's like we're trying to air out a smoky room, opening
18 all these windows, and yet we're fueling the fire that's
19 in the room.

20 So really support Madam Chair's encouragement
21 that we need to -- we need to look at some of those zombie
22 dinosaur highway projects that have been on the books. We
23 need to not do anymore harm with our transportation
24 dollars. They really need to be working to help us
25 address the problem, not perpetuate it.

1 And, you, know I think we really -- we can't
2 afford to take our current plans as sacrosanct. We need
3 to call the question and use the performance metrics that
4 help us do that job.

5 Thank you.

6 CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

7 MS. ESPINOZA: Good afternoon. Chair
8 Nicholas[SIC] and members of the Board. Thank you for the
9 opportunity to speak at the meeting today. My is Demi
10 Espinoza. And I'm a policy manager with Safe Routes to
11 School National Partnership.

12 And my work focuses on enhancing policies to make
13 walking and biking easier and safer for children and their
14 families. And I do that in the Inland Empire here and in
15 Orange County. And we are here today because we believe
16 that investing in active transportation is one way that
17 can help us achieve greater GHG reductions.

18 And for that reason, we supported a coalition
19 letter, facilitated by Climate Plan and other
20 organizations here today. We are invested in the
21 implementation of SB 375, but support higher targets. The
22 proposed 19 percent target does not go far enough to meet
23 our goals.

24 And I'm concerned that areas within the SCAG
25 region are not doing enough to meet these goals or we're

1 not addressing our State's VMT gap. Within my region of
2 Southern California, especially within the Inland Empire
3 and Orange County, highway expansion projects and sprawl
4 developments are issues that need to be addressed.

5 For example, we need to consider the removal of
6 long local highway expansion projects from RTPs, and curb
7 sprawl development. These types of projects only
8 contribute to increased VMT, and become barriers to
9 walking and biking and transit. We can have more
10 connected communities that do not need to be car
11 dependent.

12 Investment in active transportation projects and
13 reducing displacement pressures by doing more equitable,
14 affordable, infill development are strategies that can
15 help us reduce emissions.

16 Lastly, we want to use the forthcoming SB 150
17 report to hold our regions accountable for meeting these
18 targets. So we recognize that your staff is developing
19 metrics and report to track SB 375's implementation. So
20 this is a great opportunity to use these reports to
21 measure actual -- actual results and get to some of the
22 issues around social equity consideration that we're
23 talked about. And so we appreciate those discussions
24 being implemented in the SB 150 report.

25 And also, you know, we encourage the transparency

1 around this process, around SB 375, to make it more
2 accessible for community members to understand where these
3 targets come from, what's really at stake. So the
4 proposed targets only really require one percent emission
5 reduction change from what we've already done. We can do
6 better as a region and as a state.

7 So thank you for your consideration, and work
8 during this process.

9 CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

10 MR. YANCEY: Honorable Chair, members of the
11 Board, and staff, my name is Andrew Yancey. I'm an
12 attorney with Latham and Watkins. I represent the Golden
13 Door, a world class resort and agricultural operation in
14 San Diego County. And I also review statewide greenhouse
15 gas issues for our firm.

16 I'd like to talk to you today about the San Diego
17 region. I'd just like to note at the beginning when Ms.
18 Kawada gave her presentation earlier from SANDAG, she
19 noted one of the things SANDAG is trying to do is promote
20 development in the urban areas. SANDAG even performed a
21 stress test last year, which was part of the materials in
22 your packets today that looked at if they could get
23 additional GHG reductions out of an even more dense
24 development model, and determine that the development
25 plans are already pretty smart in San Diego. And that

1 additional density wouldn't really help much.

2 What they didn't look at was what happens if the
3 development model switches to more of a sprawl-based
4 model. Unfortunately, the County of San Diego is
5 proposing to do just that.

6 Dr. Sherriffs asked earlier about climate action
7 plans in the SANDAG region. Well, just last month, the
8 County of San Diego approved a Climate Action Plan that
9 unfortunately ignores vehicle miles traveled. Instead of
10 looking to vehicle miles traveled for one of the
11 mitigation measures for unplanned growth, it allows almost
12 exclusively on a program to allow offset carbon credits to
13 be purchased from anywhere in the world.

14 Because the unplanned projects this would apply
15 to are not within the SANDAG model, the VMT from these
16 projects would be in addition to what SANDAG has been
17 looking at. One such project is the Newland Sierra
18 project, which is expected to come before the Board later
19 this year, is 2100 homes on a currently rural site located
20 more than six miles from the end of the transit line in
21 Escondido. It would increase VMT.

22 Now there is a school of thought that VMT
23 shouldn't matter. Vehicle technology improvements will
24 make VMT obsolete. Supervisor Ron Roberts, who's a CARB
25 Board member, who you all know well, is a proponent of

1 this approach. He has, in public presentations, called
2 VMT a political model, a pathetic metric and a stupid
3 metric. Unfortunately, he's not here today to discuss
4 this. I'm sure you've heard his impassioned case before.

5 And, you know, maybe Supervisor Roberts is right,
6 maybe Supervisor Roberts is wrong. I don't know the
7 answer to this question. I'm not a technical expert. But
8 I think the State policy is pretty clear.

9 Miss King pointed out in her staff presentation
10 earlier that vehicle technology improvements are not going
11 to get us to the 2035 targets. Reductions in vehicle
12 miles traveled is an absolutely necessary component of
13 meeting those targets. There is a more detailed
14 description of that in staff's written response to
15 comments. It's also in the scoping plan, and OPR's SB 743
16 guidance.

17 So what we're looking at right now in the SANDAG
18 region is a tragedy of the commons. The county is playing
19 by its own rules and ignoring VMT.

20 I'll wrap-up quickly, Madam Chair.

21 This leaves the cities holding the bag and having
22 to do more to be able to meet the VMT reduction models.
23 And Chair Nichols asked earlier about funding. That's
24 going to create a funding issue where new sprawl growth is
25 going to be competing for highway dollars that could have

1 gone to transit otherwise.

2 So I just wanted to leave you with a thought
3 about the call to action that we've heard about today.
4 It's not just about the targets being approved, it's about
5 the implementation. And I understand that CARB doesn't
6 have land-use jurisdiction. I understand that CARB cannot
7 and should not be reviewing every development proposal and
8 plan in the state.

9 And when you have a situation like San Diego
10 County that is clearly implementing a policy that ignores
11 VMT, perhaps some direct guidance would be necessary to
12 make sure is that there's a level playing field for the
13 developers in the county and the cities, and for all the
14 members of the MPO there to make sure that everyone one is
15 playing by the same rules to meet the targets.

16 Thank you.

17 CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

18 MR. HAMILTON: Good morning, members of the
19 Board, Madam Chair. My name is Kevin Hamilton. I'm with
20 Central California Asthma Collaborative. First, I want
21 to -- a shout out to Dr. Sherriffs and his idea of
22 providing this Climate Action Plan for cities for their
23 land-use planning, something that focuses at R1, R3, C and
24 industrial level development outside of traditional
25 freight facilities, similar to the freight handbook, I

1 think would be tremendously useful for cities as they move
2 forward with their planning, and helping them integrate
3 that planning more effectively with transportation
4 agencies.

5 But that's not what I came here to talk about
6 today. My concern is the way that the Board has addressed
7 the target setting in the San Joaquin Valley. I notice we
8 have the first four MPOs in the room today, but we lack
9 the fifth and sixth, which, of course, is Fresno County
10 and Kern County.

11 In fact, the City of Fresno is actually larger
12 than the City of Sacramento. I don't know if you knew
13 that, but by about 40,000 people. And there's around --
14 as of 2020, we expect over a million people in Fresno
15 County. This is a large place. This is a lot of people.
16 The people are severely lacking a constructed
17 transportation system, though it's not for lack of trying.

18 In Fresno, the COG there is moving forward with
19 some pretty adventurous stuff, building solar islands in
20 the incorporate cities, that the solar arcs that allow the
21 public to charge for free in their electric vehicles
22 really pushing hard to bring test drive events, and get
23 the people engaged in EV technology.

24 And, in fact, if you look at the statistics,
25 Fresno county is the largest adopter of EV vehicles in the

1 State, which is how it got added to the Volkswagen
2 settlement, as the fifth green city -- or sixth green
3 city, I forget which.

4 So we believe strongly that this Board needs to,
5 instead of treating the San Joaquin valley as -- from just
6 my perspective, my feeling, a poor relative who just can't
7 quite step up to the plate here, and isn't ready, they
8 are, in fact, ready. They are fully capable. They
9 definitely have money. Though you wouldn't see it on the
10 face of it, it's there.

11 And, in fact, they understand this technology
12 very well and the way this system works. To not challenge
13 them to the same targets you do the other large MPOs is a
14 terrible disservice to the citizens of our communities.

15 Health consequences in the Valley from climate
16 and air pollutants are tremendous. We have some of the
17 highest rates in -- of asthma for instance in California,
18 and some of the highest in the nation, especially in
19 children who have been diagnosed with it during their
20 childhood.

21 It's incredible that we've seen this rate jump
22 over the last 20 years so high. We have high rates of
23 heart disease. We have high rates of stroke. Our ERs are
24 overflowing. And a lot of that is very well corresponding
25 with the levels of these pollutants in our atmosphere from

1 mobile sources. So we real need your help there, and we
2 need you to tell our folks step up. So don't back off on
3 us. Push hard.

4 Thank you.

5 CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

6 MS. GALE: Good morning, Board Members. My name
7 is Genevieve Gale. I'm a Policy Associate with the
8 Central Valley Air Quality Coalition, or CVAQ.

9 I'd like to stray from the norm. I'm not going
10 to offer any policy recommendations, but rather tell you a
11 short story, a true story.

12 This story begins last year. The Fresno County
13 of gov -- Council of Governments, or FCOG, conducted a
14 robust public survey to solicit input on preferred land
15 use and transportation scenarios in the county. FCOG
16 hosted or participated in over 32 community meetings, and
17 also circulated an on-line petition. This survey resulted
18 in almost 1500 responses. And demographics mirror the
19 county's demographics pretty well.

20 The preferred scenario by the public was Scenario
21 B. It focused on transit-oriented development, high
22 quality transit options, walkable and bikeable streets,
23 and compact and mixed-use development. So that's Scenario
24 B as in bike.

25 The least desired scenario was Scenario C. And

1 this moved investment away from active transportation and
2 towards highway-widening projects and road enhancements.
3 So that's Scenario C as in car.

4 When the scenarios were evaluated, Scenario B
5 ranked highest for GHG and VMT reductions. It offered
6 more transit rides, more bike rides, more walks, and it
7 ranked lowest for premature deaths.

8 Scenario C trailed in all respects. It offered
9 less transit, and less bike rides, and less walks, and it
10 had just a one percent lower reduction in GHGs. You can
11 think about what your preferred scenario is.

12 In the end Scenario C was chosen. And the
13 argument was that all scenarios met CARB's GHG reduction
14 targets for the region. So while Scenario B outperformed
15 and was the public's number one choice, it wasn't
16 necessary, because the status quo was good enough.

17 So the people of Fresno County will see more
18 investment in our freeways and roadways, and it will be
19 easier to drive a car. It will not be easier to bike, it
20 will not be easier to walk, it won't be easier to breathe.

21 So like I said, I won't give you any policy
22 recommendations, but the moral of the story, I'll leave
23 that up to you to decide. But I can't help but wonder, if
24 we had just a one percent higher target, what our future
25 would look like.

1 Than you.

2 MR. FIGUEROA: Steve Figueroa. I'm with the 200
3 also locally with the Inland Empire Latino Coalition.

4 I'd like to echo what the supervisor said earlier
5 on, basically what I heard is, the unintended consequences
6 of your policy making or decisions that impact our
7 community. Especially, in the area of housing, I'm sorry,
8 if you build your housing in your urban neighborhoods, we
9 can't afford to live in them. It's too expensive. It's
10 unrealistic.

11 How many of you came here through public
12 transportation?

13 No, because you can afford your own cars, right?

14 Nobody took the bus, right? And nobody came on
15 metro, right? So let's walk what we talk. How many of
16 you would tell the Governor to take his 12 -- his \$100
17 billion bullet train to put that toward electric cars,
18 right? And that would do more to reduce the greenhouse
19 effects than anything you can propose, anything you can
20 propose, right?

21 So how many of you would tell every Senator and
22 Assemblyman that they could only drive electric vehicles
23 or use public utilities going back and forth? You gotta
24 walk what you talk.

25 But you see because the decisions you make impact

1 the businesses I advocate for, or the families with
2 children with disabilities who don't take public
3 transportation, because, quite frankly, it's not
4 comfortable, it doesn't work, and that's why the buses are
5 empty. You can't even fix the current system to make it
6 usable for those who need it.

7 That's what needs to be worked on. That's what
8 needs to be worked on. How -- you know, when CEQA is used
9 to create red-lining districts in our neighborhoods, to
10 say guess what, not in my backyard, because we're going to
11 use CEQA to say we don't want any brown people, or black
12 people, or low income people in our neighborhood. You
13 guys have the tools. They're going to use what you
14 develop here to discriminate against us.

15 And it's happening. It happens in Moreno Valley
16 all the time, the neighboring city here. And, doctor, I
17 understand. I'm a chronic heart failure. I have an ICD.
18 I have COPD.

19 But the bottom line is I want my children also to
20 afford a house and to get a house. So we have to balance
21 that. And nobody knows more than somebody who advocates
22 for families with children with disabilities who refuse to
23 take public transportation because it's so inconvenient.
24 How many of you would sit next to a homeless man who uses
25 public transportation for his home and housing nowadays.

1 Okay. Stays on there, smells like urine. I'm not
2 criticizing, because I work -- I work with the homeless.
3 I do all that, okay.

4 How many of you can stomach that with your
5 disabled child all day who's having a seizure, who's going
6 to the restroom on himself and the bus or transportation
7 won't stop in between. You've got to be realistic in your
8 outreach toward the communities.

9 I heard earlier, nobody from MPO came on public
10 transportation. They don't walk what they talk. Nobody
11 from any of the MPOs discuss how it impacts the disabled
12 or those who don't have access to whatever you're
13 developing.

14 I noticed you gave lots of people 10 minutes
15 here, because we were timing it. So what we're asking,
16 one, is walk what you talk. He had a great idea, the
17 CEQA study that you did was inadequate. Reach out to the
18 Hispanic chambers, to the black chambers. You'll fill
19 up -- you'll fill up your places, because they're looking
20 for supply-side diversity contracts to help you do what
21 you got to do, but there's no outreach from CARB to
22 minority organizations.

23 And I can say that, because I'm a member of LULAC
24 locally, the Hispanic Chamber for the State, and you guys
25 have never come to us. You've never been to one

1 convention. You've never been to one function that we've
2 put on. Okay. Nobody. I think Dean was there when I was
3 with MAPA, Mexican American Political Association, but
4 that's about it.

5 Okay. So walk what you talk. Use public
6 transportation to see what we go through and why we don't
7 take it, because you guys are developing the criteria, so
8 you should live by what you develop. Thank you.

9 MS. HERNANDEZ: Thank you very much. I'm
10 Jennifer Hernandez. I'm at the law of firm of Holland and
11 Knight, and I represent The 200. I was here in December,
12 and presented you with a fairly long and quite detailed
13 comment letter objecting to parts of the scoping plan that
14 expand CEQA, that try to restrict people's access to use a
15 vehicle to do basic needs, including get to and from work.

16 That letter remains outstanding, and I want to
17 restate the content of that letter for the purposes of
18 today.

19 But I'm here to support the staff recommendation.
20 We support the staff recommendation. Just let that minute
21 pause.

22 (Laughter.)

23 MS. HERNANDEZ: But here -- but here that your
24 environmental analysis was a complete absolute failure.
25 You claim a few maybe construction impacts. Everyone of

1 these MPOs has had to a Program EIR that chronicles the
2 adverse -- significant adverse impacts of increasing
3 density. I'm not saying that's the wrong thing. There's
4 trade-offs. But I am saying your staff has punted again
5 under the California Environmental Quality Act.

6 If you guys want to increase the targets from 18
7 to 19 percent, then all of those significant unavoidable
8 impacts identified in the EIRs done by your MPOs are all
9 worse.

10 And SCAG alone has 30 of them, significant
11 unavoidable impacts that are going to be more significant.
12 And then I want to pick up on Supervisor Gioia's comments
13 on disparate impacts. You have not, you have never,
14 looked at the impacts of this program on working families.
15 Most families work. In this county, most families that
16 work are Hispanic. They do not have a college education.
17 They get paid when they show up at work. They don't have
18 a keyboard economy job at Starbucks.

19 By restricting mobility, by increasing fuel
20 costs, by increasing the cost that people have to pay
21 every day to heat and cool their house, by making housing
22 more expensive with net zero what? What we understand is
23 that your organization thinks that somehow you're going to
24 materialize from thin air 10 -- 10 million tons of
25 greenhouse gas reductions from VMT, in the absence of any

1 evidence whatsoever that that's remotely possible.

2 The only comprehensive study that was ever done
3 on this topic was done by UC Berkeley, Carol Galante and
4 Ethan Elkind. And they claim that the VMT reduction from
5 this whole scheme would result in 1.67 million metric tons
6 of GHG per year, not 10, 1.67.

7 And that's 1.67 at what cost? The end of
8 homeownership. Well, guess what, minorities have lost all
9 homeownership that they gained after years, decades of
10 civil rights progress.

11 Global greenhouse gas reduction does not equate
12 to an end to home ownership. It does not equate to
13 denying people the right to drive to and from in cleaner
14 cars. In the sixties, we had dirty cars. We've reduced
15 tailpipe emissions 99 percent, because we thought about it
16 for criteria pollutants.

17 We reduced CO2 by 60 percent, without thinking
18 about it. Let's think about it and let's make those cars
19 cleaner. But we spent -- Gil Cedillo spent how many
20 years? A decade trying to get undocumented immigrants a
21 legal driver's license, so they could exercise their right
22 to work and take their kids to school.

23 The attack on mobility is an attack on
24 minorities. And your analysis, your environmental
25 analysis, your economic analysis of that issue fails.

1 CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. Your time is up.

2 MS. HERNANDEZ: But we support the staff report.

3 CHAIR NICHOLS: Your time is up.

4 MR. HERNANDEZ: Thanks. I think I was the only
5 person to actually be cut off.

6 Thank you.

7 CHAIR NICHOLS: I don't think so, because I
8 counted a couple of others.

9 Ms. Gurin.

10 MR. GURIN: Hello. My name is Katy Gurin. And
11 I'm on the steering committee of 350 Riverside. I also
12 collaborate with San Diego 350. So I'm here basically to
13 echo a lot of the statements that have been made regarding
14 the emissions target. I support a 25 percent reduction in
15 emissions. SANDAG -- for SANDAG.

16 SANDAG has long ignored community pleas for a
17 strong transportation system that meets the needs of
18 underserved communities. Instead, SANDAG has favored an
19 expensive toxic and car-centric approach.

20 SANDAG's adamant adherence to emission to an 18
21 or 19 percent emissions reduction target that so clearly
22 absolves them of any really changes should be rejected.

23 Thank you very much.

24 MR. HAGUE: Hello. George Hague, volunteer with
25 the Sierra Club. Glad you're here in this building with

1 the supervisors above you who many times make decisions
2 that are counter to what should be happening.

3 The same thing with Riverside County
4 Transportation Commission. I'm glad I saw the focus areas
5 that were presented at the very beginning. But when I
6 read SB 375 when it first came out, the word farmland was
7 in there, ag was in there. And I do not see that being
8 represented hardly anywhere in the past 10 years.

9 In Riverside County, it continually disappears.
10 Why? Because the majority of the supervisors support leap
11 frog development actually developing brand new cities.

12 RCTC, Riverside County Transportation Commission,
13 likewise seems to support these new cities. And a good
14 example of this is the Villages of Lakeview that was
15 approved earlier this year by a majority of the Riverside
16 County Board of Supervisors, where they have 9,000 or
17 8,750 units next to San Jacinto Wildlife Area, leap frog
18 development in the middle of ag in between the cities of
19 Perris and the cities of San Jacinto, an RTCC[SIC] just a
20 year or two prior to that facilitates this by building a
21 or approving a almost \$2 billion expansion of the Ramona
22 expressway, turning it into the Mid County Parkway, 16
23 lanes, plowing through the city of Perris, eliminating 400
24 people's homes and businesses, causing people around that
25 to suck in the pollution that will result from the Mid

1 County Parkway.

2 This continues in our area, where we expand and
3 build new cities, build new roads, and destroy
4 agricultural lands in the meantime. Something hopefully
5 these incentives that somebody mentioned can be done with
6 our county -- get our county to work with our cities to
7 place homes closer to existing urban areas, instead of in
8 the middle of nowhere, where it would be appreciated.

9 The city -- the county is also thinking about a
10 project called Paradise Valley at the southern border of
11 Joshua Tree National Park, another 8,000 homes. Agreed
12 we're in a housing crisis, but why build new cities in the
13 middle of basically nowhere, where people have to drive to
14 look for jobs?

15 It's a problem that no one in this county is
16 trying to resolve, and building new roads to get there.

17 I thank you very much.

18 CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

19 MR. EDER: Good afternoon. I'm Harvey Eder with
20 the Public Solar Power Coalition and I'm here to talk
21 about this 25 percent reduction based on 2005 by 2035 and
22 AB 7 -- 375 versus -- excuse me, SB -- SB 350 that
23 requires by 2030 a 40 percent reduction from 1990 levels,
24 which was about 400 parts per million CO2 equivalent than.
25 So we're down to about 250 these numbers are off. The

1 greenhouse gas numbers, the real numbers in the '16 plan a
2 year ago I came and talked to you about this. There's
3 been a 30 percent -- on the chapter 10, pages two and
4 three written by Dr. Aaron Katzenstein that now runs the
5 laboratory for South Coast.

6 There's been a 30 percent increase in methane
7 over the last 12 years. And that these numbers come out
8 to right now about 750 parts per million CO2 equivalent
9 now, right here in river city, not by 2050 by 2100. And
10 that all of -- all of -- the t difference is like 500
11 parts per million going back to the 350 requirements,
12 which you folks have to enforce the law.

13 And all of the Climate Action Plans and
14 everything else deriving from this are off and wrong. We
15 have to use the best science, the best evidence. We're
16 involved in litigation. We brought this up on August 12th
17 of '16. We submitted these numbers working with Dr.
18 Katzenstein, and there was no evaluation from the
19 district, no evaluation from CARB. It was just purged,
20 and that's part of our litigation now.

21 Also, worked on the first social equity low
22 income -- there was a low income solar equity program. I
23 worked as a consultant to the PUC in 1980 and '81 under
24 Leonard Grimes in the first solar proceeding. We got a 10
25 percent mark out for low income, and increased that in the

1 future. Also litigated again to Rose Bird's court and got
2 her vote, and so Breiner did not vote against to look at
3 all models of public solar, not just using the
4 industry-owned utilities to finance it. There is a
5 question of equity, low-income subsidizing, upper income
6 solar, and also of antitrust.

7 And that's still an issue now. Extending the
8 monopolies into a non-monopoly area, this is illegal and
9 cannot be allowed to continue. And in terms of social
10 equity, we've worked on this in the past. And we also
11 support and housing with the homeless program, whatever.
12 We need to have rent-to-own and other programs like that,
13 that includes solar and transportation, heating and
14 cooling and distributed heating and cooling as well.

15 Thank you.

16 CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you, Mr. Eder.

17 Last witness.

18 MS. DARYANANI: Hello. My name is Nikita
19 Daryanani with Leadership Counsel for Justice and
20 Accountability. We work with low-income communities of
21 color throughout the San Joaquin Valley, and work with
22 five value MPOs on their RTP SCS updates.

23 I'd like to echo the comments made by Climate
24 Plan earlier, as well as those made by CVAQ and CCAC, and
25 highlight the need for greater transparency, so residents

1 can see tangible results and actually experienced the
2 co-benefits that come with access to transit and active
3 transportation.

4 The current modeling approaches do not clearly
5 translate into on-the-ground improvements, and changes.
6 And greater clarity around modeling assumptions will allow
7 residents and advocates to better assess their region's
8 progress in achieving our emission reduction goals.

9 I urge ARB to encourage MPOs to move beyond the
10 status quo and front-load projects that benefit
11 disadvantaged communities. We want to see projects that
12 result in greater connectivity to and from essential
13 services, especially for rural communities. And land-use
14 planning that limits the sprawl development we continue to
15 see in the valley, and prioritize infill development in
16 existing communities.

17 I think there are still plenty of opportunities
18 for alternative modes of transit, and vanpooling in rural
19 communities that agencies must be more proactive in
20 seeking. Many agencies in the valley are also still very
21 reluctant to study social equity and transportation
22 inequity, leaving so many communities out and ignoring
23 decades of historical neglect.

24 More ambitious and stronger regional reduction
25 goals will help us achieve our State's ambitious climate

1 goals, and encourage the valley to reduce emissions by
2 implementing more stringent, equitable, and innovative
3 land use and transportation policies and programs.

4 Again, we need to move far beyond the status quo
5 to combat climate change, and advance social, economic and
6 environmental justice.

7 Thank you.

8 CHAIR NICHOLS: All right. That concludes the
9 list of witnesses who've signed up to speak on this item.
10 I'm now going to quickly turn to the staff -- I'm going to
11 close the record for this item, and just make it clear
12 that any written or oral comments received after the
13 comment period is closed will not be part of the official
14 record on this item.

15 I would like to ask if the staff wants to respond
16 to any of the comments at this time?

17 AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST KING: We did receive
18 some comments on our environmental analysis, and we would
19 like the opportunity to respond, but we will need a little
20 bit of time to prepare that response, so we could have
21 that ready to go after lunch, if we wanted to conduct the
22 vote at that time, so we can have the opportunity to
23 respond. But if the Board has any further discussion, you
24 could --

25 CHAIR NICHOLS: Well, we certainly would like a

1 response.

2 AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST KING: Yes.

3 CHAIR NICHOLS: So I think that's the better part
4 of valor. So why don't we do that. It's a good time to
5 take the lunch break. But we are on a tight schedule
6 today, because we have two more items today, one of which
7 has quite a lot of witnesses who've signed up to speak on
8 it. Although, it isn't action item, it's still important.

9 So let's try to be back here, I want to say, 45
10 minutes, but let's just make it 1:30, and be -- we will
11 resume at 1:30 then.

12 Thank you.

13 (Off record: 12:39 p.m.)

14 (Thereupon a lunch break was taken.)

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 A F T E R N O O N S E S S I O N

2 (On record: 1:36 p.m.)

3 CHAIR NICHOLS: Ladies and gentlemen, welcome
4 back to the meeting. We are ready to resume our
5 discussion on the SB 375 numbers, and the updates on GHG
6 targets. And so I'd like to move now to Board discussion,
7 and then we will -- hello. Oh. Okay. I'd like to move
8 to Board discussion, and then when we're done with that,
9 we will ask the staff to respond to comments, close the
10 record again, and then proceed.

11 So before I do that, I would like to call on
12 Board Member Sperling. I asked Dan to summarize some of
13 what we heard and help put it in context to frame the
14 discussion here.

15 So Professor Sperling.

16 BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: Well, thank you very
17 much. You know, I listened to the discussion this
18 morning, and there were a lot of very frustrated people.
19 And I have to say that includes me also very frustrated.

20 On the one hand, to deal with that frustration, I
21 think CARB needs to take more responsibility and more
22 leadership. And that means dealing, for instance, on
23 this -- on the money issue with the California
24 Transportation Commission. And we have that. We're
25 moving in that direction, which is good.

1 We need to be -- hold the MPOs more accountable
2 in terms of specific actions and with performance metrics.
3 We are moving in that direction, which is really good.
4 And we can do more. We can do things like having clearing
5 houses of information, so that we can provide more
6 assistance, in fact, provide technical assistance to the
7 local governments and the community-based organizations
8 and the NGOs.

9 There's a lot more we can do, but at the end of
10 the day most of the responsibility is not CARB's. Most of
11 the responsibility is not the MPOs in making progress and
12 reducing VMT. Setting aggressive targets, it's
13 appropriate, but way too many people are way too focused
14 on whether it's 18 or 19 or 25 percent. And I have to
15 say, having been a modeler and worked with all of the
16 transportation modelers, they're very clever, they're very
17 effective. If you want a different number, they can come
18 up with a different number. And as Chair Nichols said, we
19 need to move away from focusing on the modeling and moving
20 towards action.

21 So at the end of the day, the key responsibility
22 really is -- I know a lot of people don't want to hear
23 this, but it really is at the local level. And I'm going
24 to give examples of that in a moment. And we heard all of
25 this testimony this morning about from different groups

1 testifying that they're -- about their -- the focus needs
2 to be on all these changes. But I'm going to say that the
3 focus needs to be much more so on local decision making.

4 They need -- we need the MPOs, and the cities,
5 the local governments, the counties to be much more
6 focused on what are -- exactly are the strategies and
7 priorities for moving forward?

8 And I'll -- you know, just as a little digression
9 on that. There was a discussion about transit. You know,
10 pouring a lot of money into transit is not the answer. It
11 might be part of it, if we do it in a clever way. But
12 transit -- we're putting money into transit and ridership
13 is going down. And even worse than that, transit really
14 only accounts for a little over one percent of the
15 passenger travel -- passenger miles traveled in
16 California. It's not serving a large role, except in some
17 very specific corridors and for a few people. And it's
18 not serving low-income communities very well.

19 We can do a lot better, and we should do a lot
20 better. But just putting more money into transit is not
21 going to accomplish that by itself.

22 So here are the four strategies that I think I'd
23 like to see articulated better by the MPOs, and by all of
24 us. And this could be -- you know, this is my take on it
25 having worked from both a research perspective and a

1 policy regulatory perspective for many years.

2 So number one is what I call pooling. What that
3 really means is increasing the utilization, the load
4 factors, and all of our vehicles. And that means, you
5 know, more carpooling, that means more of the Lyft Line,
6 uberPOOL, not the conventional Lyft and Uber Services
7 where there's just one passenger, but the pooling
8 services.

9 It means the microtransit services, like Via. It
10 means conventional transit as well, and figuring out how
11 to increase the ridership and the utilization. And that
12 will be one of the most effective ways of reducing VMT.
13 And I would emphasize this is a local challenge, not
14 totally, but mostly. This is -- means coming up with ways
15 of incentivizing the pooling, figuring out working with
16 transit how you do the first/last mile, where they partner
17 with some of these other companies, private providers, or
18 maybe even get into the business themselves in some cases.

19 It means increasing the utilization of bus and
20 rail, where it works well, and not -- and getting away
21 from supporting it or funding it where it does not work so
22 well. There's other ways of doing that.

23 The overall strategy may be that to use and
24 thinking about this overall is what we need to do is
25 reduce VMT, but increase passenger miles traveled. And

1 that responds to a lot of the concerns here. And what
2 that means is provide more services to people. And it can
3 be -- it has to be in unconventional ways.

4 We sink a huge amount of money into transit. And
5 as we've heard the ridership is going down, so we've got
6 to get creative and innovative about it. But we can do --
7 and so if we do that, we can increase the passenger miles
8 traveled. That means providing more accessibility for low
9 income disadvantaged communities, elderly people, a lot of
10 people, young people as well.

11 Okay. So that was number one, the pooling, and
12 that's -- and that is a local -- mostly a local issue.

13 Number two is housing. That's a real crisis in
14 this State that everyone understands and acknowledges.
15 And that is also mostly a local issue, whether you call it
16 transit-oriented development, or whatever you want, but
17 it's somehow dealing with that housing crisis, so that
18 people are not moving way -- long distances away to get
19 cheap housing increasing their VMT.

20 Number three, this is also local, and that is
21 creating the incentives and disincentives for everything
22 I've just talked about. And that means the -- dealing
23 with reducing the sprawl, the transit-oriented
24 development, the pooling. You know, one little example of
25 that is that airports for instance. Most airports put a

1 tax on the Lyft and Uber, but they do it per ride. They
2 should change it to do -- to reduce it for the vehicles
3 that have multiple riders, and increase it for the ones
4 that have a single passenger, as just, you know, one
5 simple example.

6 And the fourth one is one for CARB and is more of
7 a statewide priority and responsibility. And that is we
8 do need to restructure the transportation funding. The SB
9 1 money that -- there's a lot of that SB 1 money, other
10 transportation funding, the cap-and-trade funds. We need
11 to restructure it in a way that it rewards cities and
12 counties that are implementing the kinds of strategies and
13 projects that do result in less VMT and more PMT, as I
14 said a moment ago.

15 And so at the end of the day, you know, I think a
16 lot of the people in the audience have to think about this
17 as partners in this. This is not -- you can't just point
18 at a CARB or even the MPOs. Most of these decisions are
19 at the local level. And CARB should play a strong
20 partnership role in that. And in a lot of ways that --
21 you know, including the funding and including performance
22 metrics and so on.

23 But at the end of the day, you know, it's the
24 responsibility of all of us. And a lot of the local
25 community-based organizations and NGOs have a big

1 responsibility in this. And I know there's frustration,
2 tried hard, sometimes it's failed, but that is the way the
3 change -- most of the change is going to happen, if we're
4 really going to be successful.

5 Thanks for letting me do that speech.

6 (Laughter.)

7 CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you very much.

8 Ms. Takvorian.

9 BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Thank you. Thank you
10 very much.

11 So I just wanted to start by thanking all of the
12 community members who were here today from throughout the
13 state of California and who testified today. Clearly,
14 there is a strong appetite for more ambitious targets and
15 for CARB intervention.

16 And this is the question before us today, and
17 this is the question that we must focus on and respond to,
18 the strategies for how to achieve those targets do need to
19 be develop at the local level. And MPOs have a
20 responsibility to advance the kinds of strategies that Dr.
21 Sperling just talked about. And CARB needs to set the
22 appropriate targets to make those to create that incentive
23 to have it happen.

24 I'm going to focus my comments for now on San
25 Diego, because San Diego environmental justice, and

1 environmental community groups, and community residents
2 have been advocating for decades for SANDAG to move
3 towards true VMT, and transparency, and GHG reduction.
4 And San Diego's interest in this issue are clearly very
5 high. I think they comprised at least over 50 percent of
6 the -- of the testimony that we heard this morning.

7 So I want to also thank staff for the important
8 changes that you're recommending that would be
9 incorporated in the performance objectives that would
10 include transparency, accountability, all of that is very
11 good.

12 What I'm disappointed about is, I feel, staff's
13 presentation was not responsive to the San Diego
14 community -- community's call for increased targets. And,
15 in fact, there was initially no meeting in San Diego
16 planned. That there had to be a request made, even though
17 San Diego representatives were the only ones that were
18 here at the December meeting. That was disappointing.

19 And we did appreciate that staff did come forward
20 and held a really productive meeting in San Diego, and we
21 really appreciated that.

22 So we appreciated that the MPOs are satisfied
23 with the cooperation that they have felt, but I didn't
24 hear that sentiment from most of the folks who testified
25 today or from the impacted communities. So we need to be

1 clear that the report and the recommendations are
2 obviously not universally supported.

3 I'm concerned about some of what I heard, which I
4 think are a little bit worst case scenarios. I think we
5 have to challenge and incentivize the MPOs. The
6 communities are really ready to step up and work for this.
7 This is about the lives of their families. And the worst
8 case scenarios are happening right now in the asthma rates
9 that -- in some of our communities that are three times
10 that of the county average. That's the worst case
11 scenario that a child is limited in their lives, and
12 aren't able to achieve what is a rightful, healthy,
13 quality of life. So the worst case is happening now, and
14 we have this opportunity to really change it.

15 SANDAG's problems are legendary, frankly. It's
16 unfortunate. I don't like being the representative from
17 San Diego that has to say that, but they've been well
18 articulated by public comment here and in previous
19 hearings.

20 There were incorrect VMT calculations, inaccurate
21 revenue and expenditure projections. And as a result, our
22 Measure A was rejected by San Diego voters in 2016. So we
23 don't have those sales tax dollars to utilize. So it's
24 true that there is a lack of funding or as much funding as
25 we would like to have.

1 We are, as a result of all of this disarray that
2 has been really building over the last several decades, a
3 very unusual and significant step was taken when AB 805
4 was signed into law in 2017. That bill, by Assembly Woman
5 Lorena Gonzalez Fletcher actually reorganized SANDAG in
6 very significant ways.

7 State of California stepped up to require a
8 course correction for San Diego. And among the changes is
9 there's an establishment of an audit committee to oversee
10 the revenue and expenditures and metrics that San Diego is
11 using, so we hopefully can get ourselves on the right
12 track, so we know what the data is and how we can move
13 forward.

14 There's a reorganization of the transportation
15 committee to focus on VMT reduction and prioritization of
16 transit. And there's a specific incorporation of
17 disadvantaged communities as defined by CalEnviroScreen in
18 State law that has to be incorporated into the Regional
19 Transportation Plan. And I think this relates to the
20 social equity analysis that Supervisor Gioia was talking
21 about.

22 SANDAG's model doesn't include a cumulative
23 impacts approach as CalEnviroScreen does, so it tends to
24 skew the communities that are identified as most impacted.

25 So SANDAG's target probably should be 25 percent

1 as many people have asked. It's clearly needed, but I'm
2 going to recommend 21 percent that we amend the resolution
3 to change it to 21 percent. I think it's justified by
4 CARB's own report that was put out in June. The February
5 report really did not provide clear evidence or a
6 metric-based rationale for the change.

7 San Diego is the only -- or SANDAG is the only
8 one of the big 4 MPOs that did not propose a higher
9 target -- target higher than their anticipated 2015 SCS
10 target.

11 And so therefore I'm going to make an
12 amendment -- a motion for an amendment that would call for
13 SANDAG's target to be changed to a 21 percent emission
14 reduction target by 2035. And I would like to move that
15 that be incorporated into the resolution.

16 CHAIR NICHOLS: I think we need to put the motion
17 forward first, so then you can propose the amendment to
18 it. I think that's how we need to do it.

19 BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Okay. So do you want to
20 come back to me when we're --

21 CHAIR NICHOLS: Yeah.

22 BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Okay.

23 CHAIR NICHOLS: Well, let's just have whatever
24 more discussion there is, understanding that you intend to
25 make that amendment.

1 BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Yeah.

2 CHAIR NICHOLS: So we'll move on.

3 Any others?

4 Supervisor Gioia is next.

5 BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: I just wanted to add a
6 little bit to my colleague Dan Sperling's comment. I do
7 think local action is important. But let me just qualify
8 that a little bit. I assume when you say local action,
9 we're mostly referring to local regional action, because
10 there's really no way that these issues are going to get
11 resolved city by city, county by county. I don't think
12 there's the -- frankly, in some cases, the political will.
13 There's a lot of -- and I say this, having been in local
14 government for like 30 years, that there's just -- these
15 big issues just won't get solved in each individual
16 jurisdiction. So I take it by local action, you're
17 referring sort of the MPOs, the regional action.

18 I do think the frustration that we heard is that
19 different regions of the state are going to have less
20 rigorous plans than other regions of the state, and the
21 frustration that there may not be a similar approach
22 statewide. And that's where our ability to set some, I
23 don't want to say minimum standards, but to set as much
24 guidance as possible to get more quality around the state
25 in how these plans are approached.

1 Like I honestly believe the Bay Area's plan is
2 more robust than SANDAG's plan, for example. And this is
3 not meant to try to criticize any part of the state. But
4 I think we can play a role in trying to incentivize and
5 support the regional actions to be as strong as possible.

6 I don't have -- I wish I could have more faith
7 that local government can step up to solve all of these
8 issues. I think there is a value to statewide standards,
9 and statewide incentives.

10 So that's just -- just maybe to amend your
11 comments a bit, and see how we can achieve that in our
12 resolution.

13 CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. Mr. Florez. Senator
14 Florez.

15 BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Thank you. Trying to
16 figure out the system here. Well, I would just say first
17 and foremost, I agree with John Gioia, and, of course, my
18 colleague from the EJ community.

19 I think the value of this is not only being
20 engaged in the game, but getting dialogue. And I just
21 want to take the Board back to a moment in Fresno, where
22 we had a pause, and we had an opportunity to pull people
23 to the table. And that was time well spent. I think it
24 was getting folks to dialogue, to shoot towards maybe the
25 higher goal. And us being engaged in this, I think, was

1 very much of a positive.

2 So I would support Ms. Takvorian's motion when it
3 does come up.

4 CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. Great.

5 I think we're now actually ready to get to that
6 point. So we have a Resolution 18-12.

7 Do I have a motion and a second?

8 CHIEF COUNSEL PETER: Excuse me, Chair Nichols.

9 I think the staff wanted to do a CEQA response.

10 CHAIR NICHOLS: I was told that I was supposed to
11 reopen the record after that happened.

12 DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER KARPEROS: I apologize,
13 Chair Nichols, if I was unclear. Reopen the record just
14 before the vote.

15 CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. All right.

16 DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER KARPEROS: So right now.

17 CHAIR NICHOLS: I appreciate this carefully
18 nuanced legal advice that I am receiving here.

19 (Laughter.)

20 CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you. All right. Before we
21 act to put forward the resolution, let's hear from the
22 staff in response to the comments then.

23 ATTORNEY MONROE: Chair Nichols, this is Gabriel
24 Monroe an attorney for the SB 375 program. We're going to
25 start with some responses to some comments that raised

1 some questions of economic analysis related to the current
2 proposal. And then we're going to come back to staff for
3 some supplemental responses to the environmental analysis.

4 CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay.

5 CHIEF ECONOMIST WIMBERGER: Chair Nichols, hello.

6 CHAIR NICHOLS: Yes, you're hiding behind your
7 screen.

8 CHIEF ECONOMIST WIMBERGER: I'm hiding behind a
9 very large monitor, sorry.

10 This is Emily Wimberger. Staff heard comments on
11 potential economically regressive consequences of the SB
12 375 targets. In addition to ongoing staff work and
13 whatever that the Board directs staff to do, it is
14 important to note that staff have, in fact, carefully
15 considered these issues. Specifically, the SB 375 staff
16 report refers to the economic analysis for the updated
17 scoping plan, which the Board approved in December.

18 The scoping plan update recognizes the role that
19 reducing growth in VMT plays in supporting other important
20 public health, equity, economic and conservation goals.

21 The modeling for the scoping plan was conducted
22 using two Models, E3's PATHWAYS Model and REMI, a
23 macroeconomic model that was run internally by ARB, and it
24 used cost and emission reductions estimated from the
25 PATHWAYS Model.

1 The PATHWAYS Model includes inputs for vehicle
2 stock VMT and vehicle efficiency. And these were derived
3 from the VISION Model, which draws from EMFAC 2014, with
4 VMT updated to reflect adopted RTPs and SCSs. The
5 economic analysis in the scoping plan includes the
6 incremental costs between the reference or
7 business-as-usual case, and the scoping plan scenario.

8 The inputs between the reference scenario and the
9 scoping plan include changes in VMT and stock that come
10 from the VISION Model.

11 The REMI Model is then used to estimate the
12 impact of the scoping plan on the California economy,
13 California employment, and personal income. And we use
14 personal income as a proxy to estimate the impact on
15 households. The estimated impact to households in 2030
16 from -- of the scoping plan implementation is estimated at
17 \$115 to \$280.

18 The economic analysis also includes an assessment
19 of the impact of the scoping plan by region, as well as
20 comparing the impact on disadvantaged communities relative
21 to other census tracts.

22 The results show that there is not a discernible
23 difference between the impact to disadvantaged communities
24 relative to the overall regional in which they are
25 located. In other words, the modeling which staff has

1 conducted does not show a disproportionate economic impact
2 to disadvantaged communities. On the contrary, we
3 anticipate that SB 375 and the scoping plan in general
4 will support more equitable access to housing and
5 transportation. Staff is also supportive of continued
6 work to develop metrics and tools in this area.

7 Lastly, staff did quantify and monetize the
8 avoided health impacts associated with implementing the
9 scoping plan, which includes SB 375. The analysis shows
10 that there are health benefits, including avoided
11 premature mortality, avoided hospitalizations, and avoided
12 ER visits due to implementing the scoping plan.

13 These health benefits are estimated to range from
14 1.2 to 1.8 billion dollars in 2030, and these estimates do
15 not include any benefits associated with increases and
16 active transportation, which may be substantial.

17 Thanks.

18 CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you. Any questions on
19 that?

20 Then let's move on to the responses to the CEQA
21 comments.

22 AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST KING: Thank you. We
23 did receive comments claiming generally that our CEQA
24 analysis was inadequate. We respond that generally our
25 CEQA analysis, including the draft and final environmental

1 analyses and related processes, were legally adequate, and
2 analyzed all reasonably foreseeable environmental impacts
3 at a programmatic level appropriate to this high level
4 target-setting proposal.

5 We also received a comment that the environmental
6 analysis should have considered detailed impacts from
7 development across the state. Staff responds that the
8 environmental analysis prepared for the target update --
9 this target update proceeding is necessarily programmatic
10 in nature since CARB's action involves setting regional
11 greenhouse gas reduction targets.

12 Staff has reviewed the environmental impacts
13 resulting from regional planning agencies' actions, as
14 disclosed in their planning level environmental documents,
15 and prepared our final EA in a manner that discloses those
16 impacts as an appropriate level of specificity for the
17 high level planning action provided before you today.

18 The regional planning agencies have discretion as
19 to how to incorporate those targets into their planning
20 level documents, which will include their own CEQA
21 analysis as appropriate. Individual development projects
22 will also be subject to even more specific CEQA review
23 requirements when specific development projects are
24 proposed.

25 The commenter is essentially asking for multiple

1 levels of duplicative CEQA review that is not required at
2 this high level planning stage.

3 A commenter also referenced her separate comments
4 on the scoping plan update proceeding in December 2017.
5 Staff responds that the scoping plan update proceeding was
6 a separate proceeding, not under consideration today, with
7 its own environmental analysis. Responses to the
8 commenter's scoping plan comments were prepared and
9 approved prior to the scoping plan update approval.
10 Staff's responses to those comments, which the Board has
11 already reviewed and approved, are incorporated by
12 reference here.

13 We also heard a comment that CARB failed to
14 consider impacts to population and housing. Another
15 commenter raised impacts of the program on agriculture
16 generally, though it is not clear that this was intended
17 as a CEQA comment. In any event, staff responds that it
18 did consider those potential impacts as set forth in
19 chapter 4 of the final EA.

20 CHAIR NICHOLS: All right. Thank you.

21 At that point, I think we do close the record.
22 And let's -- let's bring forward the resolution. We have
23 a motion and a second.

24 And now we can consider amendments.

25 BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: I was moving the staff

1 recommendation with the amendment.

2 BOARD MEMBER MITCHELL: Second.

3 CHAIR NICHOLS: I see. Well, I think that's
4 fine. We needed a second to your amendment, I think.

5 BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Second.

6 BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: I think we had one.

7 CHAIR NICHOLS: And you had that from Mr. Florez.
8 Okay. That's great.

9 BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: And I have some
10 whereases to go with it, which I can read or I can
11 dispense with that just -- whatever your pleasure is.

12 CHAIR NICHOLS: Well, you could go ahead and do
13 that. I wanted to add one more amendment, which is very
14 simply to incorporate the comments that -- the responses
15 to the comments that we've just heard from staff as part
16 of the resolution that we'll be voting on as well, so it's
17 clear that they are part of the resolution. If you want
18 to add.

19 BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Sure. Thank you.

20 So whereas the San Diego Association Of
21 Governments is undergoing implementation of Assembly Bill
22 805, and according to Section 7 of Article 11 under
23 chapter 4 - thank you - of Division 11 of the Public
24 Utilities Code; whereas SANDAG is the only MPO in the
25 state organizational structure that also mandates its

1 prioritization of transit and requires that SANDAG's
2 regional comprehensive.

3 BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: You're going to have
4 to start over again, because he can't hear you.

5 BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: I'm sorry. You want me
6 to start from the beginning?

7 CHAIR NICHOLS: Or you could just give him the
8 language. I think if it's substantially what we discussed
9 before --

10 BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: It is. That's why I was
11 asking if you wanted me to read it.

12 CHAIR NICHOLS: I see. I'm sorry. We're not
13 used to actually proceeding with this amount of formality.
14 So I think we're all just kind of improvising here. I
15 think it's acceptable if we all understand that what
16 you're doing is changing number to 21 from what was
17 proposed by the staff, that that's the proposal. We don't
18 have to --

19 BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: For San Diego. Yes,
20 that's right.

21 CHAIR NICHOLS: Only for San Diego.

22 BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: It just references in
23 the whereases the changing environment that AB 805
24 presents.

25 CHAIR NICHOLS: Yes.

1 Dr. Balmes.

2 BOARD MEMBER BALMES: I just want to be clear,
3 only for San Diego?

4 BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: That's my motion.

5 CHAIR NICHOLS: That is the motion

6 CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. That's it.

7 Any other -- are we all set?

8 Okay. In that case, I think we're prepared to
9 vote at this point.

10 BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: Do we vote on that --
11 those changes or are we just voting --

12 CHAIR NICHOLS: Well, the two changes are the
13 responses to comments and the movement to 21, yes. I
14 thought the correct procedure -- I may need help here --
15 was to vote on the amendment separately first and decide
16 whether we were going to agree to the amendment, and then
17 vote on the resolution. Okay.

18 I see heads nodding.

19 ATTORNEY MONROE: Sorry, Chair Nichols and Board
20 members, if you do -- it's Gabriel Monroe over here. If
21 you do approve this increase in the target for SANDAG, we
22 would have an additional bit of language that we would
23 like to suggest that you include in the resolution along
24 with that, that I can read in now or if you want to
25 discuss it and vote on it first, I can read it in later.

1 CHAIR NICHOLS: I think you'd better give it to
2 us now.

3 ATTORNEY MONROE: Okay. So it would be
4 another -- it would be language that would say, "Be it
5 further resolved the increased targets are within the
6 scope of the existing draft and final EAs would not
7 present any new or substantially increased significant
8 impacts not already analyzed in the final EA, and would
9 not present any of the scenarios set forth in section
10 15088.5(a) of the CEQA guidelines requiring recirculation
11 of final EA.

12 CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. So the change in staff's
13 view does not necessitate any further analysis, which I
14 think we would want to -- we would want to know that. So
15 let's proceed.

16 VICE CHAIR BERG: Could I -- could I just ask a
17 point of clarification?

18 CHAIR NICHOLS: Um-hmm.

19 VICE CHAIR BERG: Because I'm really
20 uncomfortable with the fact that we're singling out one
21 MPO. We also had someone ask us to increase Fresno, but
22 they're, you know -- I'm uncomfortable as to since San
23 Diego is at 19 percent as the other large MPOs, they
24 started out at 13 and went to 19, I believe. And it's not
25 that I disagree with my fellow Board member, it's just I

1 don't feel very qualified to make a decision strictly on
2 one MPO.

3 And so, Diane, maybe if you could help me as to
4 why we would increase San Diego and not increase the other
5 three MPOs, not that I'm advocating that, because I think
6 there's great challenge here. And I also agree with
7 Professor Sperling. We can pick a number and how the
8 modeling turns out is that really going to give us more
9 action?

10 And so I want to be supportive. I agree with
11 what we need to do here on SB 375, but I just need to
12 express my concern to make sure that we're moving forward
13 in a way that we expect to.

14 BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Thank you, Ms. Berg. I
15 appreciate the question, and I wanted to speak
16 specifically about San Diego, because that's the region
17 that I know the best. And it seems to me that because of
18 the unprecedented State action that was taken in 2017 with
19 the adoption of AB 805, which amends the Health and Safety
20 Code and -- amends the Health and Safety Code related to
21 the operation of SANDAG. It changes the organizational
22 structure. It applies new responsibilities to SANDAG to
23 be more focused on transit, to actually incorporate
24 disadvantaged communities in -- in their planning.

25 And in their planning specifically of transit, it

1 also sets up a new audit committee that holds them more
2 accountable because there's been problems in the past.

3 Those are some of the reasons why, in addition to
4 what you've heard as inaction moving towards reducing VMT,
5 that we think it's appropriate, I think it's appropriate,
6 that their target be increased. So that's the rationale
7 that I'm presenting to all of you for consideration.

8 VICE CHAIR BERG: So, and I would -- I understand
9 they were one of the lowest ones at 13 percent. And
10 they've come out now to meet the others, where they were
11 at 15, 16, and another also 13 to 19. So you don't feel
12 that going those extra, you know three, four percent up to
13 the 19 doesn't meet your criteria, you think it should go
14 even more?

15 BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Well, I share Dr.
16 Sperling and your, I think, and probably other people's
17 concerns about metrics and about how these things have
18 been calculated. The best we can do -- and that's why I
19 think staff's approach is really a good one, that we're
20 going to improve metrics, that we're going to focus on it,
21 that we're going to have a common set of metrics and ways
22 that we measure this progress going forward, and that's
23 desperately needed, because we've been off in San Diego.

24 But what we can focus on is that, for instance,
25 SCAG and Bay Area are spending tens of millions more. I

1 think some 50 percent more in transportation dollars and
2 transit dollars than SANDAG is spending per capita.

3 So we've got evidence that the performance just
4 isn't at the same level as well. So I think that, coupled
5 with the new structuring that's happening, and the new
6 eyes on their performance from both CARB, as well as from
7 the State are reasons for them to perform more.

8 VICE CHAIR BERG: Thank you for helping me.

9 CHAIR NICHOLS: Yeah, I think that Ms. Takvorian
10 has provided a good basis for distinguishing San Diego
11 from other parts of the state, which also had people here
12 to advocate for higher numbers, but I'm not going to
13 support the resolution anyway, the amendment, because I
14 feel that we've heard enough to know that these numbers
15 are largely symbolic. And therefore, to symbolically go
16 after San Diego because of the -- what have been found to
17 be deficiencies in their program in the past, when we
18 haven't really had that engagement with them before now is
19 like the ARB just coming with a -- you know, from out
20 of -- out of nowhere in effect and giving them a higher
21 number without having given them an opportunity to justify
22 why they're already being asked to do a lot more than
23 they've already been asked to do before.

24 I have to admit I feel a little -- although, he's
25 not here. It's not -- you know, he can't speak for

1 himself, but it does bother me a little bit that the
2 representative of San Diego who is on this Board isn't
3 here to speak on this issue. So I feel somewhat troubled
4 about that as well.

5 Any other comments on the amendment?

6 If not, I think we'll have the clerk call the
7 roll please on the amendment -- on the amendment, yes.

8 BOARD CLERK McREYNOLDS: Dr. Balmes?

9 BOARD MEMBER BALMES: No. Excuse me. No.

10 BOARD CLERK McREYNOLDS: Mr. De La Torre?

11 BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: No.

12 BOARD CLERK McREYNOLDS: Mr. Eisenhut?

13 BOARD MEMBER EISENHUT: No.

14 BOARD CLERK McREYNOLDS: Senator Florez?

15 BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Aye.

16 BOARD CLERK McREYNOLDS: Assembly Member Garcia?
17 Supervisor Gioia?

18 BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: Yes.

19 BOARD CLERK McREYNOLDS: Senator -- oh, I'm
20 sorry. Ms. Mitchell?

21 BOARD MEMBER MITCHELL: No.

22 BOARD CLERK McREYNOLDS: Mrs. Riordan?
23 Supervisor Serna?

24 BOARD MEMBER SERNA: No.

25 BOARD CLERK McREYNOLDS: Dr. Sherriffs?

1 BOARD MEMBER SHERRIFFS: No.

2 BOARD CLERK McREYNOLDS: Professor Sperling?

3 BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: No.

4 BOARD CLERK McREYNOLDS: Ms. Takvorian?

5 BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Yes.

6 BOARD CLERK McREYNOLDS: Vice Chair Berg?

7 VICE CHAIR BERG: No.

8 BOARD CLERK McREYNOLDS: Chair Nichols?

9 CHAIR NICHOLS: No.

10 BOARD CLERK McREYNOLDS: Yes votes win, the
11 motion passes -- or, I'm sorry, the motion does not pass,
12 10 to 2.

13 CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you. All right. We'll now
14 move to the main motion

15 Three yeases.

16 BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Metrics.

17 CHAIR NICHOLS: You've got to count every vote
18 you get. This is important. All right.

19 DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER KARPEROS: Chair
20 Nichols?

21 CHAIR NICHOLS: Yes.

22 DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER KARPEROS: I apologize
23 again for the procedural issues. Your amendment about
24 incorporating the response to comments.

25 CHAIR NICHOLS: Yes. Do we need a separate vote?

1 DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER KAPEROS: You still
2 need to dispense with that.

3 CHAIR NICHOLS: Yes, I think we can dispense with
4 a separate vote on that, unless anybody wants to call for
5 a separate vote on that.

6 Hearing none -- nobody suggest that. Let us move
7 to the resolution as amended. And I think we can probably
8 do that without going through a roll call vote.

9 All those in favor please say aye?

10 (Unanimous aye vote.)

11 CHAIR NICHOLS: All those opposed?

12 Abstentions?

13 Thank you. It passes.

14 So thank you, everybody. This was a good
15 discussion, and very good hearing. Really appreciated the
16 participation of the -- all of the people who came in to
17 try to help us.

18 We now need to shift the cast of players at the
19 table. We're moving on to three different, but very
20 related items. An update on the progress of the State
21 strategy for our State Implementation Plan, and the South
22 Coast Air Quality Management Plan, an informational update
23 on concepts for minimizing the community health impacts
24 from freight facilities, and an update on implementation
25 of Assembly Bill 617, the Community Air Protection