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P R O C E E D I N G S

CHAIR NICHOLS: Good morning, everybody. Would you please take your seats We're about to begin.
Will you please take your seats.
I guess -- I think people are having a really good time, but it's time to start the meeting or we could have a meeting of our own, I guess.

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

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

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

CHAIRPERSON NICHOLS: Would the clerk please call the roll.

BOARD CLERK McREYNOLDS: Dr. Balmes?
BOARD MEMBER BALMES: Here.
BOARD CLERK McREYNOLDS: Mr. De La Torre?
BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: Here.
BOARD CLERK McREYNOLDS: Mr. Eisenhut?
BOARD MEMBER EISENHUT: Here.
BOARD CLERK McREYNOLDS: Senator Florez?
BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Here.
BOARD CLERK McREYNOLDS: Assembly Member Garcia?
Supervisor Gioia?
BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: Here.
BOARD CLERK McREYNOLDS: Senator Lara?
Ms. Mitchell?
BOARD MEMBER MITCHELL: Here.
BOARD CLERK McREYNOLDS: Mrs. Riordan?
Supervisor Roberts?
Supervisor Serna?
BOARD MEMBER SERNA: Here.
BOARD CLERK McREYNOLDS: Dr. Sherriffs?
BOARD CLERK McREYNOLDS: Professor Sperling?
BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: Here.
BOARD CLERK McREYNOLDS: Ms. Takvorian?
BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Here.
BOARD CLERK McREYNOLDS: Vice Chair Berg?
VICE CHAIR BERG: Here.
BOARD CLERK McREYNOLDS: Chair Nichols?
CHAIR NICHOLS: Here.
BOARD CLERK McREYNOLDS: Madam Chair, we have a quorum.
CHAIR NICHOLS: Great. A couple of announcements
to make before we get started.

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

Madam translator, would you repeat that, please?

(Thereupon interpretation in Spanish.)

CHAIR NICHOLS: Gracias.

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

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

I want to make sure that speakers are aware that
the Board will impose a three minute time limit. We appreciate it if you give your name when you come up to the podium and then put your testimony into your own words. It's easier for us to follow it if you will just get straight to your main points.

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

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

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

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

BOARD CLERK McREYNOLDS: Madam Chair, we had two
people sign up to speak for this item.

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

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

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: Yes. Thanks, Chair.

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

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

Among the proposed measures in the State SIP Strategy was a commitment to develop the incentive funding to achieve further emission reductions from on-road heavy-duty vehicles or the South Coast's incentive
measure. This item delivers on that commitment.

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

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

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

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

California already has in place the accounting framework to receive SIP credit for incentive projects after the projects have been completed, and the funds
expended. The South Coast incentive measure extends that framework to future projects for incentive programs where the future funding stream is guaranteed.

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

That concludes pie remarks.

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

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

Thanks.

MS. GAMBLE: Good morning.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Good morning.

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

I'm here for two reasons: One to say I hope you have the courage and the commitment to draft for the no emi -- zero emission for the drayage trucks. And I just learned what that words means, so that's the one that -- the trucks that go from city to city, from the port to the -- to the other cities, so that's one of the reasons.
And the other reason I'm here is I'm hoping that the draft includes we say good jobs, but good jobs to me mean jobs that can afford a family to support itself.

So thank you.

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

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

Hi.

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

CHAIR NICHOLS: Minault.

MR. MINAULT: That's quite all right.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Pronounced the French way.

MR. MINAULT: French names are awful difficult.

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

Right now, I'm teaching a class of students through L.A. Trade Tech to help them pass entrance examples to union apprenticeship programs. And the unions that are looking to recruit are the ones like IBEW Local 11, whose members will build the battery electric buses
that will be deployed across Southern California in the next 12 years, as well as building the charging infrastructure to go with it.

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

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

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you very much.

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

And I think what we'll do is ask Mr. Corey to briefly speak to those items and then we'll let Mr. Eger
come -- or Eder pardon me, Eder, come forward and speak on all of them.

Okay.

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

CHAIR NICHOLS: Excuse me?

BOARD CLERK McREYNOLDS: Take a vote for this item?

CHAIR NICHOLS: I'm not understanding.

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

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

Okay.

Would you go ahead, please.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: Yes. Thanks, Chair.

So the second consent item I'm going to briefly describe it. CARB staff has proposed amendments to the Cap-and-Trade Regulation in order to accomplish two goals. First, CARB staff seeks to clarify existing requirements related to changes of facility ownership. Specifically, the proposed amendments clarify that the Cap-and-Trade Regulation requires a successor entity after change of
ownership to be responsible for the outstanding
pre-transfer compliance obligation of the predecessor
covered entity. This clarification is made in light of
ongoing bankruptcy litigation involving a covered entity
in the program.

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

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

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

The proposed amendments do not change the
structure of the program. CARB staff will also continue
with the rulemaking process to propose more substantial modifications to comport with the requirements of AB 398. That process will conclude after the -- in -- over the course of this -- this year.

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

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

The majority of these proposals includes low overhead rate and leverages the expertise of researchers within the University of California and California State
University systems.
And we recommend approval of these proposals.
That concludes the summary.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you very much. Okay. Okay
No. Sorry.
Mr. Eder, would you please come forward.

MR. EDER: Good morning. My name is Harvey Eder.
I'm speaking for myself and for the Public Solar Power
Coalition. First, I have a process question.
Am I getting three minutes on each -- you know,
each of the three items?

CHAIR NICHOLS: I think three minutes total, sir.
MR. EDER: I protest that, and say that my time
is being cut. I don't know how the Brown Act fits in or
whatever.
Anyway, for the district on one again echoing
what the previous two speakers said there should be
zero-emission vehicles, trucks, battery. I incorporate by
reference the February issue of The Economist, the article
on electric vehicles, electric trucks. They're here
today. Anyway, it's cost effective, and whatnot. And
been looking at this and talking to manufacturers.

On greenhouse -- okay, first of all, for natural
gas, it's biased. This plan is a fossil fuel natural gas
plant. All the plants for the state have been. Ninety
percent of gas is imported into the state. Health and Safety Code 530002(b) says the legislative intent is to not use fossil fuels, especially non-renewable imported into this State. This is not even published in the blue book, this 53000. And it also includes for a solar financing secondary mortgage entity. Anyway, this -- this has been purged. This is 81 from Row Behrity[phonetic].

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

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

I think we need to take them up in order. So let's start with the first one, which is the incentives. I'm sorry. I didn't -- I'm trying to learn how to use the system. Okay. Got it.
BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: No problem. Thank you. I'm glad actually we pulled some of the items. I would like to ask staff and -- in the future, I know this item on cap and trade is on consent. I'm just wondering, given the timeframe of the legislation, given the ongoing conversation in this realm, whether or not we should not put cap and trade on consent moving forward, and for a couple of -- couple of reasons.

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

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

BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Yes.

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

BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Okay.

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER CHANG: The second piece
was an oversight in the drafting of the regulation when we linked with Ontario. And currently, if the Ontario floor price is the one that is — is the floor price that we should us, there's no mechanism in the regulation to choose that. So these are very, very small surgical changes that, as Mr. Corey said, don't affect the broader structure of the regulation or the broader regulatory changes that we are currently workshopping and having conversations with stakeholders about.

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

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

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

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

Thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Yes. Well, I'm going to take that as a Board member request of the staff, and --
BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: However, you'd like to do it.

CHAIR NICHOLS: -- ask the staff to respond.

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

CHAIR NICHOLS: Yeah, absolutely.

BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Okay. Thank you.

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

BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: At some point.

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

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

So we thought it was really important to get that
one fixed and clarified right away. So any other Board
members wanted to comment on item number 1? If not, we
can have a resolution.

        I have a motion.

        Yes. Sorry.

        BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Hello.

        CHAIR NICHOLS: Your yellow light is flashing.

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

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

        BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Yes.

        EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: Yes.
BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Thank you

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

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: So moved.

VICE CHAIR BERG: Second.

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

(Unanimous aye vote.)

CHAIR NICHOLS: Opposed?

Any abstentions?

Okay. Great.

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

BOARD MEMBER BALMES: So moved.

VICE CHAIR BERG: Second.

CHAIR NICHOLS: All in favor, please say aye?

(Unanimous aye vote.)

CHAIR NICHOLS: Opposed?
None.
And any abstentions?
Okay. Great.
Then on item number 3, which is the seven research proposals, no one has addressed those seven research proposals.
I don't know if any Board members have any comments on them?
BOARD MEMBER BALMES: I think I have to recuse myself as a UC employee.
CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. All right.
Any other?
BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: Likewise also.
CHAIR NICHOLS: So, all right, Dr. Sperling as well. So our two -- our two actual researchers can't vote on the research proposals, but I guess that's the -- that's the way it is.
With those two excepted, I'll ask for a motion from --
BOARD MEMBER SHERRIFFS: Move approval.
BOARD MEMBER MITCHELL: Second.
CHAIR NICHOLS: Motion and a second. All in favor please say aye?
(Unanimous aye vote.)
(Professor Sperling and Dr. Balmes recused.)
CHAIR NICHOLS: Opposed?

None.

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

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

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

This is not simply an update to the numerical targets. As we know, SB 375 was not intended to simply lead us to develop better modeling, but also to prompt changes in land use and transportation policy. This
update presents a new framework for SB 375 that brings
greater focus to tracking and monitoring the policies and
investments that are occurring at the regional level.

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

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

Mr. Corey.

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

During that discussion, the Board expressed
interest in staff's proposed direction and provided
comments focusing on helping address challenges the MPOs
faced, as well as the importance of setting targets to
achieve concrete benefits for communities around the State.

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

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

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

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

Heather

(Thereupon an overhead presentation was
AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST KING: Thank you, Mr. Corey. Good morning, Chair Nichols and members of the Board.

--o0o--

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

--o0o--

AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST KING: We came to you in December with an informational update on staff's current thinking on the SB 375 targets. These are, of course, the per capita greenhouse gas emission reduction targets that apply to passenger vehicles. At that time, we also recommended a paradigm shift in how CARB evaluates the sustainable communities strategies, the SCSs, that are prepared by the state's metropolitan planning organizations, the MPOs. And we also talked to you about how we plan to approach tracking implementation moving forward.
Staff is proposing three key elements as part of the proposal before you today. The first is to adopt the proposed higher numeric targets. This is the same proposal you heard about in December. The second element would direct staff to work with the MPOs to recognize and isolate actual progress due to the land-use trans -- and transportation policies and investments inside each of their plans.

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

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

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

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

--o0o--
AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST KING: For the targets themselves, this slide summarizes the existing and proposed 2035 targets for the four largest MPOs in the state. As we discussed with you in December, preliminarily SACOG's target is going to be structured as a pilot. Under this recommendation, SACOG's target is 19 percent with SACOG responsible for developing some innovative programs to address challenges that are unique to the SACOG region in its 2020 MTP.

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

If adopted by the Board, the proposed targets would take effect October 1st, 2018, which is exactly eight years from when the original targets were established. CARB is able to set targets for years 2020 and 2035, though not listed on the slide, the 2020 targets would be brought in line with the existing anticipated performance of the current SCSs, which we see as a necessary clean-up step. And as 2020 approaches, it will become the first milestone reporting year under SB 375 for implementation.
AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST KING: Here are the existing and proposed higher targets for the eight San Joaquin Valley MPOs. These targets would apply to the third round of SCSs prepared by the valley MPOs.

Next slide, please.

--o0o--

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

Next slide, please.

--o0o--

AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST KING: Thank you.

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

As you'll recall from our discussion in December, there's a gap between what the scoping plan scenario calls for from this sector, and what the SB 375 Program can realistically achieve. We did hear from stakeholders who want SB 375 to be more ambitious. For example, several
stakeholders have said that targets should be set at 25 percent right in line with what the scoping plan calls for from this sector.

So why not just make the targets 25 percent?

Let's talk about that. SB 375 allows the MPOs to recommend their targets to CARB, which they have done so. The MPOs' recommendations to CARB were very much a continuation of what their existing SCSs would more or less achieve, if they're implemented. And as we describe in our final staff report, which we published in February, we do believe that the MPOs can do more. Our proposal is a push on the MPOs to do more than what they would achieve on paper today.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

There are disadvantaged communities who are
seeking certain pots of State funding to implement some of the projects that are in today's SCSs. And those jurisdictions could, in some cases, become effectively ineligible overnight for that money.

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

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

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

--o0o--

AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST KING: Over the last two months, as you've heard, we've conducted four workshops around the state to reach out to more of our stakeholders
about how to get more out of SB 375. We had 130
stakeholders attend in person.

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

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

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

SB 375 was always about providing choices,
choices for where to live, choices for how to get around. And today's proposal seeks to acknowledge the need for further progress, not only on emissions, but for access to choices, and providing those choices will lower VMT.

--o0o--

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

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

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

In addition, just last year, SB 375 was amended to add a third piece to CARB's role in SB 375. Until now,
we've been limited to setting targets and reviewing SCSs. But this new piece calls for monitoring SB 375 implementation to date. So as part of this target update, we're introducing a monitoring component.

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

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

    --o0o--

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

    --o0o--

    AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST KING: That serves as the basis for this list of seven focus areas listed on this slide. We're organizing around these seven topics: healthy communities, land use and the struggles with local control, the affordable housing crisis, access to
transportation choices, incentives and the price of driving, next generation mobility, and the decision-making process itself as to how the money gets allocated and how do the projects get selected.

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

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

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

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

--o0o--

AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST KING: During the next several months, we'll take what we learn, we'll extract out what are the right metrics to track, what are the actionable items and what are the best practices? This spring we plan to conduct a public process to solicit input on how we'll update our program guidelines for evaluating the SCSs. We anticipate having a draft available this summer, and we plan to finalize those guidelines prior to when the new targets would take effect later this year.

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

We'll update you, the Board, prior to your joint
meeting with the California Transportation Commission later this year with some of these action items that could potentially be brought to the table for those meetings.

--o0o--

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

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

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

--o0o--

AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST KING: As you've heard today, our recommended proposal to update the SB 375 targets aims to achieve multiple goals, one of which is to complete a statutory requirement to update the targets every eight years. CARB may update the target every four
years, as conditions change. So your next opportunity to revise the targets would be in 2022.

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

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

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you. Thank you very much.

Dr. Balmes, just had a brief comment here.

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

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

AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST KING: Thank you.

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

So I guess this is a question or comment at this point. One piece that seems to be missing from the discussion, maybe it's included elsewhere, is the role of funding. And the -- it gets brought up all the time by
the MPOs is, okay, so you've got a plan. Now, where's the money going to come from to actually implement it?

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

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

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

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: Sure, Chairman.

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

But more substantively, I think this was really at the core of the bill, presents an opportunity, for instance, the conversations of the implementation of the scoping plan, the implementation of 375, the intersection of transportation policy and funding. Just as you said Chair, that the CTC plays a significant role over in terms of transportation funding and decisions that will be with
us for decades, and the opportunity to -- for the Board to engage with CTC in terms of that decision-making process, and how it comports with the State's long-term policies, in terms of air quality, climate policy, and some of the issues that are raised with 375.

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

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

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

And so I think maybe there's at least some hope on the horizon that we may have found a new mechanism that
might -- that might help with that problem.

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

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

AGP VIDEO: The microphone is not on.

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

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

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

And I think we know that as one implements these plans, there is a great potential in some regions to impact people who are living in these communities, especially lower income communities. And I was involved
in the development of the first SCS in the Bay Area, Plan Bay Area. And that issue was discussed frequently. And there was a lot of thought given to that.

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

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

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

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

We very much agree with you that there is a need as we move forward with implementation of SB 375, and
particularly with the requirements that have been added under SB 150 for the tracking that we're talking about --

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: Right.

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

This particular finding relates to the target-setting process.

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: No, I realize that.

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER KARPEROS: Right.

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: I realize that.

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

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

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: I mean, I know this is an issue that my -- a number of my colleagues have raised as well. And so what does it take to ensure that we're getting a commitment to doing these things?
Because I'm not so certain that when folks walk out of the room, that when push comes to shove, knowing sort of the discussions that go on in each of the regions that we -- that we would get those strong metrics.

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

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

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

Okay. Thanks.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Great. Professor Sperling.

BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: I just have a few short comments, because I want to have a more robust discussion later. But I first want to repeat what Professor Balmes said, that was, I thought, the most brilliant, insightful
staff presentation I've heard in a very long time. It was sophisticated, and clearly I agreed with it.

(Laughter.)

BOARD MEMBER BALMES: You made her blush.

(Laughter.)

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

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

And so I'm -- I think we're on the right path,
but we need to really up our game. And we can talk about the details later.

  Thank you.

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

MR. IKHRATA: (Nods head.)

CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. Great, starting with Hasan Ikhrata from SCAG.

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

(Thereupon an overhead presentation was presented as follows.)

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

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

We met several times. We talked about what's happening, where we need to go. A couple of things I want
to mention and I want to commit to today. And my
colleagues from San Francisco, Sacramento, and San Diego
will also speak to that.

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

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

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

So with all of that, we've been discussing here
how do we reduce per capita greenhouse gas emission? Now,
the transit decline doesn't mean that transit is bad.
We're investing heavily in transit in Southern California. L.A. County just voted $120 billion to build more transit.

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

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

Having said that, I think MPOs, with the help from ARB and CTC, could bribe the cities to do the right thing by providing them funding. And I think we have done that in the past, and it works. I think many cities, if you incentivize them, they'll be willing to do the right thing. So we will be reporting in and tracking homes and
jobs being developed in underserved communities in high
quality transit areas, and making sure that we're not
driving the original residents out of their homes because
we're doing transit-oriented development. We will commit
to that, and we spoke to your staff about that.

The question in front of us is we need to reverse
the trend that's happening right now. I think I'm
supposed to push some buttons here to get --
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MR. IKHRATA: Okay. We are supposed to reverse
the trends that's going in the wrong direction. We're
also supposed to reduce and get to the 25 percent. I
believe we can. And what the approach that your staff
proposing to you is a good one, it is not like us saying
let us go through our modeling exercise, but coming back
to you every year, and saying to you, hear what we did
differently, hear how it's working, and hear how it's
going to lead to us getting that 25 percent.

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

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

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

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

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

--o0o--

MR. IKHRATA: And with that, I'm going to turn it
to my colleague from San Diego.

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

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

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: Okay. Thank you.

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

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

So on the planning side, the basis of our
regional plan has been on urban area transit strategy. We adopted that with our last plan. And actually investments really focus on those types of strategies in the urban area where there's existing infrastructure and existing population.

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

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

We're also working on things like regional clean fuel infrastructure, chargers, fueling stations, whatnot to promote a regional infrastructure to actually help meet
the state's goals and our local goals for that. So that's on the planning side.

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

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

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

Not everyone can afford Uber or Lyft. So we
really need to look at how you can transform, you know, senior and para-transit services, and hopefully use technology to support that.

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

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

So local sales tax measure dollars are being used to preserve open space, and preserve -- we've, to date, preserved, and leveraged enough dollars, and preserved about 8,600 acres of open space, real critical habitat in
the region. And what that does it also directs
development into the urbanized areas.

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

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

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

SO we've worked with those groups to identify
those. We've also done statewide working with our
partners to develop a social equity analysis tool that
could be use statewide.
BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: And I'm sure my colleague from San Diego will comment about that, since you're in San Diego.

BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: You can count on it.

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

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

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

Here we go.

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

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

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

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

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

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

The second area is really the Bay Area will also
have to continue to encourage pricing strategies where
they make sense. This will include a planned 550 mile
express lane network, and could include a bridge toll hike, if the voters approve it this June, as well as further additional cities rolling out demand-based pricing concepts, parking pricing.

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

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

And transit is also an area of plan where we invest 60 percent of our dollars just to make sure that we are modernizing and keeping up on transit. And this will continue to be a major focus area, as well as we invest significant dollars to expand the transit system, but we'll also need to continues to invest in this high
quality transit and focus very much on the first and last mile connections as those are very important.

--o0o--

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

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

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

And also in this last plan, we also developed an action plan, because we found that in some of the areas we were moving off target, in particular on housing affordability. And that has led to some of our other initiatives such the CASA initiative I mentioned earlier.
Vital Sign also tracks health, housing affordability, and other real-time indicators related to social equity.

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

MR. CORLESS: Well, Thank you, Alix, Chair Nichols and the Board. Thank you again for having us here. We just wanted to kind of wrap this up. I was going to give a couple more slides about SACOG and then talk a little bit about sort of statewide how we are enthusiastic about partnering with the State and your agency and many others.
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MR. CORLESS: The Sacramento region is considered one of the big four, but in many ways, we have sort of a foot in the Central Valley economy and a foot in the Bay Area economy. We in an interesting in-between place. We are not participating in the infill, and, affordable and attached housing boom that's hit the coastal markets. Yet, we have commercial corridors that are struggling, and retail that's going empty that is the perfect place to put affordable housing and mixed use services, and frankly high frequency transit. That's one of our strategies we're looking at to get to 19 percent.

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

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

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

Some of our numbers look good and others do now,
And we want to be very honest with both our public, and you all about where those trends are heading.

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

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

We have a very unique rural urban connection strategy program. We have a huge ag area, and we're making sure that we don't pave over some of the nation's prime farm land, and that we actually bring back some of the -- our ability to actually use more of our food locally, so we're not trucking it to out of state and trucking it back in. That's a big part of our RUICS program. And then finally, we've got a lot on data and zero emissions.
Supervisor Gioia, you mentioned the equity question. And I -- and I want to put at least -- I've been out of California for 10 years. I've sort of come back. I worked at MTC for quite awhile. I would just say to you, I'm -- we are, I think, in a really interesting and challenging place, which is you're asking us to predict the future, and we are up to that challenge, but we also understand that future has never been more uncertain.

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

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

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

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

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

But we stand ready to work with you, to work with State agencies to make sure that we can actually reestablish ourselves as that world leader in these forms
of mobility as this disruption only accelerates.

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

Thank you, Madam Chair.

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

Dr. Balmes.

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

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

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

(Laughter.)

CHAIR NICHOLS: Sure. You can all come up and just speak briefly. That's fine.
MS. BOCKELMAN: Alix Bockelman again, MTC. We did look at health benefits associated with active transportation I think using the -- an ITHIM model.

BOARD MEMBER BALMES: Yeah.

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

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

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

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

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

CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. Thanks.
Any other quick -- yes, Supervisor Serna.

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

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

MR. IKHRATA: Well, that's a great questions. And I think -- I mean, we met with the advocates, the same one that come and says you need to do 25 percent. This is the wrong argument to have. This is the wrong approach to be arguing 19 or 25 or 15.
Right now we have a trend that's going in the wrong direction. How do we make it go in the right direction? How do we report to you, so you have a comfort level, you have a call to action that we are going in the right direction?

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

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

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

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

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

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

BOARD MEMBER SERNA: And I -- and I get that. I guess what I'm -- maybe I'm not communicating this as well as I could. I'm -- my concern is really focused on how
are we working with the public, so that they understand outside of the language of professionals --

    MR. CORLESS: Right.

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

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

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

BOARD MEMBER SERNA: Thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

Yes, go ahead.

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

And one of the things they do, they do meet with us as a staff on a monthly basis with actually Board members that Chair the Committee. My chair basically is committed and he's going, as an elected official to listen to these voices. The charge of the -- we've given them for the community based organizations is to take the information that we get, this, you know, very technocratic kind of language that we speak, and we understand, and then help us. And they're responsible for translating that and understanding it enough to take it out to their communities, and push that information out, and basically solicit the information back in from their own communities in their language, in their -- in the ways that are
meaningful to them and then bring back -- that back to us. So where we've seen progress in terms of that is things like we -- we can measure mode share. We can measure VMT and we're committed to doing that as part of our metrics for the regional plan, but it wasn't -- those weren't the only metrics that meant something, because people -- how do you translate it as someone struggling to get to work or struggling to get to school? What does VMT mean to them?

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

CHAIR NICHOLS: Question?

BOARD MEMBER SHERIFFS: Thank you.

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

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

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

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

We have, you know, the whole spectrum. It's sort of like with housing you, have the whole spectrum, right? So I don't know if -- I mean, what I'm hopeful is that I think if we can do this incentive approach first and to see, you know, can they achieve certain targets, or measurable things in mobility, in terms of clean energy,
clean choice, because I think we need them to -- and it needs to -- it needs to boil up from the bottom from listening to their communities, and see what's really reasonable and, you know, actionable for them.

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

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

MS. BOCKELMAN: In the MPO --

BOARD MEMBER SHERIFFS: Looking for ways to help you get your job done.

MS. BOCKELMAN: Right. In the MTC region I know a lot of the cities obviously adopt Climate Action Plans. It's not something that we have required. We've required other things as -- in terms of when we provide funding, we've required all the cities to have Complete Streets adopted policies. We've required every city to have a housing element adopted. We think that really strengthens the ability to get SB 375.
So this is an area where we probably can partner better with the cities, because they are doing a lot in this area with the Climate Action Plans.

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

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

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

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

So this is -- I mean, we could feel good about say we're going to reach people, but this is a language that very few understand. And we have an obligation to do the outreach and to encourage cities to do Climate Action Plan. But frankly, we have to be very clear about what's
happening. The trend that we're facing. How the land use in California lends itself to where we're going.

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

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

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

CHAIR NICHOLS: Ms. Mitchell.

BOARD MEMBER MITCHELL: Thank you, Madam Chair. Welcome. Thank you all for coming today and presenting your ideas to us.
A couple of things that I want to touch on and ask your comment on. When we started this process back in 2008, 2010, the nation was in recession. And so what we have seen over the last 10 years or so is a nation recovering. And so part of that is that the unemployment rate, which was very low back then, is now -- or very high back then has now become very low, and we have -- most of our population is employed.

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

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

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

MR. IKHRATA: So I think you, more than anybody, you sit in the SCAG board. You're familiar with kind of the discussion. The economy recovered, incomes are rising, people are buying cars. You know, at one point, we need to figure out how we have -- it's not the car versus the transit or versus the bicycle or the walking,
it is how you make a transportation system work for everybody, and how you price it in such a way that it works for everybody, and how you develop policies that's really for the revolution that's coming in the near future.

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

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

And I think we discussed with Richard and Kurt and the staff about maybe, in our performance reporting, to be very specific, the modes, about the social equity,
disadvantaged communities, where are the housing getting built, what did it do to the original residents. And all of that has to come together in an annual or biannual reporting, so we can be educated in the cycle's impact.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. Come on.

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

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

In terms of our transit system, I think while there may have been pretty big declines in parts of the state, I mean our rail systems have seen huge increases in ridership. We may have reach a plateau, because we're at the point where people -- you know, can't really get on the system. So we're really trying to continue to invest
in core capacity improvements to our transit system. Ordering new BART cars are kind of rolling in. They need to roll in faster. New train control system to increase the frequency through our Transbay Tube by 30 percent. We're electrifying Caltrain or extending BART to San Jose. We need all of that.

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

CHAIR NICHOLS: That's an important point. You have to look more specifically at the different regions. I -- thank you. I think what we should do actually is take a 10 minute break for the court reporter. Obviously, we've got a lot of people signed up who want to speak on this item, but I think this could conclude our colloquy with the MPOs, and everybody could use a brief comfort break.

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

Thank you.

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

(Thereupon a recess was taken.)

(On record: 11:09 a.m.)
CHAIR NICHOLS: Our next witness is Matt Regan from the Bay Area Council. I don't that we've posted the list of speakers anywhere.

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

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

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER CHANG: Yes.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Yes. Okay. Good. Thank you. Excellent. Okay. So we have 34 witnesses before lunch. I think many people do not have a lengthy testimony, but if you could try to get it down to two minutes, that would be terrific and much appreciated.

Mr. Regan, hi.

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

To hear staff make a call for tools -- land use tools in our to make these plans successful. And Board Member Sperling to hear him make a call for action rather than just more plans is very encouraging. And to hear our MPOs say that, you know, things cannot stay the way they
are, that the status quo cannot remain, and we cannot expect to meet our goals in terms of greenhouse gas reductions, unless we -- something changes.

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

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

Plan Bay Area is a good plan, but it's based on the premise, on the supposition, on the assumption that the cities in our region, our 101 cities and our nine counties have bought into the plan, that they understand
that their -- they have a responsibility and a role to play in reducing VMT, reducing greenhouse gases. But my experience, spending way too many Tuesday nights, and planning commissions is that they have not bought into the plan, and they do not understand that they have a constructive role to play.

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

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you very much.

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

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

Much is at stake. We don't have time to lose in
our climb efforts. And stronger targets, together with strong State and local partnerships, and along with measurable VMT reduction strategies, more active transportation, focused investment programs, and health metrics will not only help clean up the air, but will -- but the increased physical activity and -- will bring us tremendous public health gains and reduction in chronic disease rates.

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

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

And we've asked also -- we've asked the Board to support and elevate ongoing health analysis. And I appreciate Dr. Balmes bringing this up. I know Dr. Sherriffs has been very active in this. Several regional
planning agencies have begun integrating health into the planning efforts, and you've heard some of that today.

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

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

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

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

Thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thanks.

MS. TREMONTI: Hello, Chair Nichols and members of the Board. I am Ashley Tremonti with the City of San Diego here today to express our support for the targets set forth in the proposed update to SB 375, and to suggest
that the Board consider revisiting these targets on a more frequent basis, possibly every two to four years.

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

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

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

So thank you, and that is all.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

BOARD MEMBER SHERRIFFS: And I just want to clarify. I wasn't asking for a regulation. I was asking
if it would be a useful tool, and then how we could promote that. So I'm glad to hear that you're working on that.

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

BOARD MEMBER SHERIFFS: Great.

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

BOARD MEMBER SHERIFFS: Thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thanks.

Sorry, question?

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

I just had a question for you.

If I might --

(Closer to the microphone.)

BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Here we go.

I'm just a little bit confused, because my understanding is that the revelation at the end of last year in regards to vehicle miles traveled miscalculation puts the San Diego Climate Plan's ability to reach its goals at a great risk, that VMT was grossly overestimated
in 2010. And as a result, it appeared that there was
great reduction in VMT. We find that to not be true as a
result of SANDAG's Calculations.

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

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

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

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

BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Right.

MS. TREMONTI: And we are still on track to meet
that goal. We're still developing programs around
increasing the number of mode shift or increasing mode
shift.
BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN:  I'm speaking of the 2020 goal, and the fact that -- so are you saying you're on track to meet that?

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

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

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

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

MS. TREMONTI:  Right.

(Laughter.)

BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN:  Thanks for being here.

CHAIR NICHOLS:  Okay.

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

(Laughter.)
CHAIR NICHOLS: You just come on up.

MS. REYNOSO: Okay. Thank you.

Can you hear me?

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

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

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

San Diego is the eighth largest city in the country. Yet, it's transportation system lags behind cities with much smaller populations. As a result, low
income communities of color are fronting the impacts of high levels of pollution, and can only reach 29 percent of jobs within 90 minutes on public transit.

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

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

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

We are asking that based on the community stories and testimony brought forth today that you ensure SANDAG is held more accountable with a 25 percent emission reduction target. These pieces of data and stories of scandal are not anomalies. They are SANDAG's status quo. CARB staff's proposed target means more of the
status quo for San Diego. A 25 percent target is not a paper exercise. It gives us a more ambitious target to push for. And finally, the passage of Assembly Bill 805, or the SANDAG reform bill --

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

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

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

Thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

MS. CEVALLOS(THROUGH INTERPRETER): Hello. Good morning. My name is Llesenia Cevallos and I live in National City. I'm also a member of the National Coalition Environmental. I'm here to ask that the ARB vote for 25 percent emission reduction target for SANDAG. It is very important to me that we address the inadequate transportation system in San Diego, because I am concerned with the health of my children.
And I am concerned that we are flooding the street -- the streets with cars and the freeways and we are producing more pollution. I have three children and I am worried about the future that awaits them. The main issues that I have, the Interstate 5, at only 600 feet away from my home. The window in my room faces the freeway. When I open the window, pollution comes in and marks the walls of my room with a black and sticky substance.

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

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

Thanks for your time.

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

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

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

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

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

I'm here to ask the Board to give priority to the
communities that are mostly impacted by these harmful emissions. The problem in my community is the pollution produced by the transportation system. SANDAG gives priority to the freeways. In my personal experience, I have suffered for eight years of an allergy in my skin caused by the environment.

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

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

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

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

We need that the Board -- the ARB Board assure us that SANDAG will achieve this type of transportation system. The problem in our communities that there is no -- not enough transportation -- public transportation
to travel that -- without taking a long time. It's very
difficult to use the public transportation to be able to
raise your job, go shopping, go to school and other places
in San Diego.

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

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

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

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

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

I am now on the advisory council for Stay Cool
for Grandkids, which is a non-profit organization of
volunteer grandparents, elders, and other citizens in San
Diego region dedicated to preserving a livable community
in the name of those too young to have a voice, our future
generations.

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

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

Intergenerational equity is at the heart of the
lawsuit Juliana versus United States. The 21 plaintiffs,
ranging in age from 10 to 20 years old, state that the
federal government's refusal to take serious action
against climate change unlawfully puts the well-being of
current generations ahead of future generations.
And so far, the courts agree, despite attempts by the Trump administration to have the case dismissed. In March 2018, the 9th Circuit Court of Appeals allowed the suit to go to trial. This followed an earlier decision in November of 2017 when the District Court Judge Ann Aiken sent -- set a judicial precedent ruling that climate change may pose an unconstitutional burden for younger generations.

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

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

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

MR. LEITER: Hi. I'm Bob Leiter. I'm a retired urban planner, living in -- live in Poway, California. So
I'm focusing my comments on the San Diego region. And I'll just mention I've met many of you or worked with many of you. I was a city planner for the Cities of Escondido and Chula Vista in San Diego County. Then became the planning director for SANDAG. And I was the SANDAG planning director for about seven years, including the start-up of SB 375 planning.

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

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

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

We understand that CARB and SANDAG staff believe it would be difficult to replicate the 21 percent GHG reduction that was shown in SANDAG's most recent Regional
Transportation Plan. But we believe that by working together, CARB and SANDAG staffs would be able to identify opportunities in the San Diego region to receive GHG reduction credit for future, what we call, multiple benefit projects, and also for multi-jurisdictional projects.

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

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

The idea of Green Streets is that you can design Complete Streets that also reduce stormwater pollution runoff, and promote water conservation, and still reduce
greenhouse gas emissions. And the advantage of taking that approach is now you qualify not just for transportation funds like SB 1 funds, you also qualify for a number of other State sponsored grant programs. And I can give you examples of that, but I know that time doesn't permit that.

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

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

Thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Would you wind up, please. I'm being a little generous here with the timing, because we shortened it, but we do have a lot of people waiting to testify.
So if you can try to condense your remarks and get to the bottom line, we would appreciate it.

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

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

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

It's surprising and shocking that my own MPO in San Diego does not meet these standards and is not willing to. You know, it's time to stand up for disadvantaged communities. These are impacted by vehicle pollution. Stand up for the public transportation, and against trying to build more freeways near our schools and homes.
And the fact that freeways, you know, are so congested and failing on a daily basis should really be kind of a bright light to all of us here that this is not working. And I assure you in San Diego, it is not. Vehicle miles traveled are increasing in California, and this should be the call to action for the MPOs for SANDAG to take cars off the road, find public transit incentives, and remove the vehicles. The present efforts are failing.

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

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

MR. GRUBB: Good morning, Chair Nichols and Commissioners. My name is David Grubb. I'm Transportation Chair of the San Diego chapter of the Sierra Club. My colleagues in the environmental community have done a wonderful job of presenting the arguments. So I'll be very brief, and just ask you to please set the targets for the big four MPOs at 25 percent for all of the reasons that you've already heard. Thank you.
MR. RENTSCHLER: Good morning. My name is Kyle Rentschler, and I'm a conservation organizer at Sierra Club San Diego. I'm here, along with our partners at Climate Action Campaign and Environmental Health Coalition, to speak in support of higher greenhouse gas emissions reduction targets in the San Diego region.

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

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

This is also not the time to abide by one-sided accounts put for by San Diego, especially when that agency's leadership has demonstrated time and time again that emissions reductions, public health, and equity are
nowhere near the list of their top priorities.

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

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

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

Thank you for your time.

MS. WOLFRAM: Good morning. My name is Sophia
Wolfram and I work with Climate Action Campaign, an advocacy organization that advances policy across the San Diego region to stop climate change and improve quality of life, especially through the adoption and implementation of local Climate Action Plans.

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

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

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

Our cities are working hard to do their fair share to meet State climate targets, and they need support from this body to meet those targets.
San Diego's legally binding Climate Action Plan calls for 50 percent of commuters in the urban core walking, biking, or taking transit by 2035. AB 805, passed last year, requires that SANDAG seek to harmonize the upcoming regional transportation plan with local Climate Action Plans.

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

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

Also, since 2013, the Early Action Program, which is meant to build out the backbone of the bike system in the county, has spent $61 million and completed just four miles of bike facilities. Our cities need your leadership to meet the reduction targets, which are aligned to State
targets. And our communities need your help to shift the
direction in which our region is headed toward a more
equitable, a healthier, and a safer future.

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

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

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

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

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

What SANDAG claims is about lack of revenue and
the VMT rebound effects is in reality about lack of
political will and unwillingness to innovate and apply
bold and creative strategies to advance transit, walking,
and biking, and to shift away from the stereotype of
southern California sprawl.

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

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

Thank you.

MR. TIPPETS: Good morning, Chair and Board.

Bill Tippets, Southwest Wetlands Interpretive Association, a small organization in southwest corner of the state, Imperial Beach.

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

We also support all the recommendations of our sister environmental, transportation, and social justice groups that are talking to you. We believe that it's
feasible for SANDAG region to achieve at least a 21 percent reduction in GHG, which they have in their current RTP, and potentially up to 25 percent that would be needed to close the GHG emissions gap in your own scoping plan.

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

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

Just as a rational GHG reduction strategy requires reductions in both total and per capita GHG emissions, a land use and transportation strategy must also include required reductions in total and per capita VMT. It has to do that. It's the only way it's going to work.
And a tighter linkage between SB 375 plan measures and SB 150 monitoring is absolutely needed. A lot of the suggestions that the staff presented in this overview are very good. We completely support them and we like the idea of separating monitoring from compliance monitoring, did you do it or not, to effectiveness monitoring, which is the most important thing. That's what we really want, reduce greenhouse emissions, and show that the co-benefits are being produced that the plans propose.

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

Thank you very much.

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

We submitted two letters on SB 150 and 375
recently, signed by more than 20 organizations. And I'll go over a few key points of those. We want to thank so much our partners from the San Diego region who have a strong message here today.

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

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

So what do we recommend in terms of 375?

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

Two, improve trans -- improve transparency. We appreciate the State's -- staff's proposal to improve
transparency. Right now, it's very hard to understand how these plans will translate to changes on the ground and to meeting the actual targets.

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

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

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

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

Thanks very much.

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

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

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

Thank you.

MS. LINDBLAD: Hi. Good afternoon. I'm Bryn Lindblad, Associate Director of Climate Resolve, a nonprofit in Los Angeles focused on advancing local
solutions to climate change, and also part of the
ClimatePlan Network and signed on to that letter.

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

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

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

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

And so I'll speak from experience in the SCAG.
The current RTP SCS in the SCAG region, we're still seeing
50 percent of growth outside of transit priority areas. A lot of that is green field development. There's still highway capacity expansion happening in there.

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

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

So really support Madam Chair's encouragement that we need to -- we need to look at some of those zombie dinosaur highway projects that have been on the books. We need to not do anymore harm with our transportation dollars. They really need to be working to help us address the problem, not perpetuate it.
And, you, know I think we really -- we can't afford to take our current plans as sacrosanct. We need to call the question and use the performance metrics that help us do that job.

Thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

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

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

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

And I'm concerned that areas within the SCAG region are not doing enough to meet these goals or we're
not addressing our State's VMT gap. Within my region of Southern California, especially within the Inland Empire and Orange County, highway expansion projects and sprawl developments are issues that need to be addressed.

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

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

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

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

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

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

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

I'd like to talk to you today about the San Diego region. I'd just like to note at the beginning when Ms. Kawada gave her presentation earlier from SANDAG, she noted one of the things SANDAG is trying to do is promote development in the urban areas. SANDAG even performed a stress test last year, which was part of the materials in your packets today that looked at if they could get additional GHG reductions out of an even more dense development model, and determine that the development plans are already pretty smart in San Diego. And that
additional density wouldn't really help much.

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

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

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

Now there is a school of thought that VMT
shouldn't matter. Vehicle technology improvements will
make VMT obsolete. Supervisor Ron Roberts, who's a CARB
Board member, who you all know well, is a proponent of
this approach. He has, in public presentations, called VMT a political model, a pathetic metric and a stupid metric. Unfortunately, he's not here today to discuss this. I'm sure you've heard his impassioned case before.

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

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

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

I'll wrap-up quickly, Madam Chair.

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

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

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

Thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

MR. HAMILTON: Good morning, members of the
Board, Madam Chair. My name is Kevin Hamilton. I'm with
Central California Asthma Collaborative. First, I want
to -- a shout out to Dr. Sherriffs and his idea of
providing this Climate Action Plan for cities for their
land-use planning, something that focuses at R1, R3, C and
industrial level development outside of traditional
freight facilities, similar to the freight handbook, I
think would be tremendously useful for cities as they move forward with their planning, and helping them integrate that planning more effectively with transportation agencies.

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

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

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

And, in fact, if you look at the statistics, Fresno county is the largest adopter of EV vehicles in the
State, which is how it got added to the Volkswagen settlement, as the fifth green city -- or sixth green city, I forget which.

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

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

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

It's incredible that we've seen this rate jump over the last 20 years so high. We have high rates of heart disease. We have high rates of stroke. Our ERs are overflowing. And a lot of that is very well corresponding with the levels of these pollutants in our atmosphere from
mobile sources. So we really need your help there, and we need you to tell our folks step up. So don't back off on us. Push hard.

Thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

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

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

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

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

The least desired scenario was Scenario C. And
this moved investment away from active transportation and
towards highway-widening projects and road enhancements.
So that's Scenario C as in car.

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

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

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

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

So like I said, I won't give you any policy
recommendations, but the moral of the story, I'll leave
that up to you to decide. But I can't help but wonder, if
we had just a one percent higher target, what our future
would look like.
MR. FIGUEROA: Steve Figueroa. I'm with the 200 also locally with the Inland Empire Latino Coalition.

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

How many of you came here through public transportation?

No, because you can afford your own cars, right? Nobody took the bus, right? And nobody came on metro, right? So let's walk what we talk. How many of you would tell the Governor to take his 12 -- his $100 billion bullet train to put that toward electric cars, right? And that would do more to reduce the greenhouse effects than anything you can propose, anything you can propose, right?

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

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

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

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

I have COPD.

But the bottom line is I want my children also to afford a house and to get a house. So we have to balance that. And nobody knows more than somebody who advocates for families with children with disabilities who refuse to take public transportation because it's so inconvenient. How many of you would sit next to a homeless man who uses public transportation for his home and housing nowadays.
Okay. Stays on there, smells like urine. I'm not criticizing, because I work -- I work with the homeless. I do all that, okay.

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

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

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

And I can say that, because I'm a member of LULAC locally, the Hispanic Chamber for the State, and you guys have never come to us. You've never been to one
convention. You've never been to one function that we've put on. Okay. Nobody. I think Dean was there when I was with MAPA, Mexican American Political Association, but that's about it.

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

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

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

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

(Laughter.)

MS. HERNANDEZ: But here -- but here that your environmental analysis was a complete absolute failure. You claim a few maybe construction impacts. Everyone of
these MPOs has had to a Program EIR that chronicles the adverse -- significant adverse impacts of increasing density. I'm not saying that's the wrong thing. There's trade-offs. But I am saying your staff has punted again under the California Environmental Quality Act.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The attack on mobility is an attack on minorities. And your analysis, your environmental analysis, your economic analysis of that issue fails.
CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. Your time is up.
MS. HERNANDEZ: But we support the staff report.
CHAIR NICHOLS: Your time is up.
MR. HERNANDEZ: Thanks. I think I was the only person to actually be cut off.
   Thank you.
CHAIR NICHOLS: I don't think so, because I counted a couple of others.
   Ms. Gurin.
MR. GURIN: Hello. My name is Katy Gurin. And I'm on the steering committee of 350 Riverside. I also collaborate with San Diego 350. So I'm here basically to echo a lot of the statements that have been made regarding the emissions target. I support a 25 percent reduction in emissions. SANDAG -- for SANDAG.
   SANDAG has long ignored community pleas for a strong transportation system that meets the needs of underserved communities. Instead, SANDAG has favored an expensive toxic and car-centric approach.
   SANDAG's adamant adherence to emission to an 18 or 19 percent emissions reduction target that so clearly absolves them of any really changes should be rejected.
   Thank you very much.
MR. HAGUE: Hello. George Hague, volunteer with the Sierra Club. Glad you're here in this building with
the supervisors above you who many times make decisions
that are counter to what should be happening.

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

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

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

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

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

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

I thank you very much.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

MR. EDER: Good afternoon. I'm Harvey Eder with the Public Solar Power Coalition and I'm here to talk about this 25 percent reduction based on 2005 by 2035 and AB 7 -- 375 versus -- excuse me, SB -- SB 350 that requires by 2030 a 40 percent reduction from 1990 levels, which was about 400 parts per million CO2 equivalent than. So we're down to about 250 these numbers are off. The
greenhouse gas numbers, the real numbers in the '16 plan a
year ago I came and talked to you about this. There's
been a 30 percent -- on the chapter 10, pages two and
three written by Dr. Aaron Katzenstein that now runs the
laboratory for South Coast.

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

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

Also, worked on the first social equity low
income -- there was a low income solar equity program. I
worked as a consultant to the PUC in 1980 and '81 under
Leonard Grimes in the first solar proceeding. We got a 10
percent mark out for low income, and increased that in the
future. Also litigated again to Rose Bird's court and got her vote, and so Breiner did not vote against to look at all models of public solar, not just using the industry-owned utilities to finance it. There is a question of equity, low-income subsidizing, upper income solar, and also of antitrust.

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

Thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you, Mr. Eder.

Last witness.

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

I'd like to echo the comments made by Climate Plan earlier, as well as those made by CVAQ and CCAC, and highlight the need for greater transparency, so residents
can see tangible results and actually experienced the co-benefits that come with access to transit and active transportation.

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

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

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

More ambitious and stronger regional reduction goals will help us achieve our State's ambitious climate
goals, and encourage the valley to reduce emissions by implementing more stringent, equitable, and innovative land use and transportation policies and programs.

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

Thank you.

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

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

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

CHAIR NICHOLS: Well, we certainly would like a
AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST KING: Yes.

CHAIR NICHOLS: So I think that's the better part of valor. So why don't we do that. It's a good time to take the lunch break. But we are on a tight schedule today, because we have two more items today, one of which has quite a lot of witnesses who've signed up to speak on it. Although, it isn't action item, it's still important. So let's try to be back here, I want to say, 45 minutes, but let's just make it 1:30, and be -- we will resume at 1:30 then.

Thank you.

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

(Thereupon a lunch break was taken.)
AFTERNOON SESSION
(On record: 1:36 p.m.)

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

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

So Professor Sperling.

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

On the one hand, to deal with that frustration, I think CARB needs to take more responsibility and more leadership. And that means dealing, for instance, on this -- on the money issue with the California Transportation Commission. And we have that. We're moving in that direction, which is good.
We need to be -- hold the MPOs more accountable in terms of specific actions and with performance metrics. We are moving in that direction, which is really good. And we can do more. We can do things like having clearing houses of information, so that we can provide more assistance, in fact, provide technical assistance to the local governments and the community-based organizations and the NGOs.

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

So at the end of the day, the key responsibility really is -- I know a lot of people don't want to hear this, but it really is at the local level. And I'm going to give examples of that in a moment. And we heard all of this testimony this morning about from different groups.
testifying that they're -- about their -- the focus needs
to be on all these changes. But I'm going to say that the
focus needs to be much more so on local decision making.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The overall strategy may be that to use and thinking about this overall is what we need to do is reduce VMT, but increase passenger miles traveled. And
that responds to a lot of the concerns here. And what
that means is provide more services to people. And it can
be -- it has to be in unconventional ways.

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

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

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

Number three, this is also local, and that is
creating the incentives and disincentives for everything
I've just talked about. And that means the -- dealing
with reducing the sprawl, the transit-oriented
development, the pooling. You know, one little example of
that is that airports for instance. Most airports put a
tax on the Lyft and Uber, but they do it per ride. They should change it to do -- to reduce it for the vehicles that have multiple riders, and increase it for the ones that have a single passenger, as just, you know, one simple example.

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

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

But at the end of the day, you know, it's the responsibility of all of us. And a lot of the local community-based organizations and NGOs have a big
responsibility in this. And I know there's frustration, tried hard, sometimes it's failed, but that is the way the change -- most of the change is going to happen, if we're really going to be successful.

Thanks for letting me do that speech.

(Laughter.)

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you very much.

Ms. Takvorian.

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

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

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

I'm going to focus my comments for now on San Diego, because San Diego environmental justice, and
environmental community groups, and community residents have been advocating for decades for SANDAG to move towards true VMT, and transparency, and GHG reduction. And San Diego's interest in this issue are clearly very high. I think they comprised at least over 50 percent of the -- of the testimony that we heard this morning.

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

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

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

So we appreciated that the MPOs are satisfied with the cooperation that they have felt, but I didn't hear that sentiment from most of the folks who testified today or from the impacted communities. So we need to be
clear that the report and the recommendations are
obviously not universally supported.

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

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

There were incorrect VMT calculations, inaccurate
revenue and expenditure projections. And as a result, our
Measure A was rejected by San Diego voters in 2016. So we
don't have those sales tax dollars to utilize. So it's
ture that there is a lack of funding or as much funding as
we would like to have.
We are, as a result of all of this disarray that has been really building over the last several decades, a very unusual and significant step was taken when AB 805 was signed into law in 2017. That bill, by Assembly Woman Lorena Gonzalez Fletcher actually reorganized SANDAG in very significant ways.

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

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

SANDAG's model doesn't include a cumulative impacts approach as CalEnviroScreen does, so it tends to skew the communities that are identified as most impacted. So SANDAG's target probably should be 25 percent
as many people have asked. It's clearly needed, but I'm going to recommend 21 percent that we amend the resolution to change it to 21 percent. I think it's justified by CARB's own report that was put out in June. The February report really did not provide clear evidence or a metric-based rationale for the change.

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

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

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

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

CHAIR NICHOLS: Yeah.

BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Okay.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Well, let's just have whatever more discussion there is, understanding that you intend to make that amendment.
BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Yeah.

CHAIR NICHOLS: So we'll move on.

Any others?

Supervisor Gioia is next.

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

I do think the frustration that we heard is that different regions of the state are going to have less rigorous plans than other regions of the state, and the frustration that there may not be a similar approach statewide. And that's where our ability to set some, I don't want to say minimum standards, but to set as much guidance as possible to get more quality around the state in how these plans are approached.
Like I honestly believe the Bay Area's plan is more robust than SANDAG's plan, for example. And this is not meant to try to criticize any part of the state. But I think we can play a role in trying to incentivize and support the regional actions to be as strong as possible. I don't have -- I wish I could have more faith that local government can step up to solve all of these issues. I think there is a value to statewide standards, and statewide incentives.

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

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

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

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

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

CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. Great.

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

Do I have a motion and a second?

CHIEF COUNSEL PETER: Excuse me, Chair Nichols.

I think the staff wanted to do a CEQA response.

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

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

CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. All right.

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER KARPEROS: So right now.

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

(Laughter.)

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

ATTORNEY MONROE: Chair Nichols, this is Gabriel
Monroe an attorney for the SB 375 program. We're going to
start with some responses to some comments that raised
some questions of economic analysis related to the current
proposal. And then we're going to come back to staff for
some supplemental responses to the environmental analysis.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay.

CHIEF ECONOMIST WIMBERGER: Chair Nichols, hello.

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

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

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

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

The modeling for the scoping plan was conducted
using two Models, E3's PATHWAYS Model and REMI, a
macroeconomic model that was run internally by ARB, and it
used cost and emission reductions estimated from the
PATHWAYS Model.
The PATHWAYS Model includes inputs for vehicle stock VMT and vehicle efficiency. And these were derived from the VISION Model, which draws from EMFAC 2014, with VMT updated to reflect adopted RTPs and SCSs. The economic analysis in the scoping plan includes the incremental costs between the reference or business-as-usual case, and the scoping plan scenario.

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

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

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

The results show that there is not a discernible difference between the impact to disadvantaged communities relative to the overall regional in which they are located. In other words, the modeling which staff has
conducted does not show a disproportionate economic impact to disadvantaged communities. On the contrary, we anticipate that SB 375 and the scoping plan in general will support more equitable access to housing and transportation. Staff is also supportive of continued work to develop metrics and tools in this area.

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

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

Thanks.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you. Any questions on that?

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

AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST KING: Thank you. We did receive comments claiming generally that our CEQA analysis was inadequate. We respond that generally our CEQA analysis, including the draft and final environmental
analyses and related processes, were legally adequate, and analyzed all reasonably foreseeable environmental impacts at a programmatic level appropriate to this high level target-setting proposal.

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

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

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

The commenter is essentially asking for multiple
levels of duplicative CEQA review that is not required at this high level planning stage.

A commenter also referenced her separate comments on the scoping plan update proceeding in December 2017. Staff responds that the scoping plan update proceeding was a separate proceeding, not under consideration today, with its own environmental analysis. Responses to the commenter's scoping plan comments were prepared and approved prior to the scoping plan update approval. Staff's responses to those comments, which the Board has already reviewed and approved, are incorporated by reference here.

We also heard a comment that CARB failed to consider impacts to population and housing. Another commenter raised impacts of the program on agriculture generally, though it is not clear that this was intended as a CEQA comment. In any event, staff responds that it did consider those potential impacts as set forth in chapter 4 of the final EA.

CHAIR NICHOLS: All right. Thank you. At that point, I think we do close the record. And let's -- let's bring forward the resolution. We have a motion and a second.

And now we can consider amendments.

BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: I was moving the staff
recommendation with the amendment.

BOARD MEMBER MITCHELL: Second.

CHAIR NICHOLS: I see. Well, I think that's fine. We needed a second to your amendment, I think.

BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Second.

BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: I think we had one.

CHAIR NICHOLS: And you had that from Mr. Florez.

Okay. That's great.

BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: And I have some whereases to go with it, which I can read or I can dispense with that just -- whatever your pleasure is.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Well, you could go ahead and do that. I wanted to add one more amendment, which is very simply to incorporate the comments that -- the responses to the comments that we've just heard from staff as part of the resolution that we'll be voting on as well, so it's clear that they are part of the resolution. If you want to add.

BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Sure. Thank you.

So whereas the San Diego Association Of Governments is undergoing implementation of Assembly Bill 805, and according to Section 7 of Article 11 under chapter 4 - thank you - of Division 11 of the Public Utilities Code; whereas SANDAG is the only MPO in the state organizational structure that also mandates its
prioritization of transit and requires that SANDAG's regional comprehensive.

    BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: You're going to have to start over again, because he can't hear you.

    BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: I'm sorry. You want me to start from the beginning?

    CHAIR NICHOLS: Or you could just give him the language. I think if it's substantially what we discussed before --

    BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: It is. That's why I was asking if you wanted me to read it.

    CHAIR NICHOLS: I see. I'm sorry. We're not used to actually proceeding with this amount of formality. So I think we're all just kind of improvising here. I think it's acceptable if we all understand that what you're doing is changing number to 21 from what was proposed by the staff, that that's the proposal. We don't have to --

    BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: For San Diego. Yes, that's right.

    CHAIR NICHOLS: Only for San Diego.

    BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: It just references in the whereases the changing environment that AB 805 presents.

    CHAIR NICHOLS: Yes.
Dr. Balmes.

BOARD MEMBER BALMES: I just want to be clear, only for San Diego?

BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: That's my motion.

CHAIR NICHOLS: That is the motion.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. That's it.

Any other -- are we all set?

Okay. In that case, I think we're prepared to vote at this point.

BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: Do we vote on that -- those changes or are we just voting --

CHAIR NICHOLS: Well, the two changes are the responses to comments and the movement to 21, yes. I thought the correct procedure -- I may need help here -- was to vote on the amendment separately first and decide whether we were going to agree to the amendment, and then vote on the resolution. Okay.

I see heads nodding.

ATTORNEY MONROE: Sorry, Chair Nichols and Board members, if you do -- it's Gabriel Monroe over here. If you do approve this increase in the target for SANDAG, we would have an additional bit of language that we would like to suggest that you include in the resolution along with that, that I can read in now or if you want to discuss it and vote on it first, I can read it in later.
CHAIR NICHOLS: I think you'd better give it to us now.

ATTORNEY MONROE: Okay. So it would be another -- it would be language that would say, "Be it further resolved the increased targets are within the scope of the existing draft and final EAs would not present any new or substantially increased significant impacts not already analyzed in the final EA, and would not present any of the scenarios set forth in section 15088.5(a) of the CEQA guidelines requiring recirculation of final EA.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. So the change in staff's view does not necessitate any further analysis, which I think we would want to -- we would want to know that. So let's proceed.

VICE CHAIR BERG: Could I -- could I just ask a point of clarification?

CHAIR NICHOLS: Um-hmm.

VICE CHAIR BERG: Because I'm really uncomfortable with the fact that we're singling out one MPO. We also had someone ask us to increase Fresno, but they're, you know -- I'm uncomfortable as to since San Diego is at 19 percent as the other large MPOs, they started out at 13 and went to 19, I believe. And it's not that I disagree with my fellow Board member, it's just I
don't feel very qualified to make a decision strictly on one MPO.

And so, Diane, maybe if you could help me as to why we would increase San Diego and not increase the other three MPOs, not that I'm advocating that, because I think there's great challenge here. And I also agree with Professor Sperling. We can pick a number and how the modeling turns out is that really going to give us more action?

And so I want to be supportive. I agree with what we need to do here on SB 375, but I just need to express my concern to make sure that we're moving forward in a way that we expect to.

BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Thank you, Ms. Berg. I appreciate the question, and I wanted to speak specifically about San Diego, because that's the region that I know the best. And it seems to me that because of the unprecedented State action that was taken in 2017 with the adoption of AB 805, which amends the Health and Safety Code and -- amends the Health and Safety Code related to the operation of SANDAG. It changes the organizational structure. It applies new responsibilities to SANDAG to be more focused on transit, to actually incorporate disadvantaged communities in -- in their planning.

And in their planning specifically of transit, it
also sets up a new audit committee that holds them more accountable because there's been problems in the past.

Those are some of the reasons why, in addition to what you've heard as inaction moving towards reducing VMT, that we think it's appropriate, I think it's appropriate, that their target be increased. So that's the rationale that I'm presenting to all of you for consideration.

VICE CHAIR BERG: So, and I would -- I understand they were one of the lowest ones at 13 percent. And they've come out now to meet the others, where they were at 15, 16, and another also 13 to 19. So you don't feel that going those extra, you know three, four percent up to the 19 doesn't meet your criteria, you think it should go even more?

BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Well, I share Dr. Sperling and your, I think, and probably other people's concerns about metrics and about how these things have been calculated. The best we can do -- and that's why I think staff's approach is really a good one, that we're going to improve metrics, that we're going to focus on it, that we're going to have a common set of metrics and ways that we measure this progress going forward, and that's desperately needed, because we've been off in San Diego.

But what we can focus on is that, for instance, SCAG and Bay Area are spending tens of millions more. I
think some 50 percent more in transportation dollars and 
transit dollars than SANDAG is spending per capita.

So we've got evidence that the performance just
isn't at the same level as well. So I think that, coupled
with the new structuring that's happening, and the new
eyes on their performance from both CARB, as well as from
the State are reasons for them to perform more.

VICE CHAIR BERG: Thank you for helping me.
CHAIR NICHOLS: Yeah, I think that Ms. Takvorian
has provided a good basis for distinguishing San Diego
from other parts of the state, which also had people here
to advocate for higher numbers, but I'm not going to
support the resolution anyway, the amendment, because I
feel that we've heard enough to know that these numbers
are largely symbolic. And therefore, to symbolically go
after San Diego because of the -- what have been found to
be deficiencies in their program in the past, when we
haven't really had that engagement with them before now is
like the ARB just coming with a -- you know, from out
of -- out of nowhere in effect and giving them a higher
number without having given them an opportunity to justify
why they're already being asked to do a lot more than
they've already been asked to do before.

I have to admit I feel a little -- although, he's
not here. It's not -- you know, he can't speak for
himself, but it does bother me a little bit that the representative of San Diego who is on this Board isn't here to speak on this issue. So I feel somewhat troubled about that as well.

Any other comments on the amendment?

If not, I think we'll have the clerk call the roll please on the amendment -- on the amendment, yes.

BOARD CLERK McREYNOLDS: Dr. Balmes?

BOARD MEMBER BALMES: No. Excuse me. No.

BOARD CLERK McREYNOLDS: Mr. De La Torre?

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: No.

BOARD CLERK McREYNOLDS: Mr. Eisenhut?

BOARD MEMBER EISENHUT: No.

BOARD CLERK McREYNOLDS: Senator Florez?

BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Aye.

BOARD CLERK McREYNOLDS: Assembly Member Garcia?

Supervisor Gioia?

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: Yes.

BOARD CLERK McREYNOLDS: Senator -- oh, I'm sorry. Ms. Mitchell?

BOARD MEMBER MITCHELL: No.

BOARD CLERK McREYNOLDS: Mrs. Riordan?

Supervisor Serna?

BOARD MEMBER SERNA: No.

BOARD CLERK McREYNOLDS: Dr. Sherriffs?
BOARD MEMBER SHERIFFS: No.
BOARD CLERK McREYNOLDS: Professor Sperling?
BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: No.
BOARD CLERK McREYNOLDS: Ms. Takvorian?
BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Yes.
BOARD CLERK McREYNOLDS: Vice Chair Berg?
VICE CHAIR BERG: No.
BOARD CLERK McREYNOLDS: Chair Nichols?
CHAIR NICHOLS: No.
BOARD CLERK McREYNOLDS: Yes votes win, the motion passes -- or, I'm sorry, the motion does not pass, 10 to 2.
CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you. All right. We'll now move to the main motion.
Three yeses.
BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Metrics.
CHAIR NICHOLS: You've got to count every vote you get. This is important. All right.
DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER KARPEROS: Chair Nichols?
CHAIR NICHOLS: Yes.
DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER KARPEROS: I apologize again for the procedural issues. Your amendment about incorporating the response to comments.
CHAIR NICHOLS: Yes. Do we need a separate vote?
DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER KARPEROS: You still need to dispense with that.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Yes, I think we can dispense with a separate vote on that, unless anybody wants to call for a separate vote on that.

Hearing none -- nobody suggest that. Let us move to the resolution as amended. And I think we can probably do that without going through a roll call vote.

All those in favor please say aye?

(Unanimous aye vote.)

CHAIR NICHOLS: All those opposed?

Abstentions?

Thank you. It passes.

So thank you, everybody. This was a good discussion, and very good hearing. Really appreciated the participation of the -- all of the people who came in to try to help us.

We now need to shift the cast of players at the table. We're moving on to three different, but very related items. An update on the progress of the State strategy for our State Implementation Plan, and the South Coast Air Quality Management Plan, an informational update on concepts for minimizing the community health impacts from freight facilities, and an update on implementation of Assembly Bill 617, the Community Air Protection