A SPECIAL JOINT MEETING OF THE POLICY COMMITTEES

COMMUNITY, ECONOMIC AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT (CEHD) COMMITTEE; ENERGY AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE (EEC); AND TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE (TC)

Please Note Date and Time
Thursday, January 5, 2017
11:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

SCAG Main Office
818 W. 7th Street, 12th Floor
Board Room
Los Angeles, CA 90017
(213) 236-1800

If members of the public wish to review the attachments or have any questions on any of the agenda items, please contact Tess Rey-Chaput at (213) 236-1908 or via email at REY@scag.ca.gov. Meeting Agendas and Minutes are available at: http://www.scag.ca.gov/committees/Pages/default.aspx

The meetings of the Joint Policy Committees may be viewed live or on-demand at http://www.scag.ca.gov/NewsAndMedia/Pages/SCAGTV.aspx

SCAG, in accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), will accommodate persons who require a modification of accommodation in order to participate in this meeting. SCAG is also committed to helping people with limited proficiency in the English language access the agency’s essential public information and services. You can request such assistance by calling (213) 236-1908. We request at least 72 hours (three days) notice to provide reasonable accommodations and will make every effort to arrange for assistance as soon as possible.
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CALL TO ORDER & PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
The Honorable Bill Jahn, Chair, Community, Economic, and Human Development (CEHD) Committee
The Honorable Carmen Ramirez, Chair, Energy and Environment Committee (EEC)
The Honorable Barbara Messina, Chair, Transportation Committee (TC)

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD – Members of the public desiring to speak on items on the Special Joint Meeting Agenda, must fill out and present a Public Comment Card to the Assistant prior to speaking. Comments will be limited to three (3) minutes per speaker. The Chair has the discretion to reduce the time limit based upon the number of speakers. The Chair may limit the total time for all public comments to twenty (20) minutes.

DISCUSSION ITEM

1. State of California Air Resources Board (ARB) 2030 Target Scoping Plan Discussion Draft
   (Hasan Ikhrata, Executive Director)
   Attachment 1

CONSENT CALENDAR

Approval Item

2. Minutes of the Special Joint Meeting of the Policy Committees – March 24, 2016
   Attachment 15

ADJOURNMENT
This Page Intentionally Left Blank
DATE: January 5, 2017

TO: Community, Economic and Human Development (CEHD) Committee
Energy and Environment Committee (EEC)
Transportation Committee (TC)

FROM: Hasan Ikhrata, Executive Director, 213-236-1944, Ikhrata@scag.ca.gov

SUBJECT: State of California Air Resources Board (ARB) 2030 Target Scoping Plan Discussion Draft

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S APPROVAL:

RECOMMENDED ACTION: For Information Only – No Action Required.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:
After months of work and a series of public workshops, on December 2, 2016, the California Air Resources Board (ARB) released the 2030 Target Scoping Plan Discussion Draft (“Discussion Draft”), and the associated Appendix D: Environmental Justice Advisory Committee (EJAC) Initial Recommendation, Draft Scoping Plan Scenario & Alternative Modeling Description, and Supplemental Information on Natural and Working Lands. The Draft 2030 Target Scoping Plan (“Draft Scoping Plan”), including Appendices A-C and Appendices E-K currently pending, is scheduled to be released in January of 2017 for a 45-day public review and comment period. The Discussion Draft provides the current ARB staff proposal on how to achieve the State’s Senate Bill 32 (SB 32) climate goal of reducing greenhouse gases of at least 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030. The framing and draft Scoping Plan Scenario and alternatives included in the Discussion Draft are consistent with the materials presented at previous Scoping Plan interagency workshops and ARB Board meetings. The Discussion Draft is not the complete 2030 Target Scoping Plan. Some analyses, such as those newly required by Assembly Bill (AB) 197, economic and environmental analyses and supporting technical appendices are not included at this time but will be included in the Draft Scoping Plan. Mr. Kurt Karperos, Deputy Executive Officer at ARB, and Ms. Edie Chang, Deputy Executive Officer at ARB will present an overview of the Discussion Draft at the Joint Policy Committee meeting. The complete Discussion Draft is posted at ARB’s website: https://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/scopingplan/scopingplan.htm.

STRATEGIC PLAN:
This item supports SCAG’s Strategic Plan Goal 1: Improve Regional Decision Making by Providing Leadership and Consensus Building on Key Plans and Policies.

BACKGROUND:
State legislation Assembly Bill (AB) 32, which took effect in 2006, requires California to reduce its GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020 and continue reductions in GHG emissions beyond 2020. Full implementation of AB 32 will help mitigate risks associated with climate change, while improving
energy efficiency, expanding the use of renewable energy resources, cleaner transportation, conserving natural and working lands, and reducing waste and water. SB 32, passed in 2016, codified the Governor’s Executive Order B-30-15 which required GHG emissions be reduced by at least 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030. Assembly Bill (AB) 197, which passed at the same time as SB 32, requires ARB to prioritize measures resulting in direct emission reductions and consider social costs of GHG reductions when adopting post-2020 regulations to reduce GHG emissions.

ARB is required to develop a Scoping Plan pursuant to AB 32, and to update the Scoping Plan at least every five years. The initial AB 32 Scoping Plan was approved in 2008 and subsequently re-approved by ARB in August 2011 to include an updated environmental analysis of the Scoping Plan. Based on a sector-by-sector approach, the initial (2008) Scoping Plan was the first economy-wide climate change plan that pioneered the concept of a market-based program supplemented with complementary measures. Built upon the paradigm for climate mitigation and management strategies from the initial Scoping Plan, the First Update to the Climate Change Scoping Plan approved in May 2014 set the groundwork to reach the State’s long-term climate goals as set forth in Executive Orders S-3-05 and B-16-2012. This First Update to the Climate Change Scoping Plan highlighted the State’s progress towards meeting the near-term 2020 GHG emission reduction goals as defined in the initial Scoping Plan. ARB’s current effort on the Scoping Plan is to reflect SB 32’s 2030 target (at least 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030). As currently planned, approval of the Final 2030 Target Scoping Plan is scheduled for spring 2017.

The 2030 Target Scoping Plan development process consists of a suite of concurrent activities. One of the activities is an update of the SB 375 targets by ARB. SB 375 requires that each metropolitan planning organization (MPO) adopt, as part of its regional transportation plan, a “Sustainable Communities Strategy” that sets forth plans to meet regional GHG emission reduction targets set by ARB. In 2010, ARB established the GHG emissions reduction targets for the SCAG region, respectively at 8% and 13% below per capita GHG emissions recorded in 2005 for the years 2020 and 2035. Since then, SCAG has prepared two RTP/SCS plans (in 2012 and 2016), and both meet or exceed the required ARB targets for years 2020 and 2035. SB 375 also requires that ARB update the regional GHG emission reduction targets at least every eight years. Currently, ARB is in the process of updating the regional targets for the year 2035 for each MPO. The new ARB targets will be required to be met by each MPO in the next rounds of RTP/SCS plans, which for SCAG will initially be the 2020 RTP/SCS. ARB is proposing to release Discussion Draft preliminary target recommendations in spring 2017, and adopt final targets in summer 2017.

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC WORKSHOPS FOR THE 2030 TARGET SCOPING PLAN DISCUSSION DRAFT
ARB is collaborating with numerous State agencies to develop the 2030 Target Scoping Plan, and has hosted a series of public workshops throughout the year 2016 to inform the development of the update. ARB has also solicited comments and feedback from affected stakeholders and the Environmental Justice Advisory Committee (EJAC). ARB kicked off the update efforts in October 2015. Following public meetings of the EJAC and public workshops on economic analysis, the energy sector, the agriculture sector, and the natural and working lands sector, ARB held a public workshop on the transportation sector to discuss potential transportation and land use strategies. On November 7, 2016, ARB held a public workshop to provide a high-level presentation on the draft 2030 Target Scoping Plan GHG policy
scenarios, preliminary economic analysis, natural and working lands inventory, and public health analysis. In December 2016, ARB held two additional public workshops. The December 14, 2016 public workshop provided information on carbon sequestration modeling methods and initial natural and working lands inventory results. The December 16th public workshop provided an overview of the 2030 Target Scoping Plan Discussion Draft, including economic modeling updates. For a complete list of Discussion Draft public workshops and workshop materials, please visit: https://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/scopingplan/meetings/meetings.htm.

OVERVIEW OF THE 2030 TARGET SCOPING PLAN
The Scoping Plan is a roadmap that lays out vision, goals, and strategies that the State will take to continue working towards achieving the State’s short and long-term GHG reduction goals. The 2030 Target Scoping Plan is expected to shape climate change-related priorities and funding opportunities for the next few years. More importantly, the update will help provide a path forward towards a vision for a more sustainable California in 2050 (80 percent below 1990 levels by 2050).

The Discussion Draft includes sector-based measures to help maximize GHG reductions across all areas. This sector-based approach to climate strategies is consistent with the sector-focused public workshops that ARB has held to inform the 2030 Target Scoping Plan development. It also helps maximize synergies among the sectors and realize co-benefits. The Discussion Draft includes six (6) sectors: (1) low carbon energy; (2) industry; (3) transportation sustainability (including land use vision and vibrant communities and landscapes, vehicle-miles traveled (VMT) reduction strategies, vehicle technology, clean fuels, and sustainable freight); (4) natural and working lands (including agricultural lands); (5) waste management; and (6) water (e.g., the fossil fueled-based energy that is used to pump, treat, heat, and/or convey water).

The ARB Board-approved 2020 GHG emissions limit is 431 million metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent (MMTCO$_2$e). This is an aggregated and statewide GHG emission limit, rather than sector- or facility-specific. The 2030 GHG emissions limit is 40 percent below 431 MMTCO$_2$e or 260 MMTCO$_2$e. Achieving the 2030 limit will require more aggressive statewide GHG reductions at an accelerated annual pace.

To be in line with the GHG emissions trajectories, the design of various climate strategies in the Discussion Draft ensures a continuation of policies, strategies, and programs that were established in prior Scoping Plans to reach the 2020 GHG emissions limit, and includes policies that are known commitments. Examples of policies, strategies, and programs include SB 375 GHG targets and land use policies; Mobile Source Strategy; Cap-and-Trade Program; Low Carbon Fuel Standard; Renewable Portfolio Standard; Advanced Clean Cars Program; ZEV Program; Sustainable Freight Strategy; and Short-lived Climate Pollutant Strategy. According to ARB, even with the known commitments, the State is falling short of the 2030 target. Hence, new measures to further reduce GHG emissions are needed to help fill the gap.

SCAG has invited Mr. Kurt Karperos, Deputy Executive Officer at ARB, and Ms. Edie Chang, Deputy Executive Officer at ARB, to give a presentation on the Discussion Draft at today’s joint meeting of Policy Committees. Based on the current schedule, ARB will release a Draft 2030 Target Scoping Plan
(“Draft Scoping Plan”) in January of 2017 for a 45-day public review and comment period. ARB is planning to release a second Draft 2030 Target Scoping Plan in the spring of 2017, followed by a public hearing to present the second Proposed Draft 2030 Target Scoping Plan to the ARB Board for consideration and approval.

FISCAL IMPACT:
Work associated with this item is included in the Fiscal Year 16/17 Overall Work Program (17-080.SCG00153.04: Regional Assessment).

ATTACHMENT:
PowerPoint Presentation: “Update on the 2030 Target Scoping Plan”
Update on the 2030 Target Scoping Plan
January 5, 2017

Outline

- AB 32 and 2030 Target Scoping Plan Overview
- Preliminary Policy Scenario Evaluations
- Local Action
- Schedule
AB 32 and the Scoping Plan

- Achieve 1990 emissions level by 2020
- Continue greenhouse gas (GHG) reductions beyond 2020
- Develop Scoping Plan and update it every five years; first Scoping Plan developed in 2008
- California on track to meet 2020 GHG limit
  - Cleaner and more efficient energy use
  - Cleaner transportation
  - Cap-and-Trade Program

GHG Inventory - Tracking Progress

![Graph showing GHG emissions from 2000 to 2014](image-url)
New Directives and Legislation

- Executive Order B-30-15
  - Reduce GHG emissions 40% below 1990 levels by 2030
  - Update Scoping Plan to incorporate 2030 GHG target

- Senate Bill 32 (SB 32) codifies 2030 GHG target

- AB 197
  - Consider the social costs of GHG reductions
  - Prioritize measures resulting in direct emission reductions
  - Follow existing AB 32 requirements—including considering cost-effectiveness and minimizing leakage

GHG Reduction Targets

- Emissions to be Reduced by 2020
- Additional Reductions by 2030
- Additional Reductions by 2050

*Executive Order B-30-15 and SB 32
**Executive Orders S-3-05 and B-16-2012

Note: MMT = Million Metric Tons
Objectives for Scoping Plan

- Achieve 2030 target
- Provide direct GHG emissions reductions
- Minimize emissions leakage
- Facilitate sub-national, national, and international collaboration
- Support cost-effective and flexible compliance
- Support federal climate activities, including the US EPA Clean Power Plan
- Support climate investment for programs in disadvantaged communities
- Provide air quality co-benefits
- Protect public health

Advisory Groups

- Economic Advisors
  - Five core academic economists and energy modelers
  - Provide input on tools and modeling assumptions to evaluate economic impact of Scoping Plan

- Environmental Justice Advisory Committee (EJAC)
  - Over 20 Committee meetings and regional community meetings to date
  - Draft initial recommendations by sector
GHG Emission Sources by Sector

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Emissions (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commercial and Residential</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electric Power</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycling and Waste</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High GWP</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2014 Total CA Emissions: 441.5 MMTCO2e

https://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/inventory/data/data.htm

Scoping Plan Scenarios

- Assume Known Commitments are implemented
  - Known commitments do not achieve the 2030 target of 260 MMTCO2e

- Three scenarios to fill the gap
  - Draft Scoping Plan Scenario (includes Cap and Trade)
  - Alternative 1 (No Cap and Trade)
  - Alternative 2 (Carbon Tax)
Known Commitments

- Already required or committed to in plans or statute
  - SB 350 - increase renewable energy and energy efficiency
  - SB 1383 - Short-Lived Climate Pollutant Plan
  - SB 375 – support sustainable community development
  - Mobile Source Strategy- help State achieve its federal and state air quality standards
  - Low Carbon Fuel Standard
  - Sustainable Freight Action Plan

- 2030 GHG emissions estimated to be ~301 MMTCO2e after known commitments are accounted for

Draft Scoping Plan Scenario

- 2030 Known Commitments

  **Plus:**

  - New Refinery Efficiency Measure for All Facilities in the Sector
    - Fewer GHG emissions per barrel of a refined product
    - Estimated to achieve 20 percent GHG reductions by 2030

  - Post-2020 Cap-and-Trade Program
Alternative 1 (No Cap-and-Trade)

- **Enhanced** 2030 Known Commitments
- **Enhanced** Refinery Efficiency Measure for All Facilities in the Sector
  - 30 percent GHG reduction by 2030
- New Efficiency Measure: Industrial Sector Measures for All Facilities in the Sectors
  - 25 percent GHG reduction by 2030
- New Incentive Measure: Early retirement and replacement of older inefficient gasoline light-duty vehicles and furnaces
- New Measure: Increased renewable gas
- New Measure: Heat pumps in buildings

Alternative 2 (Carbon Tax)

- 2030 Known Commitments
  
  **Plus:**
  
  - New Refinery Efficiency Measure for All Facilities in the Sector
    - Fewer GHG emissions per barrel of a refined product
    - Estimated to achieve 20 percent GHG reductions by 2030
  - Carbon tax post-2020
Role of Local Action

- Local governments are critical partners in State strategy
- Rate of reduction to achieve 2030 target requires action at all levels
- Many local governments are already leading climate efforts
- Air district actions to reduce air pollutants can also reduce GHGs

Regional Targets (SB375)

- Need more stringent regional SB375 targets to reduce GHG emissions from vehicle activity
- SB375 requires targets to be updated by 2018
- MPOs recently provided target recommendations
- ARB staff is evaluating the gap between MPO recommendations and VMT goal
- Additional actions besides SB375 targets will be needed
- ARB will release proposed updated targets in spring 2017
Recommended Local Plan Level Goals

- Community-wide goal of 6 MTCO2e per capita by 2030 and 2 MTCO2e per capita by 2050 implemented through Climate Action Plan
  - Consistent with statewide limits in AB 32, SB 32 and EO S-3-05
  - Consistent with Under 2 MOU “fair share”
  - Consistent with Paris Agreement
  - Demonstrates leadership role on climate change mitigation
- May consider mass emissions and service population emissions

Project Level GHG Goals (CEQA)

- Beyond plan level actions, local governments can support State goals through individual projects via CEQA
- Absent conformity with specific GHG reduction plan, recommend projects implement all feasible measures to contribute to “fair share”
- No net increase in GHG may not be appropriate or feasible for every project
  - Lead agency can develop numeric project level thresholds
  - Projects with emissions in excess of threshold, incorporate all feasible mitigation
    - Mitigation recommendation: onsite design, direct investments in project vicinity, retiring carbon credits
Schedule

- Mid-January 2017: Release full Draft Scoping Plan with all appendices, economic and environmental analyses
- January Board Hearing on full Draft Scoping Plan
- First quarter 2017: Release final Scoping Plan
- Spring 2017: Final Board consideration
- Summer 2017: SB 375 Target Updates
THE FOLLOWING MINUTES ARE A SUMMARY OF ACTIONS AND/OR DISCUSSIONS THAT OCCURRED AT THE JOINT MEETING. A VIDEO RECORDING OF THE ACTUAL MEETING IS AVAILABLE AT http://scag.ca.gov/NewsAndMedia/Pages/SCAGTV.aspx

A Joint Meeting of the Policy Committees of the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) was held at the SCAG Los Angeles Office. A quorum was present.

**TC Members – Present:**  
Chair*  1. Hon. Alan Wapner  
Vice-Chair*  2. Hon. Barbara Messina  
*  3. Hon. Sean Ashton  
*  4. Hon. Glen Becerra  
5. Hon. Ben Benoit  
6. Hon. Russell Betts  
*  7. Hon. Art Brown  
*  8. Hon. Joe Buscaino  
9. Hon. Diana Lee Carey  
*  11. Hon. Gene Daniels  
*  12. Hon. Paul Eaton  
*  13. Hon. Felipe Fuentes  
*  14. Hon. James Gazeley  
*  15. Hon. Carol Herrera  
*  16. Hon. Steve Hofbauer  
*  17. Hon. Jim Hyatt  
18. Hon. Severo Lara  
*  19. Hon. Clint Lorimore  
*  20. Hon. Ray Marquez  
*  21. Hon. Michele Martinez  
*  22. Hon. Ryan McEachron  
23. Hon. Marsha McLean  
*  24. Hon. Dan Medina  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member Name</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Alan Wapner</td>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>SANBAG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Barbara Messina</td>
<td>Alhambra</td>
<td>District 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Sean Ashton</td>
<td>Downey</td>
<td>District 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Glen Becerra</td>
<td>Simi Valley</td>
<td>District 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Ben Benoit</td>
<td>Wildomar</td>
<td>WRCOG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Russell Betts</td>
<td>Desert Hot Springs</td>
<td>CVAG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Art Brown</td>
<td>Buena Park</td>
<td>District 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Joe Buscaino</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>District 62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Diana Lee Carey</td>
<td>Westminster</td>
<td>OCCOG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Jonathan Curtis</td>
<td>La Cañada Flintridge</td>
<td>District 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Gene Daniels</td>
<td>Paramount</td>
<td>District 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Paul Eaton</td>
<td>Montclair</td>
<td>District 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Felipe Fuentes</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>District 54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. James Gazeley</td>
<td>Lomita</td>
<td>District 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Carol Herrera</td>
<td>Diamond Bar</td>
<td>District 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Steve Hofbauer</td>
<td>Palmdale</td>
<td>District 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Jim Hyatt</td>
<td>Calimesa</td>
<td>District 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Severo Lara</td>
<td>Ojai</td>
<td>VCOG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Clint Lorimore</td>
<td>Eastvale</td>
<td>District 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Ray Marquez</td>
<td>Chino Hills</td>
<td>District 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Michele Martinez</td>
<td>Santa Ana</td>
<td>District 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Ryan McEachron</td>
<td>Victorville</td>
<td>SANBAG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Marsha McLean</td>
<td>Santa Clarita</td>
<td>North L.A. County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Dan Medina</td>
<td>Gardena</td>
<td>District 28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
* 25. Hon. Keith Millhouse  
   Moorpark  
   VCTC

26. Hon. Carol Moore  
   Laguna Woods  
   OCCOG

* 27. Hon. Kris Murray  
   Anaheim  
   District 19

* 28. Hon. Frank Navarro  
   Colton  
   District 6

* 29. Hon. Pam O’Connor  
   Santa Monica  
   District 41

30. Hon. Micheál O’Leary  
   Culver City  
   WCCOG

* 31. Hon. Sam Pedroza  
   Claremont  
   District 38

32. Hon. Teresa Real Sebastian  
   Monterey Park  
   SGVCOG

33. Hon. Dwight Robinson  
   Lake Forest  
   OCCOG

* 34. Hon. Ali Saleh  
   Bell  
   District 27

* 35. Hon. Karen Spiegel  
   Corona  
   District 63

* 36. Hon. Michelle Steel  
   Orange County

37. Hon. Cynthia Sternquist  
   Temple City  
   SGVCOG

* 38. Hon. Jess Talamantes  
   Burbank  
   District 42

* 39. Hon. Cheryl Viegas-Walker  
   El Centro  
   District 1

**CEHD Members – Present:**

Chair* 1. Hon. Bill Jahn  
   Big Bear Lake  
   District 11

Vice-Chair* 2. Hon. Larry McCallon  
   Highland  
   District 7

3. Hon. Al Austin  
   Long Beach  
   GCCOG

4. Hon. Stacy Berry  
   Cypress  
   OCCOG

5. Hon. Carol Chen  
   Cerritos  
   GCCOG

* 6. Hon. Steven Choi  
   Irvine  
   District 14

7. Hon. Jeffrey Cooper  
   Culver City  
   WSCCOG

* 8. Hon. Margaret E. Finlay  
   Duarte  
   District 35

9. Hon. Debbie Franklin  
   Banning  
   WRCOG

10. Hon. Bob Joe  
    South Pasadena  
    Arroyo Verdugo Cities

* 11. Hon. Barbara Kogerman  
    Laguna Hills  
    District 13

12. Hon. Paula Lantz  
    Pomona  
    SGVCOG

* 13. Hon. Victor Manalo  
    Artesia  
    District 23

14. Hon. Joseph McKee  
    Desert Hot Springs  
    CVAG

15. Hon. Ray Musser  
    Upland  
    SANBAG

* 16. Hon. Steve Nagel  
    Fountain Valley  
    District 15

* 17. Hon. Erik Peterson  
    Huntington Beach  
    District 64

18. Hon. Jim Predmore  
    Holtville  
    ICTC

19. Hon. Sonny R. Santa Ines  
    Bellflower  
    GCCOG

20. Hon. Becky Shevlin  
    Monrovia  
    SGVCOG

21. Hon. Mark Waronek  
    Lomita  
    SBCCOG
EEC Members – Present:

Chair* 1. Hon. Deborah Robertson  
Rialto  
District 8

Vice-Chair* 2. Hon. Carmen Ramirez  
Oxnard  
District 45

3. Hon. Ross Chun  
Aliso Viejo  
TCA

* 4. Hon. Margaret Clark  
Rosemead  
District 32

5. Hon. Larry Forester  
Signal Hill  
GCCOG

6. Hon. Laura Friedman  
Glendale  
Arroyo Verdugo Cities

7. Hon. Sandra Genis  
Costa Mesa  
OCCOG

8. Hon. Diana Mahmud  
South Pasadena  
SGVCOCG

9. Hon. Thomas Martin  
Maywood  
GCCOG

Rolling Hills Estates  
District 40

* 11. Hon. Mike Munzing  
Aliso Viejo  
District 12

12. Hon. Jim Osborne  
Lawndale  
SBCCOG

13. Hon. David Pollock  
Moorpark  
VCOC

14. Hon. Meghan Sahli-Wells  
Culver City  
WCCOCG

15. Hon. Betty Sanchez  
Coachella  
CVAG

16. Mr. Steve Schuyler  
Building Industry Association  
of Southern California (BIASC)

* 17. Hon. John Sibert  
Malibu  
District 44

18. Hon. Diane Williams  
Rancho Cucamonga  
SANBAG

19. Hon. Edward Wilson  
Signal Hill  
GCCOG

*Regional Councilmember

Staff Present
Hasan Ikhrata, Executive Director
Debbie Dillon, Deputy Executive Director, Administration
Darin Chidsey, Director, Strategy, Policy and Public Affairs
Huasha Liu, Director, Land Use and Environmental Planning
Naresh Amatya, Acting Director, Transportation Planning
Basil Panas, Chief Financial Officer
Joe Silvey, General Counsel
Joann Africa, Chief Counsel/Director, Legal Services
Tess Rey-Chaput, Office of Regional Council Support
CALL TO ORDER AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

President Cheryl Viegas-Walker, El Centro, District 1, called the meeting to order at 10:03 a.m. and asked Councilmember Larry McCallon, Highland, District 7, to lead the Pledge of Allegiance.

Transportation Committee (TC) Chair Alan Wapner, SANBAG, provided an introduction to the Action/Discussion Items of the Special Joint Meeting of the Policy Committees. He reminded the members that developing the Proposed 2016 RTP/SCS (also referred to as the “Plan”) is a fluid process and that future amendments and revisions to the document may be made and emphasized the importance of its approval and the certification of the accompanying Proposed Final Program Environmental Impact Report (also referred to as the “Proposed Final PEIR” and the “PEIR”).

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

Chair Alan Wapner announced that Public Comments related to Agenda Item Nos. 1 and 2 would be entertained after the items were presented.

ACTION/DISCUSSION ITEMS

TC Chair Wapner asked Community, Economic and Human Development (CEHD) Committee Chair Bill Jahn and Energy and Environment Committee (EEC) Chair Deborah Robertson to provide remarks.

CEHD Chair Bill Jahn thanked the CEHD Committee members for their efforts to provide SCAG staff with guidance and direction in the development and preparation of the Proposed 2016 RTP/SCS that would lead the region to improve sustainability and maximize the efficiency of transportation investments. He urged the members to support the actions as proposed to move the Plan forward.

EEC Chair Deborah Robertson echoed the comments made by CEHD Chair Bill Jahn and stated that the five (5) major components of the Proposed Final PEIR comply with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requirements. Similarly, she urged the members to support the actions as proposed to move the Plan forward.

CONSENT CALENDAR


A MOTION was made (Jahn) to approve Agenda Item No. 3. Motion was SECONDED (Finlay) and passed by the following votes:

AYES: Benoit, Betts, Carey, Chen,* Chun, Clark, Cooper, Curtis, Daniels, Eaton, Finlay, Forester, Friedman, Fuentes, Gazeley, Genis, Herrera, Hofbauer, Hyatt, Jahn, Joe, Lantz, Lorimore, Manalo, Marquez, M. Martinez, Martin, McCallon, McEachron, McKee, McLean, Medina, Messina, Millhouse, Mitchell, Musser, Nagel, Navarro, O’Leary, Osborne, Peterson, Pollock, Predmore, Real Sebastian, Ramirez, Robertson, Sahli-Wells, Saleh, Sanchez, Santa Ines, Shevlin, Spiegel, Steel, Sternquist, Talamantes, Viegas-Walker, Wapner, Waronek and Williams (59).
NOES: None (0).

ABSTAIN: Berry, Franklin and Robinson (3).

Councilmember Carol Chen, Cerritos, GCCOG, indicated that she intended to vote “Yes” on this item; however, inadvertently voted “No” on her electronic device. General Counsel, Joe Silvey, directed staff to record Councilmember Carol Chen’s “Yes” vote and is annotated* above.

ACTION/DISCUSSION ITEMS

1. Proposed Final 2016-2040 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (2016 RTP/SCS)

Chair Wapner asked Naresh Amatya, Acting Director, Transportation Planning, and Huasha Liu, Director, Land Use and Environmental Planning, to provide background information.

Mr. Amatya reported that the public comments received at the March 3, 2016 meeting were used during the updating of the Plan. He discussed the significant updates made to the Plan; the Plan’s core components and the comments/response summary; the Plan’s outcomes and benefits; the schedule timeline; and recommended action. Mr. Amatya indicated that the Plan meets state and federal requirements and will help the region achieve improved mobility, accessibility and sustainability. In looking ahead beyond the adoption of the Plan, Mr. Amatya discussed moving forward with transportation priorities and maximizing the value of the investments to be made in the SCAG Region. Huasha Liu, Director, Land Use and Environmental Planning, discussed building a shared vision in the areas of sustainability, housing, demographics, and GIS services/data modeling; and tracking our progress in air quality and performance monitoring.

TC Member Russell Betts, Desert Hot Springs, asked for clarification regarding a statement referenced on page 168 of the agenda packet with respect to the Mileage Based User Fee program that does not assume revenues before 2025. TC Chair Alan Wapner responded that when calculations were made regarding the financing of the proposed projects, there was an assumption that the Mileage Based User Fee concept would not be implemented prior to 2025 such that only projects to be implemented after 2025 would receive funding from Mileage Based User Fees.

CEHD Member Joseph McKee, Desert Hot Springs, asked a question with respect to the energy cost-savings and where those savings would be coming from.

TC Member Marsha McLean, Santa Clarita, asked how to address transportation connectivity funding issues in the Plan relative to the outcome of Measure M that will go to the voters at the November 2016 ballot. TC Chair Wapner responded that any significant event that would affect certain components of the Plan would require amendments to the Plan for the Regional Council’s consideration.

CEHD Member Paula Lantz, Pomona, asked for clarification with respect to the relationship between the Plan and funding specifically on the investment component. Hasan Ikhrata, Executive Director, responded that the Plan, under the federal law, has to be financially-constrained and cited an example on transportation investments and sources of funding.
EEC Member David Pollock, Moorpark, asked a question regarding the date when the local revenue sources will be available, for example, with respect to the proposed half-cent sales tax for Ventura County. Mr. Ikhrata responded that if the measure does not pass at the November election, an amendment will be made to the Plan.

EEC Member Larry Forester, Signal Hill, asked for clarification on page 167 of the agenda packet in reference to the 12% indicated as “Additional State” under the core components of the financial plan. Mr. Ikhrata responded and cited an example that in 2006, the California voters passed the 1B bond [Highway Safety, Traffic Reduction, Air Quality and Port Security Bond Act of 2006] to fund transportation projects to relieve congestion, improve goods movement, improve air quality and enhance the safety and security of the transportation system.

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

TC Chair Wapner opened the Public Comment period.

Greg Carpenter, City Manager, City of El Segundo, commented that the City of El Segundo continues to oppose the passenger demand forecasts associated with the Los Angeles International Airport and requested that the associated Proposed Final PEIR be revised and strongly urged the Regional Council to not approve the 2016 RTP/SCS.

Laurel Impett, Planner for Shute, Mihaly, Weinberger, stated that the 5-Cities Alliance, which is comprised of the cities of Glendale, La Cañada Flintridge, Sierra Madre, Pasadena and South Pasadena, submitted comments on the Proposed Final PEIR with respect to CEQA’s requirements. She stated that staff’s responses to the comments had failed to fully address the deficiencies and she cited as examples possible inconsistencies with State climate policy and a failure to properly address the SR-710 project in the health risk analysis.

Susan Durbin, Silverstein Law, representing the City of La Cañada Flintridge, commented on excluding the SR-710 North Extension from the project list and the 710 Tunnel alternative as it is incompatible with SB 375.

Harry Baldwin, commented that prior RTPs have included the SR-710 North Extension Project to alleviate air quality problems and relieve congestion issues. He encouraged the members to support the Proposed 2016 RTP/SCS as he feels it meets state and federal requirements.

Katie Lemmon, Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Committee, expressed support for the Proposed 2016 RTP/SCS and its shared vision for the region’s transportation future.

Leland Dolly, stated support for the Proposed 2016 RTP/SCS and complimented Hasan Ikhrata for his efforts.

Mary Cammarano, San Gabriel County Water District, complimented SCAG staff for the development of the Proposed 2016 RTP/SCS and encouraged support for the SR-710 Extension to relieve congestion in the cities of San Gabriel and Alhambra.
On behalf of State Senator Ed Hernandez, Clayton Arick expressed support for the 710 Tunnel and the Proposed 2016 RTP/SCS and urged adoption of the Plan.

Ignacio Muniz, Principal, Fremont Elementary, Alhambra Unified School District, expressed support for the 710 Extension to relieve congestion and improve air quality for the community.

On behalf of State Assembly Member Ed Chau, Henry Lo expressed support for the SR-710 Extension and 710 Tunnel to improve air quality, health risk issues and relieve traffic congestion.

Andy Rice, PhD, Researcher, UCLA, expressed concerns with respect to the inaccessible aggregated data of model scenario for GHGs in the region and suggested making the data available to the public. He expressed support for the Plan and encouraged increased transparency.

Miles Mitchell, City of Los Angeles, expressed support for the language recently added in the Plan with respect to the SCS consistency issue in reference to Chapter IV, page 70 of the SCS. He stated that the purpose of the paragraph is “to facilitate and protect access to grant funding by local cities.” He stated that the added paragraph included two (2) basic concepts: first, for purposes of qualifying for future funding opportunities and/or other incentive programs sub-jurisdictional data used to determine consistency with the SCS shall only be used and at the discretion and approval of the local jurisdiction; second, the use of the data by public agencies for transportation modelling and planning purposes is not limited. He stated that the insertion of this language balances the goal of local control in the grant funding process. He thanked SCAG staff and complimented the level of collaboration.

Melanie Schlotterbeck, Friends of Harbor, Beaches and Parks, thanked the members and SCAG staff for the development of the Plan and she expressed support for the Plan. She asked to make a correction on page 2 of the Appendix relating to Natural and Farm Lands that referenced the total land area designated for protection as 510,000 acres—which is the plan area—as not all of this land area is designated for protection. She asked that SCAG staff be directed to make this edit.

Richard Lambros, Southern California Leadership Council, expressed support for the Plan and complimented the members and SCAG staff for their efforts.

Marnie Primmer, Interim Executive Director, Orange County Council of Governments, expressed support for the Plan and echoed comments made with respect to the insertion of the language in Chapter IV, page 70, regarding protection for local jurisdictions for using subjurisdictional data. She complimented SCAG staff for addressing OCCOG’s concerns.

Chair Wapner closed the Public Comment period.

At 11:45 a.m., Chair Wapner announced that the Special Joint Meeting of the Policy Committees would recess and reconvene at 12:00 p.m.

At 12:00 p.m., Chair Wapner reconvened the Special Joint Meeting of the Policy Committees.

EEC Chair Deborah Robertson introduced the item and asked Huasha Liu, Director, Land Use and Environmental Planning, to provide background information. Ms. Liu stated the Proposed Final PEIR was prepared pursuant to CEQA and analyzes the environmental effects of the Plan and includes mechanisms to mitigate the significant environmental effects per CEQA guidelines. She also stated that the PEIR must be certified by the Regional Council prior to any action to approve the Plan. Ms. Liu reported that the PEIR is a legally-defensible document that meets CEQA requirements. She discussed the outreach process; timeline of the release of the PEIR; and the five (5) major components of the PEIR. Lastly, Ms. Liu discussed looking ahead beyond the PEIR to help local jurisdictions reduce the burden for CEQA work in fulfilling SCAG’s mitigation measures and by facilitating any CEQA reviews associated with Plan amendments. Lastly, Ms. Liu announced the upcoming schedule for the proposed certification of the PEIR and adoption of the Plan at the April 7, 2016 of the Regional Council; and the need for reviewing agencies to approve the Plan with respect to air quality conformity by June, 2016.

EEC Chair Deborah Robertson, Rialto, asked that a correction be made on pages 54 and 101 of the Plan, with respect to the 10 Freeway Corridor and note for the record that that “freight/truck traffic does not disappear” as the trucks continue on the 15 Freeway and on to the 10 East Freeway.

TC Member Russell Betts, Desert Hot Springs, stated that based on his recollection, the Transportation Committee policy decision regarding a Mileage Based User Fee or a Vehicle Miles Travelled (VMT) fee, was SCAG would stay neutral and would not address specifically what this specific funding source. However, in reference to page 140, Councilmember Betts stated the Plan indicated $5.5 billion for VMT funding between 2021–2025; and $124.8 billion throughout the life of the Plan. He expressed concerns regarding the cited specific funding source as he considered any “VMT fee to be a huge mistake.” For this reason, Councilmember Betts stated he could not support the Plan without a change to the language to indicate support for an excise tax. Chair Wapner responded that such a change is not within SCAG’s purview since it is the Legislature’s responsibility to decide on a VMT fee or other funding mechanism. Hasan Ikhrata, Executive Director, also provided a clarification and stated that as part of the Plan, all reasonably available new revenue sources including short-term adjustments to state and federal gas excise tax rates and long-term replacement of gas taxes with Mileage-Based User Fees, or other comparable sources that satisfy federal requirements. Furthermore, Chair Wapner stated that as recorded in the minutes of its September 2015 meeting, the Transportation Committee approved transportation funding guiding principles namely, “to establish a user-based system that better reflects the true cost of transportation with firewall protection for transportation funds while ensuring an equitable distribution of costs and benefits.”

CEHD Member Joseph McKee, Desert Hot Springs, expressed concerns regarding environmental justice, specifically, in the City of Desert Hot Springs. He cited an example of the first and last mile challenges faced by his constituents and the methodology of “forcing drivers out of their cars” while increasing the cost of cars, taxes, etc... Hasan Ikhrata clarified that the goal is not to force drivers out of their cars, rather to provide alternative modes of transportation for people who do not want to drive.

TC Member Jonathan Curtis, La Cañada Flintridge, thanked Hasan Ikhrata and SCAG staff for their professionalism and expertise in developing the Plan and the associated PEIR and he complimented staff on the public participation process. He also recognized the Policy Committee members’ efforts in
reviewing documents and reaching out to their respective communities. As a Regional Council District 36 representative for the cities of La Cañada Flintridge, Pasadena and South Pasadena, he stated that he is focused on two (2) factors of the Plan: air quality and transportation goals as it relates to the 710 Tunnel’s 4.5 miles long with no exits, cost to build is $5.6 billion, and its associated health impacts.

A MOTION was made (TC Member Jonathan Curtis, La Cañada Flintridge) that “the 710 (North Extension Project) be expressly excluded from the 2016 RTP/SCS without prejudice to being added back in a later time.” Motion was SECONDED (TC Member Dan Medina, Gardena).

Hasan Ikhrata provided background information and acknowledged inclusion of the 710 North Extension Project in the Plan’s project list as submitted by Metro. He emphasized that there is no reference of a “tunnel” in the Plan although modeled as a capacity project. Mr. Ikhrata recommended respecting the principles of local control. Chair Wapner recommended bringing this matter to the Metro Board.

Hasan Ikhrata acknowledged and thanked the members for their comments and stated the requested minor changes to the Plan will be made. However, with regards to making major changes to the Plan, Mr. Ikhrata cautioned the members and stated that “maybe it seems like a simple thing to take a project that way we modeled but you will have to accept the delay in submitting the Plan because you have to go back and model the whole Plan and start a public comment period and you can do this—you can take the risk and delay the Plan—but it is not that simple to just changing the language.”

TC Member Micheál O’Leary, Culver City, directed a question to Hasan Ikhrata and asked if he were to testify at a hearing regarding the 710 North Extension Project or an expansion of LAX, would he be able to emphatically state that SCAG was not endorsing either or both projects by virtue of their inclusion in the Plan. Hasan Ikhrata responded that he would testify in accordance with any action taken on the Plan by the Regional Council.

TC Member Barbara Messina, Alhambra, clarified that since 1996, the alternatives to the 710 North Extension Project matter have been evaluated by Metro, Caltrans, etc. and the mobility and air quality issues have been addressed. She stated that the 710 Tunnel is a financially-constrained project and emphasized the importance of the role of a regional body with solving regional issues.

EEC Member Margaret Clark, Rosemead, expressed concerns relating to the congestion and air quality impacts in her city with respect to the 710 issue.

A SUBSTITUTE MOTION (EEC Member Margaret Clark, Rosemead) was made to leave the existing 710 language in the Proposed 2016 RTP/SCS. Motion was SECONDED (EEC Member Larry Forester, Signal Hill).

A Point of Order was raised (CEHD Member Barbara Kogerman, Laguna Hills) who stated that the substitute motion was the opposite of the main motion and therefore, is not an appropriate substitute motion. Chair Wapner accepted the Point of Order. Chief Counsel Joann Africa confirmed that the substitute motion was not in order and explained that the original motion was still on the table for discussion and action.

EEC Member Megan Sahli-Wells, Culver City, expressed concern with respect to taking a position on specific issues instead of supporting the Plan as a whole.
EEC Member Diana Mahmud, South Pasadena, expressed concern with building a 60-foot diameter tunnel under a city over the objections of the residents with respect to the 710 matter. She stated that the 710 Tunnel will never be built but will need other transportation solutions and recommended that SCAG employ a bottom-up approach for future RTPs and consider the elimination of the 710 North Extension Project in the Plan.

Chair Wapner asked the maker of the motion to restate the motion. A MOTION was made (Curtis) to add language to the Proposed 2016 RTP/SCS specifically to eliminate the use of the “tunnel” as an alternative for the 710 North Project. The SECONDER of the motion (Medina) agreed to the motion.

The MOTION failed by the following votes:

**AYES:** Curtis, Friedman, Genis, Joe, Mahmud, Medina, Moore, Peterson and Talamantes (9).


**ABSTAIN:** McLean, Millhouse, Munzing and Sternquist (4).

CEHD Member Steve Nagel, Fountain Valley, asked that corrections be applied in the Plan relating to Orange County’s comments on specific language changes and cited examples.

TC Member Karen Spiegel, Corona, asked for explanation with respect to the comment made regarding the LAX passenger capacity and the matter on VMT. Hasan Ikhrata responded and provided clarification.

EEC Member Edward Wilson, Signal Hill, expressed support for the Plan and suggested to look into the future.

A MOTION was made (EEC Member Edward Wilson, Signal Hill) to recommend that the Regional Council approve and adopt the Proposed 2016-2040 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy, including the associated Consistency Amendment No. 15-12 to the 2015 Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP), by adopting Resolution No. 16-578-2. Motion was SECONDED (CEHD Member Margaret Finlay, Duarte).

TC Member Marsha McLean, Santa Clarita, thanked SCAG staff for being receptive to the comments provided by the City of Santa Clarita and recommended alternate language changes relating to VMT, such as: “would be implemented” to “could be implemented” and “assumed” to “propose,” to better reflect the differing views of the members. Hasan Ikhrata explained that certain language changes that refer to revenues and costs cannot be made if they are not definitive enough for the federal government.
After conferring with Chief Counsel Joann Africa, Chair Wapner stated that adding the proposed language changes as recommended by TC Member McLean would not be possible as with such changes, the Plan may not be approved by the federal government.

TC Member Pam O’Connor, Santa Monica, provided background information regarding the VMT fee and stated support for the Plan as the Plan will benefit the region as a whole.

CEHD Member Barbara Kogerman, Laguna Hills, commented regarding the VMT fee and recommended the inclusion of other possibilities or options for funding sources in the Plan, in lieu of the VMT fee.

A SUBSTITUTE MOTION was made (CEHD Member Larry McCallon, Highland) to add language to the Proposed 2016 RTP/SCS that would require reviewing the Plan in six (6) months and ensure the Business Plan is included in the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the California High Speed Rail Authority (CHSRA). Motion was SECONDED (TC Member Ryan McEachron, Victorville).

TC Member Cheryl Viegas-Walker, El Centro, expressed concerns regarding the substitute motion and recommended moving forward with the approval of the Proposed 2016 RTP/SCS and “not tie our hands as to high-speed rail only and a six-month review.” For this reason, Councilmember Viegas-Walker stated she could not support the substitute motion.

The SUBSTITUTE MOTION failed by the following votes:

**AYES:** Choi, Clark, Herrera, Hofbauer, Jahn, Lantz, McCallon, McEachron, Moore and Wapner (10).

**NOES:** Ashton, Austin, Becerra, Benoit, Berry, Betts, Brown, Buscaino, Carey, Chen, Chun, Curtis, Daniels, Eaton, Finlay, Forester, Franklin, Fuentes, Gazeley, Genis, Hyatt, Joe, Kogerman, Lara Lorimore, Mahmud, Manalo, McKee, Medina, Messina, Mitchell, Munzing, Nagel, Navarro, O’Connor, O’Leary, Osborne, Peterson, Real Sebastian, Ramirez, Robertson, Santa Ines, Shevlin, Sibert, Spiegel, Sternquist, Viegas-Walker, Williams and Wilson (49).

**ABSTAIN:** Friedman and Sanchez (2).

Chair Wapner asked if the maker of the motion (Wilson) and the seconder of the motion (Finlay) would accept including a recommendation to the Regional Council to certify the associated PEIR in the original motion. Councilmembers Wilson and Finlay accepted the change to the motion. Therefore, the MOTION is: Recommend that the Regional Council approve and adopt the 2016-2040 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (2016 RTP/SCS), including the associated Consistency Amendment No. 15-12 to the 2015 Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP), by adopting Resolution No. 16-578-2; and recommend that the Regional Council certify the Final Program Environmental Impact Report (PEIR) for the 2016-2040 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (2016 RTP/SCS) and adopt Findings of Fact, a Statement of Overriding Considerations, and a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program associated with the Final PEIR, by adopting Resolution No. 16-578-1.
The MOTION passed by the following votes:


**NOES:** Austin, Berry, Betts, Curtis, Joe, Kogerman, Munzing, Nagel and Peterson (9).

**ABSTAIN:** Friedman and Mahmud (2).

**ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, Chair Alan Wapner adjourned the Joint Meeting of the Policy Committees at 1:14 p.m.