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Please see next page for detailed instructions on how to participate in the meeting.

PUBLIC ADVISORY
Given recent public health directives limiting public gatherings due to the threat of COVID-19 and in compliance with the Governor’s recent Executive Order N-29-20, the meeting will be held telephonically and electronically.

If members of the public wish to review the attachments or have any questions on any of the agenda items, please contact Peter Waggonner at (213) 630-1402 or via email at waggonner@scag.ca.gov. Agendas & Minutes are also available at: www.scag.ca.gov/committees.

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) 630-1402. 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.
Instructions for Public Comments

You may submit public comments in two (2) ways:

1. Submit written comments via email to: TCPublicComment@scag.ca.gov by 5pm on Wednesday, November 4, 2020.

   All written comments received after 5pm on Wednesday, November 4, 2020 will be announced and included as part of the official record of the meeting.

2. If participating via Zoom or phone, during the Public Comment Period, use the “raise hand” function on your computer or *9 by phone and wait for SCAG staff to announce your name/phone number. SCAG staff will unmute your line when it is your turn to speak. Limit oral comments to 3 minutes, or as otherwise directed by the presiding officer.

   If unable to connect by Zoom or phone and you wish to make a comment, you may submit written comments via email to: TCPublicComment@scag.ca.gov.

In accordance with SCAG’s Regional Council Policy, Article VI, Section H and California Government Code Section 54957.9, if a SCAG meeting is “willfully interrupted” and the “orderly conduct of the meeting” becomes unfeasible, the presiding officer or the Chair of the legislative body may order the removal of the individuals who are disrupting the meeting.
Instructions for Participating in the Meeting

SCAG is providing multiple options to view or participate in the meeting:

To Participate and Provide Verbal Comments on Your Computer
1. Click the following link: https://scag.zoom.us/j/253270430
2. If Zoom is not already installed on your computer, click “Download & Run Zoom” on the launch page and press “Run” when prompted by your browser. If Zoom has previously been installed on your computer, please allow a few moments for the application to launch automatically.
3. Select “Join Audio via Computer.”
4. The virtual conference room will open. If you receive a message reading, “Please wait for the host to start this meeting,” simply remain in the room until the meeting begins.
5. During the Public Comment Period, use the “raise hand” function located in the participants’ window and wait for SCAG staff to announce your name. SCAG staff will unmute your line when it is your turn to speak. Limit oral comments to 3 minutes, or as otherwise directed by the presiding officer.

To Listen and Provide Verbal Comments by Phone
1. Call (669) 900-6833 to access the conference room. Given high call volumes recently experienced by Zoom, please continue dialing until you connect successfully.
2. Enter the Meeting ID: 253 270 430, followed by #.
3. Indicate that you are a participant by pressing # to continue.
4. You will hear audio of the meeting in progress. Remain on the line if the meeting has not yet started.
5. During the Public Comment Period, press *9 to add yourself to the queue and wait for SCAG staff to announce your name/phone number. SCAG staff will unmute your line when it is your turn to speak. Limit oral comments to 3 minutes, or as otherwise directed by the presiding officer.
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The Transportation Committee may consider and act upon any of the items on the agenda regardless of whether they are listed as Information or Action items.

**CALL TO ORDER AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**  
(The Honorable Cheryl Viegas-Walker, Chair)

**PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD**

Members of the public are encouraged to submit written comments by sending an email to: TCPublicComment@scag.ca.gov by 5pm on Wednesday, November 4, 2020. Such comments will be transmitted to members of the legislative body and posted on SCAG’s website prior to the meeting. Written comments received after 5pm on Wednesday, November 4, 2020 will be announced and included as part of the official record of the meeting. Members of the public wishing to verbally address the Transportation Committee will be allowed up to 3 minutes to speak, with the presiding officer retaining discretion to adjust time limits as necessary to ensure efficient and orderly conduct of the meeting. The presiding officer has the discretion to reduce the time limit based upon the number of comments received and may limit the total time for all public comments to twenty (20) minutes.

**REVIEW AND PRIORITIZE AGENDA ITEMS**

**CONSENT CALENDAR**

Approval Item

1. Minutes of TC Meeting, October 1, 2020  
   Receive and File

2. California High-Speed Rail Los Angeles to Anaheim Section

**ACTION/DISCUSSION ITEM**

3. Release of the Draft 2021 Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP)  
   (John Asuncion, Senior Regional Planner)

**RECOMMENDED ACTION FOR TC:**

Approve and recommend that Regional Council authorize the release of the Draft 2021 FTIP for public review and comment, beginning November 6, 2020 and ending December 7, 2020.

**RECOMMENDED ACTION FOR RC:**

Authorize the release of the Draft 2021 FTIP for public review and comment, beginning November 6, 2020 and ending December 7, 2020.
4. Last Mile Freight Program Draft Guidelines
*(Scott Strelecki, Senior Planner)*

**RECOMMENDED ACTION FOR TC:**
Recommend Regional Council approve the Last Mile Freight Program Draft Program Guidelines and authorize staff to release the Last Mile Freight Program Call-for-Projects, pending the execution of a Work Program Contract with the Mobile Source Air Pollution Reduction Review Committee (MSRC)/South Coast Air Quality Management District (AQMD).

**RECOMMENDED ACTION FOR RC:**
Approve the Last Mile Freight Program Draft Program Guidelines and authorize staff to release the Last Mile Freight Program Call-for-Projects, pending the execution of a Work Program Contract with the Mobile Source Air Pollution Reduction Review Committee (MSRC)/South Coast Air Quality Management District (AQMD).

**INFORMATION ITEMS**

5. SunLine Transit Advancing Alternative Fuel Buses and Infrastructure
*(Lauren Skiver, Chief Executive Officer and General Manager, SunLine Transit)*  
15 Mins.

6. Overview of 2022 South Coast Air Quality Management Plan and Near-term Air Quality Planning Challenges
*(Dr. Philip Fine, Deputy Executive Director, South Coast AQMD)*  
30 Mins.

**CHAIR’S REPORT**
*(The Honorable Cheryl Viegas-Walker, Chair)*

**METROLINK REPORT**
*(The Honorable Art Brown, SCAG Representative)*

**STAFF REPORT**
*(John R. Asuncion, SCAG Staff)*

**FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

**ANNOUNCEMENT/S**

**ADJOURNMENT**
MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING
TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE (TC)
THURSDAY, October 1, 2020


The Transportation Committee of the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) held its meeting telephonically and electronically given public health directives limiting public gatherings due to the threat of COVID-19 and in compliance with the Governor’s recent Executive Order N-29-20. A quorum was present.

Members Present:
Hon. Sean Ashton, Downey District 25
Hon. Phil Bacerra, Santa Ana District 16
Hon. Rusty Bailey, Riverside District 68
Hon. Ben Benoit, Wildomar South Coast AQMD
Hon. Will Berg, Port Hueneme VCOG
Hon. Art Brown, Buena Park District 21
Hon. Ross Chun, Aliso Viejo OCTA
Hon. Jonathan Curtis, La Cañada-Flintridge District 36
Hon. Diane Dixon, Newport Beach OCCOG
Hon. John Dutrey, Montclair SBCTA
Hon. Emily Gabel-Luddy AVCIPA
Hon. James Gazeley, Lomita District 39
Hon. Dean Grose, Los Alamitos District 20
Hon. Jack Hadjinian Montebello
Hon. Curt Hagman San Bernardino County
Hon. Ray Hamada, Bellflower District 24
Hon. Jan Harnik, Palm Desert RCTC
Hon. Steven Hofbauer, Palmdale (Vice Chair) District 43
Hon. Mike T. Judge, Simi Valley VCTC
Hon. Trish Kelley, Mission Viejo OCCOG
Hon. Linda Krupa, Hemet WRCOG
Hon. Richard Loa, Palmdale NCTC
Hon. Clint Lorimore, Eastvale District 4
Hon. Steven Ly, Rosemead District 32
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member Name</th>
<th>District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Steve Manos, Lake Elsinore</td>
<td>District 63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Ray Marquez, Chino Hills</td>
<td>District 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Larry McCallon, Highland</td>
<td>SBCTA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Marsha McLean, Santa Clarita</td>
<td>District 67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Fred Minagar, Laguna Niguel</td>
<td>District 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Carol Moore, Laguna Woods</td>
<td>OCCOG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Ara Najarian, Glendale</td>
<td>AVCJPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Hector Pacheco</td>
<td>San Fernando</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Ed Reece</td>
<td>SGVCOG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Crystal Ruiz, San Jacinto</td>
<td>WRCOG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Ali Saleh, Bell</td>
<td>GCCOG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Tim Sandoval, Pomona</td>
<td>District 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Rey Santos, Beaumont</td>
<td>District 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Zak Schwank, Temecula</td>
<td>District 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Marty Simonoff, Brea</td>
<td>District 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Thomas Small, Culver City</td>
<td>Culver City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Jeremy Smith</td>
<td>Canyon Lake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Larry Smith</td>
<td>Calimesa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Jose Luis Solache, Lynwood</td>
<td>District 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Karen Spiegel</td>
<td>Riverside County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Cynthia Sternquist, Temple City</td>
<td>SGVCOG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Jess Talamantes</td>
<td>SFVCOG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Brent Tercero, Pico Rivera</td>
<td>GCOG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Steve Tye</td>
<td>District 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Cheryl Viegas-Walker, El Centro (Chair)</td>
<td>District 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Don Wagner</td>
<td>Orange County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Colleen Wallace</td>
<td>Banning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Alan Wapner, Ontario</td>
<td>SBCTA/SBCOG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Alicia Weintraub, Calabasas</td>
<td>LVMCOG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Paul Marquez, Caltrans District 7</td>
<td>Ex-Officio Member</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Members Not Present:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Kathryn Barger</td>
<td>Los Angeles County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Russell Betts</td>
<td>CVAG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Joe Buscaino, Los Angeles</td>
<td>District 62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Paul Krekorian</td>
<td>District 49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. L. Dennis Michael</td>
<td>District 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Frank Navarro, Colton</td>
<td>District 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Charles Puckett, Tustin</td>
<td>District 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Ward Smith, Placentia</td>
<td>OCCOG</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CALL TO ORDER & PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Hon. Cheryl Viegas-Walker, Imperial County Transportation Commission, called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m. Hon. Jess Talamantes, Burbank, led the Pledge of Allegiance. A quorum was present.

PUBLIC COMMENT

No members of the public requested to comment.

CONSENT CALENDAR

Approval Item

1. Minutes of the Meeting, September 3, 2020

Receive and File

2. Pathways to Clean Vehicle Technology and Alternative Fuels Implementation in San Bernardino County

3. Updates on Regional Data Platform (RDP)

A MOTION was made (Reece) to approve the Consent Calendar. The motion was SECONDLED (Marquez) and passed by the following votes:

AYES: ASHTON, BACERRA, BAILEY, BENOIT, BERG, BROWN, CHUN, CURTIS, DIXON, DUTREY, GABEL-LUDDY, GAZELEY, GROSE, HAGMAN, HAMADA, HARNIK, HOFBAUER, JUDGE, KELLEY, KRUPA, LORIMORE, LY, MANOS, MARQUEZ, MCCALLON, MCLEAN, MOORE, NAJARIAN, PACHECO, REECE, RUIZ, SANDOVAL, SANTOS, SCHWANK, SIMONOFF, SMALL, SMITH J., SMITH L., SOLACHE, SPIEGEL, STERNQUIST, TALAMANTES, TERCERO, VIEGAS-WALKER, WALLACE, WAPNER, WEINTRAUB (47)

NOES: None (0)

ABSTAIN: MINAGAR, SALEH (2)

DISCUSSION ITEMS

4. California Transportation Plan (CTP) 2050

John Thurston, Caltrans, reported on CTP 2050. Mr. Thurston stated the CTP 2050 seeks to identify future transportation conditions and trends. He noted the initiative has eight goals including safety, climate, equity, economy, quality of life and public health. A further goal is
to consider equity and examine how to eliminate transportation burdens across all communities particularly low-income communities of color and people with disabilities. He stated there are 15 recommendations for achieving these goals including expanding remote access to jobs, goods services and education, pricing roadways to improve efficiency, invest in state of good repair improvements, expand access to safe and convenient active transportation, advance zero-emissions vehicle technology and supportive infrastructure, improve transit, rail and shared mobility options and expand protection of natural ecosystems.

Mr. Thurston commented the plan has been revised recently to consider the effects and recovery from COVID-19. He noted public outreach is currently underway through October 22, 2020. Next steps include finalizing the plan for an anticipated release at the end of December 2020. He invited members to submit further questions or comments.

Hon. Steve Hofbauer, Palmdale, asked how the plan aligns with Metro’s Long-Range Transportation Plan as well as SCAG’s RTP/SCS. Mr. Thurston responded that the plan incorporates information from all relevant long-range transportation plans and engages in an iterative process that brings together existing regional plans and wider policy objectives.

Paul Marquez, Caltrans District 7, commented that the plan was developed over time bringing in multiple sources of information and asked about regional considerations. Mr. Thurston responded the plan includes information based on the uniqueness of each region.

5. **NACTO City Limits: Setting Safe Speeds on Urban Streets Guidance**

Jenny O’Connell, National Association of City Transportation Professionals (NACTO), reported on setting safe speeds on urban streets. She noted NACTO is a member association of cities and transit agencies and provides support with street designs that enables more bikeable, walkable and transit friendly areas as well as setting safe speed limits. She reported in 2018 there were 36,560 automobile fatalities in the United States, 3,563 in California and 1,500 in Southern California with many more injuries. In addition, there were 7,354 pedestrian and cyclists’ fatalities and from 2009 to 2018 pedestrian deaths from traffic crashes grew by 46% in the US. She reported even as traffic volumes have decreased due to the pandemic, crashes have increased.

She stated higher speeds increase the likelihood of a crash and accelerate the severity. Ms. O’Connell noted our current system for setting speed limits rewards speeders by using prevailing traffic speeds to determine speeds limits. NACTOs City Limits Guidance encourages that speeds are set based on their effectiveness in reducing fatalities and injuries considering the different modes used on the roadway. She noted tools include
default speed limits, corridor speed limits and slow zones and reviewed recommended maximum speeds for shared streets and alleys, minor and major streets. Ms. O’Connell stated these are based on similar efforts from other cities including New York and Seattle where a reduction in speed limits alone led to a reduction in fatal and serious injuries. She noted cities are in the best position to understand the nature of their streets and how to make them safest for all users.

Hon. Ara Najarian, Glendale, stated one problem with lowering speed limits is law enforcement is not able to use technology such as radar and there is a natural propensity for drivers to instinctively drive faster when limits are set lower.

Trish Kelley, Mission Viejo, commented their city made efforts to lower street speeds, but the effort was not successful due to the 85% rule. She asked what cities can do to lower speed limits considering this policy. She encouraged legislative action to provide greater latitude for local jurisdictions to set speed limits on their streets.

Hon. Cheryl Viegas-Walker, El Centro, asked for a future presentation on the task force’s current efforts.

6. **Highlights and Outcomes of the 2020 Go Human Safety and Engagement Campaign**

Dorothy Le Suchkova, SCAG staff, reported on the 2020 Go Human Safety and Engagement Campaign. Ms. Le Suchkova noted Go Human is SCAG’s active transportation safety and encouragement program that seeks to increase active transportation and promote its added benefits. She noted an advertising campaign recently concluded to build awareness and reported that while walking and biking comprises 12% of daily regional trips, they account for 27% of all fatalities. The goal of the advertising campaign is to encourage the public to slow down and watch for people walking. She reviewed the campaign’s multi-language messaging, media schedule and target audience.

Ms. Le Suchkova noted the advertising campaign reached over 320 million impressions regionally, far exceeding the target, and a post-campaign survey shows 80% of respondents found the messages motivating. She stated the effort involved working with local jurisdictions to build upon existing messaging campaigns and reviewed current community engagement efforts. Next, she reported on the Kit of Parts program which allows for five different street treatments, that when combined create a temporary complete street demonstration project including design features such as a curb extension, separated bike lane and median refuge island.

7. **Selections from Broadband Opportunity Review Project**
Michael Misrahi, EY-Parthenon, reported on the broadband opportunity review project. He noted the effort seeks to identify opportunity for public sector incentives to promote broadband. He noted telecommunications travel through a series of pathways of wireless and wired channels before reaching the intended recipient. Wired lines often involve fiber, cable or copper. Wireless infrastructure can involve Wi-Fi, antenna and satellite. He noted broadband networks consist of long-haul, middle-mile and Access/Last Mile. Long-haul is a superhighway connection to a distant destination such as another city, state or country. Middle mile aggregates demand from last mile or other communication sources before sending to the long-haul channel. Last mile is the end user of residential, business, government and others. Further, availability is often driven by population density in urban, suburban and rural geographies.

Mr. Misrahi stated most of the region has availability of at least one high speed broadband provider and he reviewed the region’s competitive intensity. He noted there is a network of fiber in the region, although there are several large areas without easy access. Next, he reviewed commercially attractive regional areas. He noted the public sector can be a partner to private industry to expand broadband reach by developing policies and practices to expedite build out in under-served areas.

Hon. Alan Wapner, Ontario, stated that years ago Ontario identified that the private sector was not moving quickly enough in providing the city with high speed broadband and stepped forward to invest in and develop the infrastructure for the city. He noted there was a partnership with the private sector and this vision and investment has benefitted the city’s residents and businesses greatly.

Hon. Steve Hofbauer, Palmdale, stated the effort by Ontario laid the groundwork to successfully compete for and retain business development in the city. Mr. Misrahi responded he is currently working with several cities using the Ontario model to develop their broadband infrastructure.

8. Future of the Office After COVID-19

Amber Schiada, Research & Insights, JLL, reported on the future of the office after COVID-19. Ms. Schiada noted that it is forecasted that 80% of employees will reenter their offices by December 2021. She explained office reentry has begun in Europe and Asia but there are compounding issues in the United States such as childcare and home schooling. She noted it is unlikely that the work from home situation currently experienced will become a new societal norm. She reviewed the productivity benefits of office work such an ability to collaborate and opportunities for junior employee to learn from senior staff. Additionally, research indicates employees still choose to work in an office for the benefits of collaboration and socialization.
She noted structural shifts affecting future office demand include work from home, space design, distributed work and urban vs. suburban. Further, while there may be some reduction of office space footprint, most employers plan to maintain the size of their office space. Only 23% of companies plan to significantly reduce the size of their office portfolio. Ms. Schiada reviewed office design implications, including the possibility that some employers will seek more cubes and separate office spaces considering distancing practices. She next reviewed the recent trend in business toward the hub-and-spoke concept of headquarter offices in large cities and smaller ones in more affordable places. She noted that research is ongoing and it is useful to see how talent reacts to these changes as ultimately business will follow the talent needed to stay competitive.

FUTURE AGENDA ITEM/S

Hon. Larry McCallon, Highland, asked for a future agenda item on the recent action by BNSF Railway Company to move a freight facility to the City of Colton. He noted this will bring significant impacts to nearby neighborhoods.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. Cheryl Viegas-Walker, El Centro, adjourned the meeting at 12:03 p.m.

[MINUTES ARE UNOFFICIAL UNTIL APPROVED BY THE TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE]
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<th>DEC</th>
<th>JAN</th>
<th>FEB</th>
<th>MAR</th>
<th>APR</th>
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<td>Desert Hot Springs</td>
<td>CVAC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bremer, Art</td>
<td>Beauregard Park</td>
<td>District 23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce, Joel</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>District 63</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown, Ross</td>
<td>Atascadero</td>
<td>OCTA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curtis, Jonathan</td>
<td>La Habra</td>
<td>District 36</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixon, Elane</td>
<td>Newport Beach</td>
<td>OCOCG</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disney, John</td>
<td>Montclair</td>
<td>District 39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutrey, J. John</td>
<td>Montclair</td>
<td>District 39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lora, Richard</td>
<td>Palmdale</td>
<td>District 43</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lie, Steven</td>
<td>Romance</td>
<td>District 32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marquez, Paul</td>
<td>Cathedral City</td>
<td>District 7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marquez, Ray</td>
<td>Corona</td>
<td>District 21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McAffee, Larry</td>
<td>Agoura Hills</td>
<td>OCTA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mihalas, Mark</td>
<td>No. L.A. County</td>
<td>District 67</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Najar, Ana</td>
<td>Glendale</td>
<td>OCTA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newman, Frank</td>
<td>Canyon Lake</td>
<td>District 6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pannell, Hester</td>
<td>Santa Maria</td>
<td>District 17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peschel, Charles</td>
<td>Tucson</td>
<td>District 17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price, Jeff</td>
<td>Chino</td>
<td>OCTA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puchtel, Jeffrey</td>
<td>Chino</td>
<td>OCTA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rahman, Kruno</td>
<td>Rancho Cucamonga</td>
<td>District 23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rivas, Ray</td>
<td>Beaumont</td>
<td>District 3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotenberg, Zaki</td>
<td>Beaumont</td>
<td>District 3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rueda, Marcy</td>
<td>Chino</td>
<td>District 22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rueda, Tabitha</td>
<td>Palmdale</td>
<td>District 6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, Jeremy</td>
<td>Canyon Lake</td>
<td>Canyon Lake</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, Larry</td>
<td>Calimesa</td>
<td>District 21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, Ward</td>
<td>Placentia</td>
<td>OCTA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stabile, Jose Luis</td>
<td>Lynwood</td>
<td>District 26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tang, Eric</td>
<td>Atascadero</td>
<td>District 39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talamantes, Jesus</td>
<td>Montebello</td>
<td>District 22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tate, Steven</td>
<td>Diamond Bar</td>
<td>District 31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegh, Walker, Cheryl</td>
<td>El Centro</td>
<td>District 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wagner, Don</td>
<td>Orange County</td>
<td>Orange County</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallestad, Alicia</td>
<td>Cathedral City</td>
<td>OCTA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attachment: TC Attendance Sheet   (Minutes of TC Meeting, October 1, 2020)
To: Transportation Committee (TC)  
Regional Council (RC)  

From: Stephen Fox, Senior Regional Planner,  
(213) 236-1855, fox@scag.ca.gov  

Subject: California High-Speed Rail Los Angeles to Anaheim Section  

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR’S APPROVAL  
Kome Ajise

RECOMMENDED ACTION:  
Receive and File.

STRATEGIC PLAN:  
This item supports the following Strategic Plan Goal 1: Produce innovative solutions that improve the quality of life for Southern Californians.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:  
The California High-Speed Rail Authority (CHSRA) is currently constructing or in the environmental review process for the various project sections for Phase 1 of the California High-Speed Train (HST) from downtown San Francisco to Anaheim. CHSRA is preparing a draft Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (EIR/EIS) for the Los Angeles to Anaheim project section scheduled for completion in June 2021, and recently issued a Revised Notice of Preparation/Notice of Intent (NOP/NOI) on August 25, 2020 to incorporate additional scoping for significant new freight rail and goods movement facilities that would be required in Colton and Barstow in order to construct and operate the HST. These projects were not included when the project was initially scoped in 2007. This report discusses these facilities and their potentially significant impacts within the SCAG region.

BACKGROUND:  
The California High-Speed Rail Authority (CHSRA) is currently constructing or in the environmental review process for the various project sections for Phase 1 of the HST from downtown San Francisco to Anaheim. Civil construction work is underway in the San Joaquin Valley along a 119-mile segment between the cities of Madera and Shafter north of Bakersfield which began in 2015. This construction work is divided between three design-build construction packages being performed by three contractor teams and needs to be completed by December 2022 per federal grant agreement requirements. Full environmental clearance of the entire Phase 1 section from San Francisco to Anaheim must also be completed by December 2022 under the federal requirements. The Phase 1 sections in the SCAG region are described below.
Bakersfield to Palmdale
This segment will run from Bakersfield to Palmdale via the “Bakersfield Gap” generally along the Union Pacific freight single track through the Tehachapi Mountains. Currently, the planned Palmdale HST station is located about 900 feet south of the existing Palmdale Transportation Center that serves Metrolink and Antelope Valley Transit Authority. The Draft EIR/EIS document was released in February 2020 and the public review period ended in April 2020.

Palmdale to Hollywood Burbank Airport
This section will run from Palmdale to Hollywood Burbank Airport. This segment is 38 miles long and the state-preferred alternative adopted in 2018 roughly follows SR 14, and is completely underground within the Santa Clarita City limits. The Draft EIR/EIS document is expected to be released in May 2021.

Hollywood Burbank Airport to Los Angeles
This section will run from Hollywood Burbank Airport to L.A. Union Station. The state preferred alternative is approximately 14 miles long and will operate on the existing Los Angeles-San Diego-San Luis Obispo (LOSSAN) Corridor. The Draft EIR/EIS was released in May 2020 and the public review period ended in August 2020.

Los Angeles to Anaheim
This section will run from L.A. Union Station to the Anaheim Regional Transportation Intermodal Center (ARTIC). The state-preferred alternative is approximately 30 miles in length and will operate on the existing LOSSAN Corridor. The Draft EIR/EIS document is expected to be released in June 2021.

On August 25, 2020, CHSRA issued a Revised NOI under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and a Revised NOP under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) for the EIR/EIS for the Los Angeles to Anaheim Project Section. The purpose was to initiate additional scoping to solicit input on new freight rail and goods movement facilities that would be required in Colton and Barstow in order to build and operate the HST. These facilities were not identified and included when the project was initially scoped in 2007. These freight rail and goods movement facilities are large in scale with potentially significant environmental impacts within the SCAG region, notably in San Bernardino County.

New Facilities
CHSRA is proposing to build additional high-speed electrified tracks in order to operate the HST along the LOSSAN Corridor between Los Angeles Union Station and Anaheim. This corridor would be shared with existing and future passenger and freight rail services (e.g., Amtrack, Metrolink and Burlington Northern Santa Fe Railroad [BNSF]). In order to meet future freight and passenger
service levels, coupled with the operation of the HST, CHSRA is proposing to evaluate new freight rail and intermodal facilities outside of the LOSSAN Corridor located in San Bernardino County. These facilities include a completely new intermodal yard in the City of Colton and new railroad staging tracks in the City of Barstow.

**Barstow Facility:** The Barstow facility, referred to as the Lenwood facility, would be required as a new freight train staging facility outside and east of the LOSSAN Corridor, which is owned by BNSF between downtown Los Angeles and Fullerton and is one of its major main lines in the SCAG region, to allow freight trains to be staged or held outside and east of the LOSSAN Corridor in the High Desert to permit adequate service windows for normal operation and maintenance in the corridor. It would consist of the following main elements: staging tracks, staging track leads, circulation and roadway modifications, and utility modifications. The Lenwood project site would generally be located along the six existing BNSF main line tracks and south and west of State Route 58 within the city of Barstow and unincorporated San Bernardino County.

**Colton Facility:** The Colton facility would be required to accommodate future freight train volumes (an average of 10 freight trains per day) that could not be accommodated in the LOSSAN Corridor due to future volumes of HST and other passenger and freight trains. It would be an entirely new intermodal rail yard and consist of the following main elements: intermodal rail yard, railroad lead tracks, circulation and roadway modifications, and utility modifications. The Colton project is in the southwest part of San Bernardino County, mostly within an unincorporated area while the remainder is primarily in the cities of Colton and Grand Terrace. It is generally south of Interstate 10 and the Union Pacific Railroad rail lines and north of the Santa Ana River and west of Colton Crossing.

**Environmental Effects:** The proposed new rail facilities could potentially have significant environmental effects in the Inland Empire, including on air quality, noise, traffic congestion, visual impacts, and environmental justice.

**Communication to CHSRA**
SCAG has sent two joint letters to CHSRA from the executive directors of the San Bernardino County Transportation Authority, SCAG and the South Coast Air Quality Management District in June and September of this year. These letters asked for more and better collaboration and communication between CHSRA, SCAG and its affected partner agencies for the Los Angeles to Anaheim segment and these new facilities; and also expressed concern on the potential air quality impacts from the new intermodal yard, the need to incorporate project specific mitigation measures and the potential challenges associated with various air quality conformity determinations, as this realignment of goods movement in the SCAG region was not modeled in SCAG’s 2020 Connect SoCal Regional Transportation Plan and Sustainable Communities Strategy.
Other SCAG partner agencies, including the Riverside County Transportation Commission and Southern California Regional Rail Authority, have also submitted comment letters to CHSRA in response to the revised NOP/NOI scoping period. Major themes of these letters include the need for better early coordination by CHSRA and the need for a rigorous and thorough environmental analysis concerning the potential negative effects of the two facilities.

NEXT STEPS:
SCAG staff will continue to work with rail partner agencies in coordinating and reviewing the analysis performed on these new rail and intermodal facilities through the CHSRA environmental process and provide regular updates to TC and RC.

FISCAL IMPACT:
Staff work related to this project is included in the FY 2020-21 Overall Work Program (OWP) under Project 140.0121.02 (Regional High-Speed Transport).

ATTACHMENT(S):
1. SCAG, SBCTA and SCAQMD Joint Letter to CHSRA - June 4, 2020
2. SCAG, SBCTA and SCAQMD Joint Letter to CHSRA - September 3, 2020
June 4, 2020

Mr. Brian Kelly
Chief Executive Officer
California High Speed Rail Authority
925 L Street, Ste. 1425
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Brian:

It is our understanding that the CHSRA is getting ready to release a CEQA/NEPA document for the Los Angeles-Anaheim segment, and that this proposed project includes plans to move freight rail capacity out of Hobart Railyard to Colton.

While we understand the need to plan for the best alignment for the high speed rail system, and recognize that this might mean realignment of existing rail infrastructure, such planning should also consider local and regional implications. First, this plan concept for freight capacity realignment is not included in our Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS). The realignment would also likely result in local truck traffic and air quality impacts in conformity budgets and air quality attainment plans given both locations are in the same air district.

While the HSR project as a whole is expected to provide greenhouse gas benefits to the State, the proposed freight has the potential to impact San Bernardino County inordinately, and these environmental impacts must be disclosed, analyzed, and mitigated to the extent feasible.

This letter is to ask for more collaboration on CHSRA’s plans for this segment. We want to work with you to find a way forward to minimize the likely impacts listed. We will certainly make further comments on the CEQA/NEPA document and we hope our teams could work together in the development of the EIR/EIS for the segment.

Thank you for the consideration.

Sincerely,

KOME AJISE
Executive Director
Southern California Association of Governments

WAYNE NASTRI
Executive Officer
South Coast Air Quality Management District

RAY WOLFE
Executive Director
San Bernardino County Transportation Authority

c: David Kim, Secretary, California State Transportation Agency
September 3, 2020

Mr. Brian Kelly (Brian.Kelly@hsr.ca.gov)
Chief Executive Officer
California High Speed Rail Authority
925 L Street, Ste. 1425
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Brian,

Thank you for your July 24, 2020 response to our letter requesting additional collaboration between CHSRA and South Coast AQMD, SCAG, and SBCTA regarding the Los Angeles-Anaheim segment of the high speed rail project. We appreciate your commitment to work with us, and note that staff have had several productive briefings on the LA-Anaheim project segment. We believe continued early and open dialogue on a project of this magnitude will be important as you move forward, especially given the magnitude of the potential air quality impacts in San Bernardino County and the aggressive schedule your team is working towards.

In that spirit, we wanted to share with you some of our early concerns based on the information we have been provided thus far. The four primary issues are 1) the potential air quality impacts from the new freight railyard in Colton, 2) the need to incorporate project specific mitigation measures, 3) the potential challenges associated with various conformity determinations, and 4) the need to establish an information sharing process between the agencies and interested stakeholders. Each of these issues are discussed in more detail in the attachment to this letter.

We recognize that the environmental documentation should present all these details, and we look forward to participating in that formal review process. However, it is our experience that early consultation and sharing of more detailed technical information enhances and streamlines the overall review process and timeline, particularly for projects with
tight schedules. We reiterate our request to engage up front on CHSRA’s plans for the Los Angeles-Anaheim segment.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

KOME AJISE
Executive Director
Southern California Association of Governments

WAYNE NASTRI
Executive Officer
South Coast Air Quality Management District

RAY WOLFE
Executive Director
San Bernardino County Transportation Authority
Air Quality Impacts

It is our understanding that one component of the LA-Anaheim project is a new BNSF intermodal freight rail yard located at the former Cal Portland Cement Company plant in unincorporated San Bernardino County near the city of Colton. The community living immediately adjacent to this site is already classified by the state Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment as being in the worst 95th percentile in the state using the CalEnviroScreen 3.0 tool. These already environmentally burdened nearby census tracts also include populations with much higher proportions of Hispanic and/or Black residents than the South Coast AQMD as a whole (see table below).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>CalEnviroScreen 3.0 Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tract 6071004004</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>95-100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract 6071007108</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>95-100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract 6071012500</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>95-100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract 6071006601</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>95-100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract 6071003612</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>80-85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Coast AQMD</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Freight rail yards have many sources of emissions that impact the air regionally and locally. These include onsite equipment (e.g., cargo handling equipment and switcher locomotives) and other mobile sources that travel to and from the site (e.g., on-road trucks and long haul locomotives). Based on the limited information we received during the briefing, it is our understanding that onsite cargo handling equipment will be zero emissions. However even if all onsite equipment is zero emissions, an intermodal facility like this will attract a significant number of on-road trucks and generate new locomotive activity as trains are built every day. The emissions from these activities will dwarf those saved from using zero emission cargo handling equipment. It is our
understanding that there are currently no project components that will address the local impacts from on-road trucks or locomotives.¹

Further, the project team expressed that they anticipate that this project has the potential to reduce regional emissions, mainly due to lower truck traffic going to rail yards near downtown LA and going to this new rail yard instead. This is projected to occur because some BNSF trackage would be used for high speed rail, and the new rail yard would be designed to make up for this reduction in throughput from the Hobart yard. While this may be a potential outcome in the long term, the timing of project implementation should be addressed. As expressed to us during the briefing, the new freight rail yard would open as early as 2026, however the high speed rail project would not operate potentially until 2040. This project therefore would appear to increase the total capacity of BNSF’s system in the short term, and the resulting regional emissions from this scenario are unclear. Given the significant challenges our region faces meeting federal air quality standards in milestone years of 2023, 2031, and 2037, better understanding these shorter term impacts are of paramount importance.

Finally, from what we know today, a new railyard would likely have significant air quality impacts, locally and potentially regionally. Our understanding is that the only reason that this freight rail yard is being included as a component of the HSR project is that it would mitigate for lost trackage for BNSF. We would like to understand more about whether the freight railyard component of the project could move forward absent construction of HSR. We appreciate that these two projects are being considered collectively in the environmental analysis, however if the rail yard can move forward independently from HSR, then the air quality impacts for that component of the project should be presented separately and mitigated accordingly.

**Need for Project Mitigation**

If our limited understanding of this project is correct, there are potentially significant air quality issues that must be addressed. We appreciate that the project team has initiated discussions with our staff about providing funding for mitigation. However, any mitigation that the project team is hoping that South Coast AQMD can accomplish on its

¹ While zero emissions cargo handling equipment is welcome, note that recent emissions inventory information from 2017 provided by the railroads to South Coast AQMD indicates that the vast majority of onsite emissions are not from cargo handling equipment at southern California rail yards. Offsite emissions would also not be addressed by onsite cargo handling equipment mitigation.
behalf should only be considered after all feasible measures have been considered as part of the project itself. South Coast AQMD should only be looked to as an implementer of another project’s mitigation as a last resort after all feasible steps have been taken within the project itself. Before any further consideration of making South Coast AQMD responsible for mitigating HSR’s air quality impacts, we recommend that time be dedicated to identifying what can be done within the project itself to reduce/avoid air quality impacts.

**Conformity**

It is not fully clear at this stage, but it would appear that this project may need a conformity determination on three fronts. First, it is our understanding that the project must be included in a conforming regional transportation plan from SCAG. Second, the project may need to meet project-level transportation conformity requirements. Finally, the project must show that it meets general conformity tests. Each of these determinations require significant technical analysis. South Coast AQMD staff traditionally works with SCAG and EPA in a secondary role on the two transportation conformity tests, and we look forward to our involvement in those processes for this project. South Coast AQMD staff takes a lead role in regards to general conformity. The timing is beneficial for the project’s general conformity analysis given that we are just now beginning our 2022 Air Quality Management Plan effort. However, given the significant challenges our region faces in meeting national ambient air quality standards on time, it is not clear what portion, if any, of the region’s emissions budget can be dedicated to general conformity in the upcoming plan. We do not anticipate that the relatively simple first-come first-served set aside process from previous AQMPs will be sufficient for the 2022 AQMP. Given that there are three HSR sections in South Coast AQMD (i.e., Palmdale-Burbank, Burbank-LA, LA-Anaheim), we recommend working on general conformity for all three projects collectively, especially as emissions impacts may overlap in time.

**Need for Additional Details and Engagement**

Each of the issues identified above will require substantial technical analysis and modeling. As that work is undertaken, we encourage HSR to communicate early with our staff to work through any methodological details as they arise. While this can

---

2 For example, if there are air quality impacts from locomotives and trucks, then the project should identify mitigation to lessen impacts from those sources.
initially take time, in our experience this additional upfront work can facilitate and streamline the review process.

In addition to the technical modeling analysis for this project, we would appreciate getting a better understanding of the whole of the HSR program in our region. For example, it appears that the Burbank-LA portion of the project will require relocation of a portion of Metrolink’s maintenance activities to somewhere in the Inland Empire. Along with the relocation of freight activities to the Inland Empire from the LA-Anaheim project, we would appreciate hearing if there are other project components that will result in impacts from any of the HSR project sections that aren’t associated directly with the construction of the high speed rail line itself.

Finally, during the July 1 briefing, my staff strongly encouraged the HSR project team to reach out specifically to local and environmental community groups to discuss this project. At the request of the project team, we provided you with a list of contacts for key organizations. Since that time, we have had initial conversations with many of these groups, and they have raised significant questions about air quality and environmental justice issues associated with this project. We are unable to answer these questions as we know that you all are still actively working on analyzing impacts. However, given the limited information about this project, and the significant concerns being raised, we would again encourage you to reach out to these groups. These groups provide unique perspectives about their own communities and valuable information to better inform projects as you consider the best way to move forward.
RECOMMENDED ACTION FOR TC:
Approve and recommend that Regional Council authorize the release of the Draft 2021 FTIP for public review and comment, beginning November 6, 2020 and ending December 7, 2020.

RECOMMENDED ACTION FOR RC:
Authorize the release of the Draft 2021 FTIP for public review and comment, beginning November 6, 2020 and ending December 7, 2020.

STRATEGIC PLAN:
This item supports the following Strategic Plan Goal 7: Secure funding to support agency priorities to effectively and efficiently deliver work products.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:
SCAG is responsible for developing and maintaining the Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP) in cooperation with the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), the county transportation commissions (CTCs), and public transit operators. SCAG in cooperation with its stakeholders has developed the Draft 2021 FTIP. In order to submit the Final 2021 FTIP to Caltrans by March 1, 2021, staff is seeking the approval of the Transportation Committee (TC) to release the Draft 2021 FTIP for a thirty (30) day public review and comment period beginning on November 6, 2020. Upon completion of the public review and response to public comments, SCAG staff will report back to the Transportation Committee, the Energy and Environment Committee, and the Regional Council at the February 4, 2021 meetings to present a summary of comments received, responses to comments, proposed revisions to the Draft 2021 FTIP and seek approval of the proposed final 2021 FTIP including the associated transportation conformity analysis.

BACKGROUND:
SCAG is the federally designated Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the six (6) counties region of Southern California and the designated Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA)
per state law. As such, it is responsible for developing and maintaining the FTIP in cooperation with Caltrans, the CTCs in the SCAG region, and public transit operators. The FTIP is developed through a “bottom up” approach.

Over the past year, staff has worked in consultation and continuous communication with the CTCs throughout the region to develop the Draft 2021 FTIP. The Draft 2021 FTIP is a programming document totaling over $35.3 billion in programming and containing over 2,000 projects covering a six (6) year period. The Draft 2021 FTIP includes 62 projects for Imperial County programmed at $67.4 million; 1,050 projects for Los Angeles County programmed at $20.2 billion; 151 projects for Orange County programmed at $2.3 billion; 388 projects for Riverside County programmed at $7.3 billion; 193 projects for San Bernardino County programmed at $4.3 billion; and 168 projects for Ventura County programmed at $1.1 billion.

The projects included in the 2021 FTIP are consistent with the adopted Connect SoCal (2020 Regional Transportation Plan/ Sustainable Communities Strategy), and for the most part, represent the first six-years of capital investments outlined in the Connect SoCal. The FTIP is developed to incrementally implement the capital projects and programs contained in the Connect SoCal. It should be noted that costs associated with system operation for transit as well as highway, which represent significant portion of costs accounted in the Connect SoCal, are not reflected in FTIP. FTIP only reflects capital improvement costs for capacity addition as well as operational improvements. It also does not capture local investments that do not rely on federal sources, which are critical to realizing the region’s vision and level of investment anticipated by Connect SoCal for Active Transportation and improvements to local streets.

The 2012 federal transportation authorization legislation, ‘Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century’ (MAP-21) and the subsequent 2015 federal transportation authorization legislation, ‘Fixing America’s Surface Transportation’ (FAST) established new requirements for performance management and reporting to ensure the most efficient investment of Federal transportation funds. To incorporate the new federal performance requirements into the FTIP, SCAG is required to show (1) that the FTIP “makes progress towards achieving [the region’s] performance targets” and (2) that the FTIP includes, “to the maximum extent practicable, a description of the anticipated effect of the FTIP towards achieving the performance targets.” The performance measure (PM) targets for the SCAG region are required to be included in the FTIP, along with information regarding how the region is working toward achieving those targets.

The MAP-21 performance measures provide a standardized quantitative framework for evaluating statewide and regional progress toward meeting national transportation system performance goals. Guidelines in support of the MAP-21 performance monitoring program were finalized by FHWA through three rulemakings. Performance Management Rule 1 (PM 1) provides performance metrics for Transportation System Safety; Performance Management Rule 2 (PM 2) defines measures for
National Highway System (NHS) pavement and bridge condition; and Performance Management Rule 3 (PM3) focuses on NHS System Performance, Freight Movement, and the CMAQ program.

In consultation with the state’s MPOs, Caltrans was required to establish two-year and four-year statewide targets for each of the designated federal performance measures within these performance categories. The MPOs, including SCAG, were then required to establish targets for their respective region. MAP-21 requires that both the RTP/SCS and the FTIP include information on the federal performance targets established for the SCAG region and a description of how the region is performing in regard to achievement of those targets.

At the conclusion of the initial four-year performance reporting cycle in 2022, SCAG will coordinate with Caltrans on the development of a report to FHWA indicating to what extent the MAP-21 performance targets for PM 1, PM 2, and PM 3 were achieved at both the state and regional level. Based on a review of projects included in the 2021 FTIP, there are more than 500 projects that are anticipated to have a safety benefit. These safety-related investments programmed in the FTIP total more than $7 billion. These figures will change since subsequent FTIP amendments will impact performance measures.

The projects contained within the 2021 FTIP have been developed in accordance with the applicable provisions and requirements of 23 CFR Part 450 and are expected to support the achievement of these PM targets. These targets will be achieved through the implementation of investment priorities through the programming of transportation projects in the 2021 FTIP, and subsequent FTIP Amendments and Administrative Modifications.

Additionally, the Draft 2021 FTIP includes a new section that describes the CTC project selection procedures. Each CTC explains how projects are selected for inclusion in the FTIP and is consistent with the “bottoms up” approach of the development for the 2021 FTIP. Per the 2020 Connect SoCal (2020 RTP/SCS), Highways and Arterials Appendix, SCAG has a current set of principles to guide the development of programming priority for Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG) and Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) funds. The principles were reviewed through the AB 1246 process and adopted by SCAG’s Regional Council. These principles are used in the development of each county’s STBG and CMAQ programs.

The FTIP must meet the following five (5) required transportation conformity tests:

1. Consistency with the Adopted 2020 RTP/SCS
   (23 CFR, Section 450.324 of the U.S. DOT Metropolitan Planning Regulations)
2. Regional Emissions Analysis
   (40 CFR, Sections 93.109, 93.110, 93.118, and 93,119)
3. Timely Implementation of Transportation Control Measures (TCMs)
   (40 CFR, Section 93.113)
4. **Financial Constraint**  
   (40 CFR, Section 93.108 and 23 CFR, Section 450.324)
5. **Interagency Consultation and Public Involvement**  
   (40 CFR, Sections 93.105 and 93.112 and 23 CFR, Section 450.324)

In order to allow for a February 4, 2021 adoption of the 2021 FTIP including the associated Transportation Conformity Analysis by the Regional Council and submit the adopted FTIP to Caltrans by March 1, 2021, staff is requesting that the Transportation Committee recommend authorization by the Regional Council to release the Draft 2021 FTIP for a 30-day public review and comment period November 6, 2020 through December 7, 2020.

Two public hearings will be held during the public review period. The first public hearing will be held on November 17, 2020 and the second public hearing will be held on December 2, 2020. Both public hearings will be held virtually. The Draft 2021 FTIP will be posted on SCAG’s website and noticed in major county newspapers including in Chinese, Korean, Vietnamese, and Spanish newspapers. Notices regarding the availability of the Draft 2021 FTIP for public review will be distributed to over 50 public libraries throughout the region. In addition, hardcopies of the 2021 FTIP will also be provided as requested by public libraries. Upon completion of the public review period, SCAG staff will provide responses to all comments in the proposed final 2021 FTIP. The proposed final 2021 FTIP will thereafter be presented to the Transportation Committee and Regional Council for approval at the February 4, 2021 meetings. The final Transportation Conformity Analysis will be presented to the Energy and Environment Committee (EEC) and Regional Council for approval on the same day. Federal approval of the 2021 FTIP is expected to occur in mid-April 2021.

The Draft 2021 FTIP is accessible at: http://ftip.scag.ca.gov/ Pages/2021/draft.aspx or www.scag.ca.gov.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**
Work associated with this item is included in the current FY 2020-21 Overall Work Program (OWP) under project 030.0146.02 (Federal Transportation Improvement Program) and 010.0170.01 (RTP Support, Development, and Implementation).

**ATTACHMENT(S):**
1. Draft 2021 Federal Transportation Improvement Program Executive Summary
2. PowerPoint Presentation - Draft 2021 Federal Transportation Improvement Program
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INTRODUCTION

The Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP) is a federally mandated four-year program of all surface transportation projects that will receive federal funding or are subject to a federally required action. The SCAG 2021 FTIP is a comprehensive listing of such transportation projects proposed over fiscal years (FY) 2020/21 - 2025/26 for the region, with the last two years 2024/25-2025/26 provided for informational purposes. As the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the six-county region of Imperial, Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino, and Ventura, SCAG is responsible for developing the FTIP for submittal to the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) and the federal funding agencies. This listing identifies specific funding sources and fund amounts for each project. It is prioritized to implement SCAG’s overall strategy for enhancing regional mobility and improving both the efficiency and safety of the regional transportation system, while supporting efforts to attain federal and state air quality standards for the region by reducing transportation related air pollution and greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. Projects in the FTIP include highway improvements, transit, rail and bus facilities, high occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes, high occupancy toll (HOT) lanes, signal synchronization, intersection improvements, freeway ramps, and non-motorized (including active transportation) projects.

The FTIP is developed through a bottom-up process by which the six County Transportation Commissions (CTCs) work with their local agencies and public transportation operators, as well as the general public, to develop their individual county Transportation Improvement Programs (TIPs) based on their project selection criteria for inclusion into the regional FTIP. The 2021 FTIP has been developed in partnership with the CTCs and Caltrans.

The FTIP must include all federally funded transportation projects in the region, as well as all regionally significant transportation projects for which approval from federal funding agencies is required, regardless of funding source.

The projects included in the 2021 FTIP are consistent with SCAG’s approved Connect SoCal - 2020 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS). The FTIP is developed to incrementally implement the programs and projects contained in the RTP/SCS.
PROGRAM SUMMARY

The 2021 FTIP includes approximately 2,000 projects programmed at $35.3 billion over the next six years. By comparison, the total programming for the 2019 FTIP was $34.6 billion. The increase in programming funds in the 2021 FTIP compared to the 2019 FTIP is due to a variety of factors. First, the passage of SB 1 in 2017 has increased programming for transportation projects throughout the state and in the SCAG region. Additionally, the passage of Los Angeles County’s Measure M sales tax has increased funding for transportation projects throughout Los Angeles County. The 2021 FTIP shows that $7.4 billion in previously programmed funds have been implemented (see listing of “Completed Projects” in Project Listing Volume III – Part A of the 2021 FTIP). In addition, the 2021 FTIP reflects $19.3 billion in secured funding (see listing of “100% Prior Years” in Project Listing Volume III – Part A of the 2019 FTIP).

The following charts and tables demonstrate how these funds are distributed based on funding source, program, and county.

FIGURE 1 is a summary of funding sources categorized as federal, state and local sources. FIGURE 1 and its accompanying pie chart illustrate that 16 percent of the program total is from federal funds, 28 percent from state funds, and 56 percent from local funds.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FEDERAL</th>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>LOCAL</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2020/21</td>
<td>$1,967,541</td>
<td>$5,305,507</td>
<td>$3,975,931</td>
<td>$11,248,979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021/22</td>
<td>$1,187,249</td>
<td>$2,119,643</td>
<td>$3,558,508</td>
<td>$6,865,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022/23</td>
<td>$1,254,329</td>
<td>$502,695</td>
<td>$2,662,077</td>
<td>$4,419,101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023/24</td>
<td>$717,156</td>
<td>$479,997</td>
<td>$3,744,516</td>
<td>$4,941,669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024/25</td>
<td>$255,100</td>
<td>$1,234,697</td>
<td>$2,465,258</td>
<td>$3,965,055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025/26</td>
<td>$240,289</td>
<td>$241,466</td>
<td>$3,398,369</td>
<td>$3,880,124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$5,631,664</td>
<td>$9,884,005</td>
<td>$19,804,659</td>
<td>$35,320,328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% OF TOTAL</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SUMMARY OF 2021 FTIP BY FUNDING SOURCE
The six pie charts shown below summarize the funds programmed in the 2021 FTIP for each county in the SCAG region by federal, state, and local funding sources.

**IMPERIAL COUNTY: $67,447 (in $000’s)**

- Federal: $35,672 (53%)
- State: $14,855 (22%)
- Local: $16,920 (25%)

**LOS ANGELES COUNTY: $20,151,569 (in $000’s)**

- Federal: $9,458,518 (47%)
- State: $6,227,718 (31%)
- Local: $4,465,333 (22%)

**ORANGE COUNTY: $2,308,037 (in $000’s)**

- Federal: $1,250,656 (54%)
- State: $486,424 (21%)
- Local: $570,957 (25%)

**RIVERSIDE COUNTY: $7,282,415 (in $000’s)**

- Federal: $3,165,922 (74%)
- State: $867,567 (28%)
- Local: $229,423 (6%)

**SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY: $4,262,912 (in $000’s)**

- Federal: $326,687 (14%)
- State: $1,565,888 (58%)
- Local: $158,855 (7%)

**VENTURA COUNTY: $1,152,430 (in $000’s)**

- Federal: $229,423 (6%)
- State: $666,688 (58%)
- Local: $158,855 (14%)
FIGURE 2 summarizes the funds programmed in the local highways, state highways, and transit (including rail) programs. FIGURE 2 (and its accompanying pie chart) illustrate that 42 percent of the total $35.3 billion in the 2021 FTIP is programmed in the State Highway Program, 20 percent in the Local Highway Program and 38 percent in the Transit (including rail) Program. For further information, please refer to the Financial Plan section of the Technical Appendix (Volume II) of the 2021 FTIP.

At the time of the development of the 2021 FTIP the SCAG region, along with every other region in the world, is facing the devastation of the COVID-19 pandemic. The national, state, county, and local stay-at home and quarantine orders have put a strain on the all aspects of society as well as the economy. As the public adjusts to the stay-at-home and quarantine orders, transportation demand has been drastically reduced and fuel consumption has decreased as people are driving less thereby consuming less fuel. The overall reduction in revenues due to the COVID-19 pandemic is unknown as the SCAG region relies heavily on local sales tax measures for the timely delivery of transportation projects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>LOCAL</th>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>TRANSIT (INCLUDING RAIL)</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2020/21</td>
<td>$1,909,560</td>
<td>$5,399,986</td>
<td>$3,939,433</td>
<td>$11,248,979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021/22</td>
<td>$1,023,299</td>
<td>$3,092,629</td>
<td>$2,749,472</td>
<td>$6,865,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022/23</td>
<td>$570,324</td>
<td>$1,220,181</td>
<td>$2,628,596</td>
<td>$4,419,101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023/24</td>
<td>$684,967</td>
<td>$1,366,716</td>
<td>$2,899,986</td>
<td>$4,941,669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024/25</td>
<td>$1,130,418</td>
<td>$2,101,509</td>
<td>$733,128</td>
<td>$3,965,055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025/26</td>
<td>$1,571,050</td>
<td>$1,695,528</td>
<td>$613,546</td>
<td>$3,880,124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$6,889,618</td>
<td>$14,876,549</td>
<td>$13,554,161</td>
<td>$35,320,328</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% OF TOTAL  | 20% | 42% | 38% | 100% |
The six pie charts below summarize the funds programmed in the 2021 FTIP for each county in the SCAG region for State Highway, Local Highway, and Transit programs.

**IMPERIAL COUNTY: $67,447 (in $000’s)**
- Local Highway: $15,702 (25%)
- State Highway: $6,609 (10%)
- Transit (including Rail): $44,136 (65%)

**LOS ANGELES COUNTY: $20,151,569 (in $000’s)**
- Local Highway: $12,094,984 (60%)
- State Highway: $5,330,117 (26%)
- Transit (including Rail): $2,736,468 (14%)

**ORANGE COUNTY: $2,308,037 (in $000’s)**
- Local Highway: $1,278,115 (55%)
- State Highway: $819,891 (36%)
- Transit (including Rail): $210,031 (9%)

**RIVERSIDE COUNTY: $7,282,415 (in $000’s)**
- Local Highway: $374,006 (9%)
- State Highway: $3,091,425 (72%)
- Transit (including Rail): $2,857,944 (40%)

**SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY: $4,262,912 (in $000’s)**
- Local Highway: $397,491 (19%)
- State Highway: $3,091,425 (72%)
- Transit (including Rail): $138,040 (12%)

**VENTURA COUNTY: $1,152,430 (in $000’s)**
- Local Highway: $786,557 (68%)
- State Highway: $227,833 (20%)
- Transit (including Rail): $139,040 (12%)
ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE

The Connect SoCal - 2020 RTP/SCS, approved by the SCAG Regional Council on May 7, 2020 (and certified by FHWA/FTA with regard to transportation conformity on June 5, 2020), includes a comprehensive Environmental Justice analysis. On September 3, 2020, Connect SoCal - 2020 RTP/SCS was approved in its entirety and for all other purposes. The 2021 FTIP is consistent with the policies, programs and projects included in the Connect SoCal - 2020 RTP/SCS, and as such the Environmental Justice analysis included as part of Connect SoCal appropriately serves as the analysis for the transportation investments in the 2021 FTIP.

A key component of Connect SoCal’s development process was to further implement SCAG’s Public Participation Plan (PPP), which involved outreach to achieve meaningful public engagement with minority and low-income populations, and included the solicitation of input from our regional environmental justice stakeholders through the Environmental Justice Working Group which started in May 2018. As part of the environmental justice analysis for Connect SoCal, SCAG identified multiple performance measures to analyze existing social and environmental equity in the region and to assess the impacts of Connect SoCal on various environmental justice population groups. These performance measures included impacts related to relative tax burden, share of transportation system usage, jobs–housing imbalance, neighborhood change and displacement, access to essential services like jobs, shopping and parks and open space, air quality, public health, noise, and rail related impacts. For additional information regarding these and other environmental justice performance measures and the detailed environmental justice analysis, please see: www.connectsocal.org/Documents/Adopted/fConnectSoCal_Environmental-Justice.pdf.

On September 6, 2018, SCAG’s Regional Council adopted an updated Public Participation Plan designed to be accessible to a general audience and adaptable in anticipation of evolving technologies and practices. The updated plan addresses Title VI Requirements and Guidelines for Federal Transit Administration Recipients (FTA Circular 4702.1B; Effective October 1, 2012), including enhanced strategies for engaging minority and limited English proficient populations in SCAG’s transportation planning and programming processes, as well as Environmental Justice Policy Guidance for Federal Transit Administration Recipients (FTA Circular 4703.1; Effective August 15, 2012).

INTERAGENCY CONSULTATION AND PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

As stated earlier in this document, the 2021 FTIP complies with applicable federal and state requirements for interagency consultation and public involvement by following the strategies described in SCAG’s Public Participation Plan (PPP).

In accordance with the PPP, SCAG’s Transportation Conformity Working Group (TCWG) serves as a regional forum for interagency consultation. For more information on SCAG’s current PPP, please visit: scag.ca.gov/Documents/Final2018PPP.pdf.

SCAG, in cooperation with the CTCs, TCWG, and other local, state, and federal partners, completed an update to the 2021 FTIP Guidelines. Development of these guidelines is the first step in drafting the 2021 FTIP. The guidelines serve as a manual for CTCs to develop their respective county Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and for submitting their TIPs through SCAG’s FTIP database. SCAG received comments from stakeholders and revised the document as necessary. The Final Guidelines for the 2021 FTIP were approved by the SCAG Regional Council on September 5, 2019. For additional information on the 2021 FTIP Guidelines, please visit: ftp.scag.ca.gov/Pages/Final2021/FTIPGuidelines.pdf.

On November 5, 2020, the Draft 2021 FTIP will be released for a 30-day public review period. During the public review period, two public hearings will be held on the Draft 2021 FTIP, the first on November 17th and the second on December 2, 2020. Given recent public health directives limiting public gatherings due to the threat of COVID-19 and in compliance with the Governor’s recent Executive Order N29-20, the hearings will be held virtually via Zoom. These public hearings will be noticed in numerous newspapers throughout the region. The notices will be published in English, Spanish, Korean, Chinese and Vietnamese languages (copies of these notices are included in Section V of the Final Technical Appendix). The 2021 FTIP will be posted on the SCAG website and distributed to libraries throughout the region.
ECONOMIC IMPACTS OF 2021 FTIP PROGRAM EXPENDITURES

THE FTIP’S INVESTMENT PLAN IN TERMS OF ECONOMIC GROWTH AND JOB CREATION

The FTIP program budget includes spending on a mix of transportation projects – state highway, local highway, and transit – that are planned in six Southern California counties over a six-year time period beginning in FY 2020/2021 and ending in FY 2025/2026. Economic and job impacts were calculated using REMI, a structural regional impact model that estimates economic and employment gains arising from transportation and infrastructure investments. The REMI model uses a system of equations based on county-specific information to forecast how the region’s economy changes over time and reacts to new conditions by county and by year.

FTIP expenditures are categorized by function into three broad industries: construction, transit operations and maintenance, and architectural and engineering services. Operations and maintenance expenditures for highways and transit facilities are included in the construction category given their similarity. Due to differences in economic impacts arising from different kinds of transportation spending, FTIP transportation project expenditure data is sorted by category, such as construction services, operations and maintenance for transit operations and architectural and engineering services. Right-of-way acquisition costs are excluded since these represent a transfer of assets and are generally considered to have no economic impact. Each category of spending was modeled separately and their impacts summed. Employment estimates are measured on a job-count basis for employment gains and are reported on an annual basis.

Over the six-year period, the FTIP program will generate an annual average of more than 104,000 jobs in the six-county SCAG region. The total employment impact of the 2021 FTIP transportation program is shown in Figure 3.

![FIGURE 3 JOBS CREATED ANNUALLY BY 2021 FTIP INVESTMENTS (REMI ANALYSIS)](attachment:Draft 2021 Federal Transportation Improvement Program Executive Summary (Release of the Draft 2021 Federal Transportation Improvement Program Executive Summary).)

In addition to supporting the economy and job creation in the SCAG region, the rest of California will also benefit from spillover impacts of these investments totaling an additional 4,760 jobs per year on average. This shows that investing for transportation in SCAG region is important for job creation not only for our region but also beyond.
These impacts are primarily related to the construction and maintenance-related benefits of the 2021 FTIP, or the economic and job creation impacts of the direct investment in transportation infrastructure. In addition, there are longer-term economic impacts as a result of the relative efficiency improvements of the regional transportation system. Connect SoCal - 2020 RTP/SCS, included an analysis of economic impacts arising from efficiency gains in terms of worker and business economic productivity and goods movement that will be beneficial in terms of economic development, competitive advantage, and overall improvement in the economic competitiveness of the SCAG region within the global economy. Projects that reduce congestion may help firms produce at lower cost, or allow those firms to reach larger markets or hire more highly skilled employees. A robust regional economy with a well-functioning transportation system provides a more attractive place for firms to do business, enhancing the economic competitiveness of the SCAG region.

Over time, these transportation network efficiency benefits become all the more important to regions such as Southern California in terms of enhanced economic growth and competitiveness, attraction and retention of employers and highly skilled employees, and creation of good-paying jobs. Economic analysis performed in support of the 2020 RTP/SCS estimated that job gains resulting from transportation network efficiency improvements derived from full implementation of the RTP to be an average of 264,500 jobs per year.

2021 FTIP PROGRAM PERFORMANCE

Connect SoCal set forth a vision to advance Southern California’s mobility, economy, and sustainability objectives for the next several decades. To help realize this vision, Connect SoCal includes specific regional goals and policies. To measure the extent to which the RTP/SCS achieves these performance objectives, and to help guide the identification of preferred strategies and alternatives, SCAG developed a set of multi-modal performance measures as featured in the Connect SoCal Performance Measures Technical Report:


The ‘Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century’ (MAP-21) legislation, which was signed into law in July 2012, established new federal requirements for states and MPOs such as SCAG to implement a performance-based approach to transportation system decision making and development of transportation plans. The ‘Fixing America’s Surface Transportation’ (FAST) Act, signed into law in December 2015, reaffirmed the federal commitment to the establishment of transportation performance measures. Although SCAG has been using performance measures in its metropolitan planning programs for many years, MAP-21 required the establishment of state and regional performance targets that address several performance measures specifically indicated in the federal legislation:

- Number of fatalities and serious injuries on all public roads
- Rate of fatalities and serious injuries on all public roads
- Total combined number of non-motorized fatalities and serious injuries on all public roads
- Pavement condition on the Interstate System and National Highway System (NHS)
- Bridge condition on the NHS
- Percent of reliable person miles travelled on the Interstate System and on the non-interstate NHS
- Percent of Interstate System mileage with reliable truck travel times
- On-road mobile source emissions
- Non-single occupancy vehicle made share
- Transit system safety
- Transit asset management

MAP-21 also required that the FTIP include, to the maximum extent practicable, a description of the anticipated effect of the TIP program toward achieving the federal performance targets, thereby linking investment priorities to those targets. Federal rulemaking finalized in May 2017 provided performance measures for highway safety, National Highway System (NHS) performance, freight movement, the Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) program, and for pavement and bridge condition. The Final Rule required that State Departments of Transportation and MPOs collaborate to establish targets in the identified national performance areas to document progress over time and to inform expectations for future performance. The performance discussion included in the 2021 FTIP will focus on key metrics from the 2020 RTP/SCS (Connect SoCal), which includes the federal MAP-21 performance measures.

For additional information regarding program performance, please see the Performance Measures chapter of the 2021 FTIP Technical Appendix at: ftip.scag.ca.gov/Documents/D2021-FTIP_TA_Sec07.pdf.
PROGRAMMING INVESTMENTS

The FTIP reflects how the region is moving forward in implementing the transportation policies and goals of the 2020 RTP/SCS (Connect SoCal). The 2021 FTIP funding breakdown (FIGURE 4) shows the region’s transportation priorities, with an emphasis on operations and maintenance of the existing regional transportation system.

FIGURE 4 2021 FTIP AMOUNT PROGRAMMED (IN $ MILLIONS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transit Improvements</td>
<td>$9,670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Operations and Maintenance</td>
<td>$4,044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway Improvements</td>
<td>$12,801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway Operations and Maintenance</td>
<td>$7,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITS, Transportation Demand Management, and Active Transportation</td>
<td>$861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>$365</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2021 FTIP INVESTMENT CATEGORIES

TRANSIT INVESTMENT: $13,713,607 ($1,000's)

- Transit Improvements: $4,044,037 (29%)
- Transit Operations & Maintenance: $9,669,570 (71%)

HIGHWAY INVESTMENT: $21,607,721 ($1,000's)

- Capacity Improvements: $12,080,166 (56%)
- HOV Lanes: $860,769 (4%)
- Capacity Improvements: $7580,287 (35%)
- Highway Operations & Maintenance: $364,572 (2%)
- ITS, TDM, & Non-Motorized: $365,747 (3%)
- Other Highway Improvement: $861
The 2021 FTIP includes an estimated $1.15 billion programmed towards active transportation projects. While the FTIP presents an overview of federally funded investments in the region, it is not a complete picture of all the active transportation type projects that are delivered. This is because active transportation projects that are 100% locally funded or 100% state funded are not required to be programmed in the FTIP. The FTIP only includes federally funded projects and other projects that require federal action. In 2017, Senate Bill 1, the Road Repair and Accountability Act, was signed into law. SB 1 established $56 billion in investments to California’s transportation system through the establishment of a new tax on gasoline purchases. Funds are split equally between the State and Cities/Counties. Further, SB1 increased the investment in the State’s Active Transportation Program (ATP) from $123 million annually to $223 million annually; nearly doubling the funding available in the program. Active transportation improvement projects tend to be smaller projects where state generated funds like SB1 are preferred by local agencies for implementation due to the reduction of cumbersome requirements common with federal funds.

**FIGURE 5** provides a breakdown of how the $1.15 billion programmed in the 2021 FTIP is allocated to different project types in the region. In addition to the amount currently programmed, Cycle 5 of Active Transportation Program (ATP) grants will be programmed once they are released by Caltrans, thereby increasing overall FTIP investments towards active transportation.

SCAG’s RTP/SCS calls for increases in active transportation funding over the 25-year plan period, culminating in a total of $22.5 billion through 2045. Overall, the level of investment described here closely aligns with Connect SoCal and demonstrates the region is on track to meet its goal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ATP PROJECT TYPE</th>
<th>SCAG REGION 2021 FTIP FY2020/21 - FY2025/26*</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE OF ATP INVESTMENT IN 2021 FTIP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle &amp; Pedestrian Infrastructure</td>
<td>$556.6</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedicated Bicycle Infrastructure</td>
<td>$216.7</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedicated Pedestrian Infrastructure</td>
<td>$139.7</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Mile/Last Mile Strategies</td>
<td>$104.6</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Detection &amp; Traffic Signals</td>
<td>$24.1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe Routes to Schools/Education</td>
<td>$1.1</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>$1.8</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATP as Part of Larger Project (est. average 5% of total cost)</td>
<td>$103.7</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL AMOUNTS</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,148.3</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Excludes ATP Projects for Cycle 5
TRANSPORTATION CONFORMITY

The 2021 FTIP must satisfy the following requirements to be in compliance with federal conformity regulations: it must be consistent with SCAG’s 2020 RTP/SCS (Connect SoCal); it must meet regional emissions tests; it must demonstrate timely implementation of transportation control measures (TCMs); it must go through inter-agency consultation and public involvement process; and it must be financially constrained.

CONFORMITY DETERMINATIONS FOR THE DRAFT 2021 FTIP

The 2021 FTIP meets all federal transportation conformity requirements and passes the five tests required under the U.S. DOT Metropolitan Planning Regulations and U.S. EPA Transportation Conformity Regulations. SCAG has made the following conformity findings for the 2021 FTIP under the required federal tests.

CONSISTENCY WITH THE 2020 RTP/SCS TEST

**FINDING:** SCAG’s 2021 FTIP (project listing) is consistent with the 2020 RTP/SCS (policies, programs, and projects).

REGIONAL EMISSIONS TESTS

These findings are based on the regional emissions test analyses shown in Tables 21–48 in Section II of the Technical Appendix.

**FINDING:** The regional emissions analyses for the 2021 FTIP is an update to the regional emissions analyses for the Connect SoCal - 2020 RTP/SCS.

**FINDING:** The 2021 FTIP regional emissions for ozone precursors (2008 and 2015 NAAQS) meet all applicable emission budget tests for all milestone, attainment, and planning horizon years for the Morongo Band of Mission Indians (Morongo), Pechanga Band of Luiseño Mission Indians of the Pechanga Reservation (Pechanga), SCAB excluding Morongo and Pechanga, South Central Coast Air Basin (SCCAB), Ventura County portion), Western Mojave Desert Air Basin (MDAB), Los Angeles County Antelope Valley portion and San Bernardino County western portion of MDAB), and the Salton Sea Air Basin (SSAB), Riverside County Coachella Valley and Imperial County portions).

**FINDING:** The 2021 FTIP regional emissions for PM2.5 and its precursors (1997, 2006, and 2012 NAAQS) meet all applicable emission budget tests for all milestone, attainment, and planning horizon years for the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB) (Pechanga excluded under 2012 annual PM2.5 NAAQS).

**FINDING:** The 2021 FTIP regional emissions for CO meet all applicable emission budget tests for all milestone, attainment and planning horizon years in the SCAB.

**FINDING:** The 2021 FTIP regional emissions for PM10 and its precursors meet all applicable emission budget tests for all milestone, attainment, and planning horizon years in the SCAB and the SSAB (Riverside County Coachella Valley portion).

**FINDING:** The 2021 FTIP regional emissions for PM10 meet the interim emission test (build/no-build test) for all milestone, attainment, and planning horizon years for the MDAB (San Bernardino County portion excluding Searles Valley portion) and Searles Valley portion of San Bernardino County).

**FINDING:** The 2021 FTIP regional emissions analysis for PM2.5 and its precursors (2006 and 2012 NAAQS) meet the interim emission test (build/no-build test) for all milestone, attainment, and planning horizon years for the SSAB (urbanized area of Imperial County portion).
TIMELY IMPLEMENTATION OF TCM TEST

**FINDING:** The TCM project categories listed in the 1994/1997/2003/2007/2012/2016 Ozone SIPs for the SCAB area were given funding priority, are expected to be implemented on schedule and, in the case of any delays, any obstacles to implementation have been or are being overcome.

**FINDING:** The TCM strategies listed in the 2016 Ozone SIP for the SCCAB (Ventura County) were given funding priority, are expected to be implemented on schedule and, in the case of any delays, any obstacles to implementation have been or are being overcome.

INTER-Agency CONSULTATION AND PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT TEST

**FINDING:** The 2021 FTIP complies with all federal and state requirements for interagency consultation and public involvement by following the strategies described in SCAG’s Public Participation Plan (PPP). For more information on SCAG’s PPP, please visit [http://scag.ca.gov/Documents/Final2018PPP.pdf](http://scag.ca.gov/Documents/Final2018PPP.pdf). In accordance with the PPP, SCAG’s Transportation Conformity Working Group (TCWG) serves as a forum for interagency consultation.

The 2021 FTIP was discussed with SCAG’s TCWG, which includes representatives from the federal, state, and local air quality and transportation agencies, on multiple occasions throughout the development process (September 24, 2019; October 29, 2019; December 7, 2019; February 25, 2020; March 24, 2020; April 28, 2020; May 26, 2020; June 23, 2020; and July 28, 2020 August 25, 2020, and September 22, 2020). The draft conformity analysis will be released for a 30-day public review on November 6, 2020. Two public hearings will be held, the first on November 17th and the second on December 2, 2020. Given recent public health directives limiting public gatherings due to the threat of COVID-19 and in compliance with the Governor’s recent Executive Order N29-20, the hearings will be held virtually via Zoom. The 2021 FTIP will also be presented to the Regional Transportation CEOs at their meeting held on January 15, 2021, fulfilling the consultation requirements of AB 1246 as codified in Public Utilities Code Sections 130058 and 130059. The 2021 FTIP is posted on the SCAG website, noticed in numerous newspapers, and distributed to libraries throughout the region. All comments on the 2021 FTIP will be documented and responded to accordingly.

FINANCIAL CONSTRAINT TEST

**FINDING:** The 2021 FTIP is fiscally constrained since it complies with federal financial constraint requirements under 23 U.S. Code Section 134(h) and 23 CFR Section 450.324(e) and is consistent with the Financial Plan contained in the Connect SoCal - 2020 RTP/SCS. SCAG’s 2021 FTIP demonstrates financial constraint in the financial plan by identifying all transportation revenues including local, state, and federal sources available to meet the region’s programming totals.
Draft 2021 Federal Transportation Improvement Program

presented to the Transportation Committee

November 5, 2020

What is the Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP)?

• The FTIP is a federally mandated list of transportation investment priorities in the SCAG region.

• Federal regulations require the FTIP be updated at least every four years, SCAG updates it every two years to be consistent with the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). With the approval of AB1291, the submittal of the 2021 FTIP will be delayed to March and receive federal approval on April 16, 2021.

• The FTIP is prepared by SCAG in coordination and consultation with the County Transportation Commissions (CTCs) through a bottoms-up approach, it is a multimodal list of capital improvements programmed with various federal, state, and local fund sources proposed over a six-year period.
Continued ... What is the Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP)?

- The FTIP is prioritized to implement the region's overall strategy for providing mobility and improving both the efficiency and safety of the transportation system. FTIP is the implementation vehicle for the capital projects (transportation improvements) committed in the Connect SoCal (RTP/SCS).

- The FTIP is a dynamic document that is amended frequently to reflect updates to funding, schedules, and program priority changes.

- The 2021 FTIP includes approximately 2,000 projects in the region, representing an investment of $35.2 billion over a six-year period.

Summary of 2021 FTIP by Funding Source (000’s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Federal</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Local</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 20-21</td>
<td>$1,967,541</td>
<td>$5,305,507</td>
<td>$3,975,931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 21-22</td>
<td>$1,187,249</td>
<td>$2,119,643</td>
<td>$3,558,508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 22-23</td>
<td>$1,254,329</td>
<td>$502,695</td>
<td>$2,662,077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 23-24</td>
<td>$717,156</td>
<td>$479,997</td>
<td>$3,744,516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 24-25</td>
<td>$265,100</td>
<td>$1,234,697</td>
<td>$2,465,258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 25-26</td>
<td>$240,289</td>
<td>$241,466</td>
<td>$3,398,369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$5,631,664</td>
<td>$9,884,005</td>
<td>$19,804,659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of 2021 FTIP by Funding Source (in $000's)

- Federal 16%
- State 28%
- Local 56%
2021 FTIP Investment Categories

**TRANSIT INVESTMENTS**
$13,713,607 (\$1,000s)
- Transit Improvements
  - Transit Operations & Maintenance

- Transit Improvements
  - Transit Operations & Maintenance

**HIGHWAY INVESTMENTS**
$21,766,167 (\$1,000s)
- Capacity Improvements
- HOV Lanes
- Highway Operations & Maintenance
- ITS, TDM, & Non-Motorized
- Other Highway Improvement

Approximately **2,000 projects** programmed region-wide for an investment of **$35.2 billion**

2021 FTIP Program Performance

- The FTIP implements the transportation priorities identified in the 2020 RTP/SCS (Connect SoCal), including safety, system preservation, access, air quality etc.

- MAP-21 & the FAST Act require the establishment of performance targets for the various performance measures (PMs) identified in the legislation.

- The 2021 FTIP includes discussion of these targets and how these investments will support the region towards achieving these targets.

- At the completion of the four-year performance reporting cycle (2022), SCAG will coordinate with Caltrans to develop a report indicating to what extent those objectives were achieved at both the state & regional level.

- Based on a review of projects included in the 2021 FTIP, there are more than 500 projects that are anticipated to result in safety benefit. These safety-related investments programmed in the FTIP total more than $7 billion. FTIP amendments will impact PMs, therefore these figures will change.
2021 FTIP Project Selection Procedures

- The 2021 FTIP includes a new Section to the Technical Appendix Volume II of III (Page VIII+1) per Caltrans and Federal requirements to highlight County Transportation Commission’s (CTC’s) Project Selection Procedures.
- Each CTC has submitted their project selection procedures to the FTIP
- Consistent with the “bottoms up” approach for 2021 FTIP development

Conformity Tests for the 2021 FTIP

The 2021 FTIP meets the five tests for transportation conformity

1. **Consistent with Connect SoCal - 2020 RTP/SCS**
   - The FTIP is consistent with the Connect SoCal - 2020 RTP/SCS.

2. **Regional Emissions Analysis**
   - Projects in the FTIP meet the Air Quality Standards set forth in the State Implementation Plan (SIP).

3. **Timely Implementations of Transportation Control Measure (TCM)**
   - The FTIP includes projects that meet this test.
   - TCMs reduce pollutants from transportation sources by reducing vehicle use or congestion conditions.

4. **Financial Constraint**
   - The 2021 FTIP complies with federal financial constraint requirements.

5. **Public Participation/Interagency Consultation**
   - The FTIP was presented to The Conformity Working Group (TCWG) throughout its development.
   - The FTIP will be released for a 30 day public review period.
   - SCAG will hold two public hearings on November 17 and December 2, 2020.
   - Public notices will be placed in newspapers throughout the region, including four foreign language newspapers.
Recommended Action

**RECOMMENDED ACTION FOR TC:**
Approve and recommend that Regional Council authorize the release of the Draft 2021 FTIP for public review and comment, beginning November 6, 2020 and ending December 7, 2020.

**RECOMMENDED ACTION FOR RC:**
Authorize the release of the Draft 2021 FTIP for public review and comment, beginning November 6, 2020 and ending December 7, 2020.
Thank you

For more information, please visit:
http://ftip.scag.ca.gov

Or email us at gutierre@scag.ca.gov

SCAG
INNOVATING FOR A BETTER TOMORROW
WWW.SCAG.CA.GOV
To: Transportation Committee (TC)  
Regional Council (RC)  

From: Annie Nam, Manager of Goods Movement,  
(213) 236-1827, Nam@scag.ca.gov  

Subject: Last Mile Freight Program Draft Guidelines  

RECOMMENDED ACTION FOR TC:  
Recommend the Regional Council approve the Last Mile Freight Program Draft Guidelines and authorize staff to release the Last Mile Freight Program Call-for-Projects, pending the execution of an agreement with the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD).  

RECOMMENDED ACTION FOR RC:  
Approve the Last Mile Freight Program Draft Guidelines and authorize staff to release the Last Mile Freight Program Call-for-Projects, pending the execution of an agreement with SCAQMD.  

STRATEGIC PLAN:  
This item supports the following Strategic Plan Goal 1: Produce innovative solutions that improve the quality of life for Southern Californians. 2: Advance Southern California’s policy interests and planning priorities through regional, statewide, and national engagement and advocacy.  

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:  
The SCAQMD Mobile Source Air Pollution Reduction Review Committee (MSRC) has created a Reduction Review Committee (MSRC) has created a Regional Goods Movement Program which includes a component for the Last Mile Freight Program. SCAG will partner with the MSRC, serving as the implementor of the Last Mile Freight Program through a sole source contract.  

On October 1, 2020, the Regional Council approved Resolution No. 20-625-2 to authorize the acceptance of $10 million in grant funds from the SCAQMD to implement Phase 1 of the Last Mile Freight Program, and to authorize the SCAG executive director or his designee to negotiate, finalize and execute related agreements.  

As part of the pending agreement between SCAG and the South Coast AQMD, the MSRC Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and Board are tasked with making a recommendation and approving
the Last Mile Freight Program Draft Guidelines (Program Guidelines). SCAG is working directly with the MSRC Last Mile Subcommittee to develop the Draft Program Guidelines. It is anticipated that the Draft Program Guidelines will go before the MSRC TAC/Board in November of this year. Since this is a partnership program, SCAG staff is seeking a recommendation for Regional Council approval from the Transportation Committee and approval from the Regional Council of the Draft Program Guidelines at the November 5, 2020 meetings.

BACKGROUND:
E-commerce has had a profound impact on last mile delivery growth, and in 2020, the COVID-19 pandemic has only exacerbated the frequency of deliveries adding further stress to global supply chains. At the same time, air quality challenges continue to impact the public health of the region. Goods movement sources contribute to more than half of the NOx emissions and nearly 11 percent of PM$_{2.5}$ emissions in the South Coast Air Basin that cause smog and hazardous air pollution in our region. Improving air quality is a priority for better public health. This is particularly critical for vulnerable communities in our region that have been disproportionately impacted by freight activities.

As part of SCAG’s Connect SoCal (2020 – 2045 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy), the Accelerated Electrification strategy is a Key Connection of the Plan seeking to de-carbonize or electrify vehicles including those within goods movement. The Last Mile Freight Program serves as an initial step towards implementing freight-related clean vehicles/equipment and infrastructure to support cleaner air goals. The focus on last mile freight operations is particularly significant as trucks serving the regional distribution market constitute nearly 90 percent of total truck trips in the region. Through the Last Mile Freight Program, there is a great opportunity to scale efforts more broadly to achieve long-term implementation of emissions reductions.

SCAG will serve as the implementor of the Last Mile Freight Program through a sole source contract with the MSRC, developing a two-phased approach as follows:
- Phase 1: Establish call-for-projects process, focusing on the procurement and commercial deployment of zero-emission or near-zero emission (ZE/NZE) heavy and/or medium duty on road trucks (can include ZE/NZE equipment and supporting infrastructure).
- Phase 2: Conduct robust outreach to expand Phase 1 projects and coordinate with both public and private sector stakeholders to deploy broader innovative technologies currently being demonstrated by leading last mile delivery companies, particularly in e-commerce use-cases.

SCAG has been working with the MSRC staff over the course of 2020, and the Last Mile Subcommittee since this past summer, to develop the Last Mile Freight Program, gain approval from the MSRC Board for a contract award, and develop the Draft Program Guidelines. SCAG staff
will provide a presentation and overview of the Draft Program Guidelines to the Transportation Committee.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**
Work associated with this item is included in the FY 2020-21 Overall Work Program (OWP) budget under project number 130.0162.18, Goods Movement Planning.

**ATTACHMENT(S):**
1. Draft Last Mile Freight Program Guidelines and Call-for-Projects
2. PowerPoint Presentation - Last Mile Freight Program Draft Guidelines & Call-for-Projects
DRAFT Last Mile Freight Program
Guidelines and Call-for-Projects
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A. LMFP BACKGROUND and OVERVIEW

Last mile freight activity is a critical component of supply chains for both consumers and intermediary businesses dealing with physical goods. E-commerce has had a profound impact on last mile delivery growth, and in 2020, the COVID-19 pandemic has only exacerbated the frequency of deliveries adding further stress to global supply chains. At the same time, air quality challenges continue to impact the public health of the region.

As part of SCAG’s Connect SoCal (2020 – 2045 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy), the Accelerated Electrification strategy is a Key Connection of the Plan seeking to decarbonize or electrify vehicles including those within goods movement. The Last Mile Freight Program (LMFP) serves as an initial step towards implementing freight-related clean vehicles/equipment and infrastructure to support cleaner air goals.

SCAG has partnered with the Mobile Source Air Pollution Reduction Review Committee (MSRC) to establish Program Guidelines and issue a Call-for-Projects for the LMFP. The LMFP is a component of a larger goods movement emission reduction effort established by the MSRC.

SCAG has developed a two-phased approach for the LMFP.

Phase 1: Focusing on the commercial deployment of zero-emission or near-zero emission (ZE/NZE) heavy and/or medium duty on road trucks (including ZE/NZE equipment and supporting infrastructure).

Phase 2: Further expanding Phase 1 projects through coordination with both public and private sector stakeholders to deploy broader innovative technologies currently being demonstrated by leading last mile delivery companies, particularly in e-commerce use-cases.

A total of $10,000,000 is available for Phase 1 of the LMFP through the Call-for-Projects and selection process. The purpose of the Program Guidelines as outlined below, is to support the solicitation of applications for the LMFP.

B. LMFP GOALS

The LMFP aims to:

- Achieve immediate emission reductions for NOx and PM$_{2.5}$ from commercially deployed vehicles/equipment and facilitate supporting infrastructure;
- Inform both industry and the public regarding ZE/NZE vehicle/equipment and supporting infrastructure performance, and how this information can be used to scale emission reductions to contribute to regional air quality goals;
- Provide private operators and the public with information on return on investment (ROI) and cost-effectiveness insights into ZE/NZE vehicle/equipment and infrastructure operations, maintenance, and reliability;
- Create greater transparency regarding the need for public versus private ZE/NZE supporting infrastructure; and
- Inform the needs and/or help address the challenges to significantly scale ZE/NZE vehicles/equipment and infrastructure in the region.
• Achieve geographic funding diversity and ensure that the LFMP provides economic and environmental benefits across the entire region.

Additionally, the LMFP is guided by a set of core principles as follows:

- Creating transparency as to critical barriers impeding the transformation of the last mile freight market;
- Measuring success for both public and private entities;
- Optimizing where investments can generate the strongest benefits for further growth; and
- Achieving air quality reduction targets.

C. LMFP AWARD INFORMATION

1. Amount Available
A total of $10,000,000 AB 2766 Discretionary Funds (Clean Transportation Funding™) is available to be awarded for the LMFP. The LMFP is intended for Phase 1 including ZE/NZE heavy and/or medium duty on road trucks (including ZE/NZE equipment and supporting infrastructure), and is to be awarded on a competitive basis for projects that will demonstrate direct and tangible emission reductions for criteria air pollutants and other benefits as detailed further in the Program Guidelines.

2. Award Size
Program awards may not exceed the investment funding maximum in the amount of $5,000,000 per project. This assumes that a combined funding total of $10,000,000 will cover the four county areas specified in the Restrictions on Funding section below.

3. Restrictions on Funding
Award selection will consider the following conditions on a program-wide basis and should not be interpreted to mean that each project needs to meet these conditions:

i. Geographic Funding Minimum
One of the goals of the LMFP is to achieve geographic funding diversity. Award selections will consider the geographic funding minimum for each county in the South Coast Air Basin including Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, and San Bernardino counties, in the amount of $1,250,000. This restriction applies to the entire funding amount of $10,000,000, and it should not be interpreted that each proposal needs to meet this requirement.

- If there are insufficient meritorious proposals in the aggregate to meet a county geographic minimum, those funds would become available to projects in other counties.

ii. Investment Funding Minimum
To facilitate funding access to small sized businesses, the LMFP will consider an investment funding minimum for small sized businesses in the amount of $3,000,000. This minimum set-aside applies to the entire funding amount of $10,000,000, and it should not be interpreted that each proposal needs to meet this requirement.
As may be applicable, proposals qualifying under the small size business category should include size standards from the U.S. Small Business Administration as validation. An applicant must not exceed the size standard corresponding to its primary industry classification in order to qualify as a small size business.

The SBA publishes a Table of Small Business Size Standards (https://www.sba.gov/document/support--table-size-standards) which lists the size standard that applies to each NAICS code. Additionally, SBA’s size standards tool (https://www.sba.gov/size-standards) can help businesses determine whether they qualify.

If there are insufficient meritorious proposals to meet the small sized business funding minimum for the program, those funds would become available to other projects.

4. Availability of Funds

Selected projects shall be reimbursed from available funds based upon submission of invoices which shall include a detailed accounting of labor hours and other expenses, as well as submission of any third-party invoices. Project match as specified below, must be expended proportionally with awarded Clean Transportation Funding™. No funds shall be paid to a selected project, until the project as described in the approved Project List is completed and proof of completion is provided to the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). Expenses from a selected project which is not yet complete may not be used as match for a completed project.

All LMFP funds are anticipated to be expended by fiscal year 2022, which ends June 30, 2022. As part of the review and selection process described in the Application Evaluation and Selection Process section, SCAG will consider a project’s likelihood of being ready to proceed and complete the project within the anticipated time frame.

D. LMFP ELIGIBILITY INFORMATION

To be selected for a LMFP award, an applicant must be an eligible applicant and the project must be an eligible project.

1. Eligible Applicants

Eligible applicants for the LMFP include those engaged in delivering goods within all or any one of the four-county South Coast Air Basin (e.g., large and small/medium sized businesses) such as asset-owners/operators, independent contractors, asset-light logistics entities, leasing companies, among others. Applicants should be domiciled in a county, operate a last-mile facility within a county, or perform last mile deliveries within a county, as defined within the South Coast Air Basin.

2. Eligible Projects

LMFP proposals should consider the following components for eligible projects:

Heavy and medium duty truck categories, used by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and the California Air Resources Board (CARB) for emission standards, are classified based on the gross vehicle weight rating of the truck. The Federal Highway Administration classifies trucks in a slightly different way, based on the number of axles that the truck has and the configuration of the truck. For the LMFP, the table below defines the truck classifications that are eligible and provides typical examples of the different types of trucks that fall in each category.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CARB Weight Class</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medium Duty Trucks</td>
<td>Class 4&lt;br&gt;14,001-16,000 lbs&lt;br&gt;2 or 3 Axles&lt;br&gt;Parcel Delivery Trucks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Class 6&lt;br&gt;19,501-26,000 lbs&lt;br&gt;3 Axles&lt;br&gt;Single Unit Trucks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy Duty Trucks</td>
<td>Class 8a&lt;br&gt;33,001-60,000 lbs&lt;br&gt;3 or 4 Axles&lt;br&gt;Single Trailer Trucks, “Tractor-Trailers”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **ZE/NZE heavy/medium duty vehicle eligible projects include**, but are not limited to: (1) last mile delivery vehicles supporting e-commerce industries such as package/parcel deliveries to residents and businesses; (2) last mile delivery vehicles supporting retail/wholesale trade, manufacturing, construction, and other transportation and logistics services from business to business; (3) last mile delivery vehicles supporting major freight facilities.
- **ZE/NZE heavy/medium duty equipment eligible projects include**, but are not limited to: (1) trailer equipment supporting e-commerce industries, retail/wholesale trade, manufacturing, construction, and other transportation logistics services from business to business; (2) Last mile operating equipment for local delivery station, sortation, and other local facilities serving residents and businesses.
- **ZE/NZE heavy/medium duty supporting infrastructure eligible projects include** but are not limited to: (1) on- or off-site fueling charging hubs or depots.
- **Project Components**: An application may describe a project that contains more than one component and may describe components that may be carried out by parties other than the applicant. SCAG expects, and will impose requirements on fund recipients to ensure, that all components included in an application will be delivered as part of the Program. SCAG may award funds for a component, instead of the larger project, if that component (1) independently meets minimum award amounts described in the LFMP Award Information section and all eligibility requirements described in the LMFP Eligibility Information section; and (2) independently aligns with the selection criteria specified in the LFMP Application Evaluation and Selection Process section. All project components that are presented together in a single application must demonstrate a relationship or connection between them.
- **Application Limit**: Each project applicant may submit no more than one application as the project lead.

### 3. Cost Sharing or Matching
LMFP proposals should consider the following conditions:
i. Investment Matching Minimum
Investment matching minimum of 1:1 for each project proposal.

- Investment matching should include a minimum 1:1 cash or equivalent such as in-kind co-funding including driver, labor, or other fleet expenses.
- Additionally, investment matching minimum will take into consideration the leveraging of the Program funding, with other funding programs including but not limited to the California Energy Commission (CEC) and Air Resources Board (ARB) where appropriate.
- If other grant programs are used to meet the investment matching minimum, contingency plans should be provided to ensure coverage in case other grant funds do not materialize.
- Investment matching component should be clearly documented including clarity on partner teams and their value to the project.

E. LMFP APPLICATION AND SUBMISSION INFORMATION

1. Address
Applications must be submitted to xxxxxx.scag.ca.gov. Instructions for submitting applications can be found at xxxxxxx.scag.ca.gov.

2. Content and Organization of Application Submission
SCAG recommends that the applicant follow the listed items below to address the Program requirements and assist evaluators in locating relevant information.

i. Project Description
The first section of the application should provide a description of the project, including the type of ZE/NZE technology being used, including clarity on operational needs for deployment, and direct components of vehicles, equipment, and supporting infrastructure. The application should discuss challenges and opportunities for further scaling these technologies, and how the LMFP can contribute to these efforts, including how the project can lead to a transformational impact on last mile operations.

Applicants must also include a detailed statement of work that focuses on the core aspects of the project and supporting details, including those defined in the Fleet and Infrastructure Components section.

ii. Fleet and Infrastructure Components
This section must consider the following conditions:

- Specifications regarding number of ZE/NZE vehicles that will be procured, and the potential to scale up to convert additional vehicles, and vehicle turnover history.
- Considerations for regional fueling/charging hubs or depots, grid integration of ZEs, etc., including the establishment of a plan to manage charging in the peak loads for proposed charging depot/infrastructure.
- Incorporation of data elements.
  - Vehicle/equipment data elements should include daily operating vehicle miles traveled (VMT), a comparison of emissions performance (NOx and PM2.5 and greenhouse gas emissions – GHG) from non ZE/NZE vehicles versus ZE/NZE vehicle for the same routes, and origin/destination and route
Supporting ZE/NZE infrastructure data elements should include fueling/charging station locations, daily operating fueling/charging needs, etc.

- Specifications regarding how investments support the combined needs of vehicles and infrastructure – if a project is seeking funding for its fleet, how will it provide for the associated infrastructure needs and vice versa?
- Specifications regarding vehicle and infrastructure lead times including but not limited to vehicle/equipment procurement, California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) process, building permits, etc.
- Considerations for involvement with third parties including utility companies, others, and supporting Letter of Intent (LOI) or other documents should be clarified.

iii. Project Location
This section of the application should describe the project location, including a geographical description of the proposed project as noted in the Geographic Funding Minimum and Eligible Applicants sections, and a high-level map of the project’s location.

iv. Funds, Sources and Use of Project Funds
This section of the application should describe the budget for the proposed project:

- Cost for the proposed project.
- A budget distinguishing between overall project cost, versus what the awarded funds and match components will support (vehicles/equipment or infrastructure). If the project contains multiple components, the budget should separate the costs of each project component. If the project will be completed in phases, the budget should separate the costs of each phase. The budget detail should sufficiently demonstrate that the project satisfies the cost-sharing requirements described in the Cost Sharing or Matching section.

v. Selection Criteria
This section of the application should demonstrate how the proposed project aligns with the criteria described in the Application Review, Criteria section. SCAG encourages applicants to either address each criterion or expressly state that the project does not address the criterion.

vi. Implementation Risk
This section of the application should include enough information to evaluate whether the project is reasonably expected to begin implementation in a timely manner. To assist project implementation risk review, the applicant should provide the information requested on project schedule, require approvals, assessment of project risks and mitigation strategies, each of which is described in greater detail in the following sections.

- Project Schedule: The applicant should include a project schedule that identifies all major project milestones. Examples of milestones include required approvals such as CEQA, permitting, etc., approval of plans, specifications and estimates, procurement, implementation agreements, including agreements with utility companies, etc. The project schedule should be sufficiently detailed to demonstrate that:
  o The project can be implemented quickly upon election of award.
All necessary activities will be complete by the June 30, 2022 deadline, as stated in the LFMP Award Information section.

- **Required Approvals**
  - CEQA Approvals to be completed at the time the project has entered a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)
  - Building/Other Permits
  - Vehicle/Equipment Procurement

- **Assessment of Project Risks and Mitigation Strategies**
  Project risks, such as procurement delays, vehicle acquisition issues, environmental uncertainties, increase in acquisition costs, permitting delays, etc., affect the likelihood of successful project start and completion. The applicant should identify all material risks to the project and the strategies that the applicant and any project partners have undertaken or will undertake in order to mitigate those risks.

vii. **Point of Contact**
The applicant must establish a point of contact (POC), responsible for submitting the application and communication in the event the application is selected for award.

3. **Submittal Information**
Applications must be submitted to xxxx.scag.ca.gov. Instructions for submitting applications can be found at xxxx.scag.ca.gov.

- **Deadline**: Applications must be submitted by 5:00 PM P.S.T. on January 29, 2021.
- **Consideration of Applications**: Only applicants who comply with all submission deadlines will be eligible for award. Applicants are strongly encouraged to make submissions in advance of the deadline.
- **Late Applications**: Late applications will not be considered.

F. **LMFP APPLICATION EVALUATION AND SELECTION PROCESS**
This section specifies the evaluation criteria that SCAG and MSRC will use to evaluate and make recommendations regarding applications for the LMFP. Applications that do not demonstrate a potential for immediate benefits based on these criteria will not proceed in the evaluation process.

Evaluation Committee members will include senior and technical staff from SCAG and the MSRC Last Mile Subcommittee. The total score for each project application will be the average of the combined score of all Evaluation Committee members. The top scoring project applications will advance to the MSRC Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)/Board and SCAG Regional Council (RC) for recommendation and approval.

1. **Project Summary**
Proposed projects will be evaluated with a maximum of 30 possible points as follows:

- The proposed project clearly advances emission reductions for NOx and PM2.5 and GHG through commercial deployment.
• The proposed project specifies the type of ZE/NZE technology being used, including how all operational deployment components (vehicles, equipment, and supporting infrastructure) contribute to improving emission reductions.
• The proposed project is innovative and provides competitive advantages over conventional last mile delivery operations.

2. Project Readiness and Implementation
Proposed projects will be evaluated with a maximum of 30 possible points as follows:
• The proposed project will address and overcome critical barriers to successful commercial deployment.
• The qualifications, experience, capabilities, and credentials of the key team members are suitable to the tasks described in the LFMP Application and Submission Information and will lead to successful completion of the project.
• The proposed project has an aggressive but achievable schedule for completing all necessary tasks.

3. Funding Request and Cost Effectiveness
Proposed projects will be evaluated with a maximum of 40 possible points as follows:
• The proposed project results in a lower cost of operations and maintenance, or at a minimum, is competitive with traditional last mile operations and maintenance costs, excluding initial capital required.
• The proposed project results in a high benefit-cost score defined as the ratio of NOx and PM2.5 equivalent reduction per dollar of LFMP investment.
• The proposed project’s match funding commitments are documented, verifiable, and will support the successful completion of the project.

G. LMFP SCHEDULE AND INFORMATION
The following schedule outlines important dates for Phase 1 of the LMFP.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LMFP Milestone</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LMFP Call-for-Projects Opens</td>
<td>December 7, 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMFP Application Workshops</td>
<td>December 17, 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMFP Deadline for Questions</td>
<td>January 8, 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMFP Questions Responses Posted</td>
<td>January 15, 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMFP Call for Projects Submittal Deadline</td>
<td>February 15, 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCAG/MSRC Approval of Selected Projects</td>
<td>April 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMFP Selected Projects Posting</td>
<td>April 2021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Project Questions, Responses, and Selection Notice
SCAG will provide information on all questions received and responses and announce selected projects by posting information and a list of selected projects at xxxx.scag.ca.gov.

Notice of selection is not authorization to begin performance or to incur costs for the proposed project. Following that announcement, the relevant SCAG staff will contact the point of contact listed in the
Section D.2.g to initiate negotiation of the MOU for authorization. Recipients of LMFP funds will not receive a lump-sum cash disbursement at the time of selection announcement or obligation of funds. Instead, LMFP funds will reimburse recipients only after the project has been completed and accompanying payment information has been provided as described in the Award Information Availability of Funds section.

2. Reporting
Each project selected for the LMFP funding must submit information to be included within an interim and final progress report, to monitor project progress and ensure accountability and financial transparency in the LMFP. This will include:

- Summarizes actions taken to implement the project;
  - Project description;
  - Fleet and infrastructure components;
  - Project location;
  - Funds, sources, and use of project funds;
  - Selection criteria; and
  - Implementation risks.
- Identifies any obstacles and their solutions;
- Discusses the success of each project’s implementation as well as the success of the overall Program, as expressed in the LMFP Goals; and
- Includes recommended strategies.

H. LMFP CONTACT INFORMATION
For further information concerning this Program Guidelines, please contact SCAG LMFP staff via e-mail at xxxxx.scag.ca.gov.

I. LMFP OTHER INFORMATION
1. Protection of Confidential Business Information
If the applicant submits information that the applicant considers to be a trade secret or confidential commercial or financial information, the applicant must provide that information in a separate document, which the applicant may cross-reference from the application information or other portions of the application. For the separate document containing confidential information, the applicant must do the following (1) state on the cover of that document that it “Contains Confidential Business Information (CBI)”; (2) mark each page that contains confidential information with “CBI”; (3) highlight or otherwise denote the confidential content on each page; and (4) at the end of the document, explain how disclosure of the confidential information would cause substantial competitive harm. SCAG will protect confidential information complying with these requirements to the extent required under applicable law. If SCAG receives a Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) request for the information that the applicant has marked in accordance with this section, SCAG will follow the procedures described in its FOIA regulations at 49 C.F.R section 7.29. Only information that is in the separate document, marked in accordance with this section, and ultimately determined to be confidential under section 7.29 will be exempt from disclosure under FOIA.
2. Publication/Sharing of Project Information
Except for the information properly marked as described in the Protection of Confidential Business Information section, SCAG may make application information publicly available or share application information within SCAG and MSRC or with other local agencies if SCAG determines that sharing is relevant to the respective LMFP’s objectives.

3. Memorandum of Understanding
Once a project has been selected, the project will need to enter an MOU with SCAG prior to implementing the commercial deployment project. Implementation of the project will include the monitoring and reporting of application information as specified in the LFMP Schedule and Information section.
SCAG will serve as the implementor for the last mile component of the MSRC Goods Movement Program.

- Goal: Achieve cost-effective emissions reduction of criteria air pollutants from last mile freight operations.

SCAG is establishing a **two-phased** approach as follows:

- **Phase 1**: establish call-for-projects process, focusing on the purchase and commercial deployment of zero-emission or near-zero emission (ZE/NZE) heavy and/or medium duty on road trucks (can include ZE/NZE equipment and supporting infrastructure).

- **Phase 2**: conduct robust outreach to expand Phase 1 projects and coordinate with both public and private sector stakeholders to deploy broader innovative technologies currently being demonstrated by leading last mile delivery companies, particularly in e-commerce use-cases.
Last Mile Freight Program Statement of Work

- Task I – Development of Program Guidelines/Issuance of Call-for-Projects.
- Task II – Screening and Selection of Projects.
- Task III – Project Implementation.

Last Mile Freight Program Approach

Investment Thesis
- The Right Problem(s) at the Right Time
- Critical Barriers
- Measuring Success

Investment Impacts
- Long Term Impacts for Both Air Quality and Economy
- Last-Mile Cost Reduction Benefits
- Business Path Direction Change
- Transformation of Industry for the Region/Nation

Investment Targets
- Award Amount(s)
- Project Scalability
- Match/Cost Share
- Vehicle Procurement
**Phase 1 – Development of Program Guidelines/Issuance of Call-for-Projects**

Program Guidelines to include, but not be limited to:

- **Investment Matching and Funding**
  - Geographic Funding Minimum
  - Investment Match
  - Funding Minimum/Maximum

- **Fleet and Infrastructure Components**
  - ZE/NZE Procurement
  - ZE/NZE Infrastructure Considerations
  - Data Considerations

- **Project Expectations**
  - Project Description(s)
  - Project Screening and Selection Criteria
  - Project Benefits

---

**Phase 1 – Program Guidelines Award Information**

- A total of $10,000,000 AB 2766 Discretionary Funds (Clean Transportation Funding™) is available to be awarded
  - Geographic funding minimum for each county in the South Coast Air Basin including Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, and San Bernardino counties, in the amount of $1,250,000.
  - A minimum set-aside for small sized businesses in the amount of $3,000,000.

- Eligible applicants include those engaged in delivering goods within all or any one of the four-county South Coast Air Basin (e.g., large and small sized businesses).

- Investment matching minimum 1:1 cash or equivalent such as in-kind co-funding including driver, labor, or other fleet expenses.

- Will consider leveraging with other funding programs (e.g., CEC and ARB programs).
Phase 1 – Program Guidelines Eligibility Information

ZE/NZE heavy/medium duty vehicle eligible projects include

1. last mile delivery vehicles supporting e-commerce industries such as package/parcel deliveries to residents and businesses;
2. supporting retail/wholesale trade, manufacturing, construction, and other transportation and logistics services from business to business;
3. supporting major freight facilities.

ZE/NZE heavy/medium duty equipment eligible projects include

1. trailer equipment supporting e-commerce industries, retail/wholesale trade, manufacturing, construction, and other transportation logistics services from business to business;
2. equipment for local delivery station, sortation, and other local facilities serving residents and businesses.

ZE/NZE heavy/medium duty supporting infrastructure eligible projects include

1. on- or off-site fueling charging hubs or depots.

Phase 1 – Program Guidelines Selection Criteria

Project Summary

• The proposed project clearly advances emission reductions for NOx and PM2.5 and GHG through commercial deployment.
• The proposed project is innovative and provides competitive advantages over conventional operations.

Project Readiness and Implementation

• The proposed project has an aggressive but achievable schedule for completing all necessary tasks.

Funding Request and Cost Effectiveness

• The proposed project results in a lower cost of operations and maintenance, or at a minimum, is competitive with traditional last mile operations and maintenance costs, excluding initial capital required.
• The proposed project results in a high benefit-cost score defined as the ratio of NOx and PM2.5 equivalent reduction per dollar of LFMP investment.
### Phase 1 – Anticipated Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LMFP Milestone</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LMFP Call-for-Projects Opens</td>
<td>December 7, 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMFP Application Workshops</td>
<td>December 17, 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMFP Deadline for Questions</td>
<td>January 8, 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMFP Questions Responses Posted</td>
<td>January 15, 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMFP Call for Projects Submittal Deadline</td>
<td>February 15, 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCAG/MSRC Approval of Selected Projects</td>
<td>April 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMFP Selected Projects Posting</td>
<td>April 2021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you for your involvement!

Scott Strelecki  
strelecki@scag.ca.gov  
213-236-1893
To: Transportation Committee (TC)  
Energy and Environment Committee (EEC)  

From: Joseph Cryer, Associate Regional Planner,  
(213) 236-1837, cryer@scag.ca.gov

Subject: SunLine Transit Advancing Alternative Fuel Buses and Infrastructure

RECOMMENDED ACTION FOR EEC AND TC:  
Information Only – No Action Required

STRATEGIC PLAN:  
This item supports the following Strategic Plan Goal 1: Produce innovative solutions that improve the quality of life for Southern Californians.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:  
The CEO/General Manager of the SunLine Transit Agency will give a presentation on the agency’s work to adopt zero-emission technologies for their bus fleet.

BACKGROUND:  
SunLine Transit Agency’s CEO/General Manager, Lauren Skiver, will provide a presentation that highlights SunLine’s 20-year commitment to alternative fuel technology and their journey to zero emissions. Ms. Skiver will provide insight into the forward-thinking vision of the Board of Directors, the partnerships that have been key to success, and the infrastructure required for zero emission buses. She will also discuss the transformation for transit workforce and resources available to agencies and jurisdictions through the Zero Emission Bus Resource Alliance (ZEBRA) and the West Coast Center of Excellence in Zero Emission Technology and Renewable Energy.

FISCAL IMPACT:  
None.

ATTACHMENT(S):  
1. PowerPoint Presentation - SunLine Transit Agency’s Innovative Approach to Transit and Alternative Fuel Technology
SunLine Transit Agency’s Innovative Approach to Transit & Alternative Fuel Technology

Southern California Association of Governments Presentation 11/5/20

About SunLine Transit Agency
### Operation – 370+ Employees

#### Routes
- 14 fixed routes
- 1 express route
- 1 regional route
- ADA Paratransit

#### Fleet
- 60 CNG
- 17 Hydrogen Electric Fuel Cell
- 4 Electric Battery BYD
- 39 CNG Paratransit Vehicles

#### Revenue Miles vs. Passenger Trips
- 4.3 million revenue miles
- 4.5 million passenger trips

---

### Creating a Transit System Transformation
Introducing Refueled

1. CONSOLIDATED FIXED ROUTE NETWORK
2. 10 COMMUTER LINK
3. SUNRIDE
4. ROUTE 111X

PROPOSED FOR JANUARY 2021

PROPOSED FOR MAY 2021

---

SunLine’s History in Alternative Fuels
Early Zero Emissions Adopter

- Early transit adopters of CNG technology
- 1992 Board voted for 100% alternative fuel fleet
- 1994 Became the first 100% CNG transit fleet
- "Hydrogen Initiative" deployed the ZE-Bus
- 1st Hydrogen Fueling Station
- 2000 Emerged as an Industry Hydrogen Pioneers
- 2001 2nd Generation H2 Bus
- Hythane Modified buses ran on a blend of 80% CNG and 20% Hydrogen fuel
- 2006 SunFuels – First Transit Agency to Own & Operate H2 Generation and Dispensing Station

SunLine Board Policy

Purpose:
- "To establish policy advocating the purchase and use of only vehicles fueled by alternative fuels with the lowest possible emissions."

Policy:
- "It shall be the policy of SunLine Transit Agency that the replacement and/or addition of all vehicles, revenue or non revenue, be made with vehicles fueled with alternative fuel that provides the lowest emissions."

Actions to be Followed:
- "The State of California has established four categories of alternate fuel vehicles: 1) Zero Emission Vehicles; 2) Ultra Low Emission Vehicles; 3) Low Emission Vehicles; 4) Transitional Low Emission Vehicles. SunLine will, whenever possible, purchase vehicles in the same order as listed above. We do recognize that it may not always be possible to buy a vehicle from these categories as alternate fueled vehicles are still relatively new and are not always available. We also have to be practical and take into consideration the cost of the vehicle, and the cost of the continued use and maintenance."

Approved March 24, 1993
SunLine’s Zero Emission Fleet & Fueling Infrastructure

ZEB Fleet

- 4 FC Shuttle Buses (Pilot Project)
- 5 awarded through VW Mitigation Settlement and vehicle replacement funds
- 5 awarded through EPA TAG

4- BYD

El Dorado National
- Ballard
- US Hybrid
- BAE

New Flyer
- Ballard
- Cummins
- Hydrogenics
- Siemens

Packet Pg. 81
Hydrogen Fueling Station Overview

- Proton/Nel PEM Electrolyzer
- 900 Kg per day production
- 380 Kg use per day
- 2 dispenser fast fill rate
- $8.7 Million CARB Grant

Hydrogen Fueling Station Lessons Learned

- Ensuring utilities were able to support project
- Ensuring we have personnel with the right credentials to execute the project
- Correctly estimating the amount of civil work involved
- Establishing a performance based statement of work
SunLine is looking to expand its fueling systems with the creation of a micro-grid:

- **Phase 1** – Solar Farm
- **Phase 2** – Solar to Hydrogen for Electricity Storage
- **Phase 3** – 700 Bar Public Fueling Station
- **Phase 4** – Hydrogen / Electricity Truck Plaza
West Coast Center of Excellence in Zero Emission Technology & Renewable Energy

Mission & Vision

**Mission**
- To provide a transition pathway for current employees employed to operate and maintain carbon based vehicle and infrastructure by providing training on ZEB technologies
- To attract the next generation of technology technicians to be ready for green jobs being developed today and into the future

**Vision**
- For every investment in technology, there should be a focused investment in training. The West Coast Center of Excellence in Zero Emission Technology and Renewable Energy will be an instrumental resource for the State of California and the WORLD…
Advisory Board Objectives

- Help identify new training programs and opportunities
- Create industry certified training programs and coursework to ensure the material and training meet the needs of the operators and manufacturers
- Advance the industry influence of the Board and training materials
- Build collaborations that will leverage the agreed to training programs and coursework
- Help secure funding for Board initiatives and programs
Advisory Board Members

Zero Emission Bus Resource Alliance (ZEBRA)
Mission & Vision

What is ZEBRA?
A national professional association for transit agencies to share lessons learned about zero emission buses (ZEB). Founders envisioned ZEBRA as a group of transit leaders exchanging information without the involvement of manufacturers or outside groups.

Mission
To advance transit agencies’ capacity for ZEB adoption through information exchange, training programs, shared research and public education.

Vision
Formed to create a forum that allows transit agencies to inform, educate, and discuss regulatory, funding, and performance topics connected to ZEB deployments.

Current Members

[Image of current members logos]
Thank You!
Questions?

Lauren Skiver
CEO/General Manager
SunLine Transit Agency
lskiver@sunline.org
RECOMMENDED ACTION FOR EEC AND TC:
Information Only – No Action Required

RECOMMENDED ACTION FOR CEHD AND RC:
Receive and File

STRATEGIC PLAN:
This item supports the following Strategic Plan Goal 1: Produce innovative solutions that improve the quality of life for Southern Californians.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:
Despite much progress over the past decades, our region still faces significant air quality challenges with serious implications for funding and implementation of important transportation projects. Dr. Philip Fine, Deputy Executive Officer at the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD), will provide a presentation on the recent and upcoming air quality planning efforts for the South Coast Air Basin (Basin) and Coachella Valley. Two draft air quality plans have been prepared to address the 2006 24-hour PM2.5 standard in the Basin and the 1997 8-hour ozone standard in the Coachella Valley. Both plans show attainment of these standards by 2023 based on continued implementation of existing regulations. The 2022 Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) is also being prepared to address the attainment of the 2015 8-hour ozone standard in the Basin and the Coachella Valley by attainment deadlines of 2038 and 2033, respectively. Attainment of the 1997 8-hour ozone standard in the Basin by June 2024 attainment deadline continues to be very challenging because of the lack of federal actions to regulate federal sources and lack of adequate incentive funding.

BACKGROUND:
Pursuant to federal and state laws, the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) is
developing several air quality plans for the South Coast Air Basin (Basin) and Coachella Valley including the 2022 Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP).

As required by California Health and Safety Code, SCAG is responsible for providing socio-economic growth forecast and travel activity projection data to SCAQMD for the development of the 2022 AQMP. SCAG is also required to prepare a portion of the AQMP, commonly known as the Appendix IV-C Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy and Transportation Control Measures.

The 2022 AQMP will include an important component relative to regional transportation planning and federal transportation conformity requirements, the motor vehicle emissions budgets, which set an upper limit which on-road transportation activities are permitted to emit. The new emission budgets established as part of the 2022 AQMP process and approved in the final plan will become the functioning emission budgets for transportation conformity for future Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS) and Federal Improvement Program (FTIP) and their amendments post the effectiveness date of the new emission budgets.

SCAG staff has been providing SCAQMD with the socio-economic growth forecast and travel activity projection data from the adopted Connect SoCal. Staff will also prepare our portion of the 2022 AQMP based on the Connect SoCal.

As presented in the Connect SoCal, it is a significant challenge to meet various federal health-based air quality standards in the SCAG region with potentially serious consequences. A particularly pressing challenge is for the South Coast Air Basin to meet the 2024 statutory deadline of attaining the 1997 ozone standard. An air quality plan has been prepared and recently submitted to U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to specifically address the attainment challenge. However, if the U.S. EPA disapproves the air plan, a federal sanctions clock will be triggered which will lead to federal highway sanctions if the underlying deficiency cannot be resolved within 24 months. Highway sanctions restrict federal funding to transportation projects that expand highway capacity, nonexempt project development activities and any other projects that do not explicitly meet exemption criteria. If imposed, highway sanctions have the potential to impact billions of dollars of federal funding and tens of billions of dollars of important transportation projects in the SCAG region.

It is important to note that additional air quality plans are also being developed by the other four local air districts within the SCAG region in collaboration with the California Air Resources Board (ARB). Staff has been closely participating in and monitoring the various air quality planning efforts throughout the SCAG region and will report on any significant issues to EEC as appropriate.
FISCAL IMPACT:
Work associated with this item is included in the current FY20-21 Overall Work Program (21-025.0164.01: Air Quality Planning and Conformity).

ATTACHMENT(S):
1. PowerPoint Presentation – Overview of Recent and Upcoming Air Quality Planning Efforts and Near-term Air Quality Challenges
Overview of Recent and Upcoming Air Quality Planning Efforts and Near-term Air Quality Challenges

SCAG Energy and Environment Committee & Transportation Committee
November 5, 2020

Dr. Philip Fine
Deputy Executive Officer
Planning, Rule Development and Area Sources
South Coast AQMD

Cleaning The Air That We Breathe...

Presentation Outline

1. Recent Air Quality Planning Efforts
2. 2022 Air Quality Management Plan
3. 2023 Attainment Challenge
Recent Air Quality Planning Efforts

- 2006 24-hr PM2.5 standard – South Coast Air Basin
- 1997 8-hr Ozone standard – Coachella Valley

---

PM2.5 National Ambient Air Quality Standards – South Coast Air Basin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Attainment Deadline</th>
<th>Attainment Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1997 Annual PM2.5</td>
<td>15 μg/m³</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Attained in 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997 24-hour PM2.5</td>
<td>65 μg/m³</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Attained in 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2006 24-hour PM2.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>35 μg/m³</strong></td>
<td><strong>2019</strong></td>
<td><strong>Serious Nonattainment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 Annual PM2.5</td>
<td>12 μg/m³</td>
<td>2025</td>
<td>Serious Nonattainment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Missed deadline due to two sites still exceeding the standard
  - Mira Loma very close to the standard – 50/50 chance of attaining this year
  - Compton design value high due to 3 unexplained high days in 2017 – very likely will attain this year
  - Exceptional event demonstrations (wildfires) will be critical
  - New Plan due to EPA this year
**Overall Progress Towards Attainment**

![Graph showing PM2.5 concentrations over time with annotations for Compton and Mira Loma.]

* Likely exceptional events are removed  ^ Preliminary 2020 Jan-Jun Data

**Attainment Demonstration**

- **Compton** – Supplemental weight of evidence and air quality trend analysis based on monitoring data
  - Traditional attainment demonstration using chemical transport modeling is not appropriate
    - High PM episodes observed in 2017 were likely driven by anomalous human activities which are not reflected in the emissions inventory
    - If local emissions causing non-attainment are unknown, difficult to develop an effective control strategy
    - Traditional control strategy for Compton would require unrealistic levels of emissions regional reductions and may not be effective
  - Compton will very likely be in attainment before U.S. EPA considers plan
- **Mira Loma** – Traditional Approach - Updated emissions inventory/regional air quality modeling
  - Modeling analysis indicates attainment by 2023 with baseline emissions (existing regulations) with recently adopted regulations providing further assurances
**Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards – Coachella Valley**

### Coachella Valley Attainment Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria Pollutant</th>
<th>Averaging Time</th>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Attainment Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ozone (O₃)</td>
<td>(1979) 1-Hour (0.12 ppm)</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
<td>11/15/2007 (attained 12/31/2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1997) 8-Hour (0.08 ppm)</td>
<td>Nonattainment (Extreme)</td>
<td>6/15/2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2008) 8-Hour (0.075 ppm)</td>
<td>Nonattainment (Severe)</td>
<td>7/20/2027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2015) 8-Hour (0.070 ppm)</td>
<td>Nonattainment (Severe)</td>
<td>8/3/2033</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ozone Trend in Coachella Valley (design value)**

[Graph showing ozone trend and standards over time, including 1979 1-Hr Ozone Standard (125 ppb), 1997 8-Hr Ozone Standard (85 ppb), and 2015 8-Hr Ozone Standard (70 ppb).]
**Air Quality Setting**

- Ozone exceedances in Coachella Valley are primarily due to the direct transport of ozone and its precursors from the South Coast Air Basin.

**Pathway to Attainment**

- Attainment by 2023 is expected to be achieved based on baseline emissions:
  - Adopted rules and regulations provide continued emission reductions in future years.
  - Recently adopted rules and regulations since 2016 AQMP as well as continued implementation of 2016 AQMP measures provide further assurance for 2023 attainment.
  - Based on preliminary modeling, attainment may be earlier (2022), but 2023 is retained as attainment year given uncertainties in meteorology, emissions inventory and modeling approach.
2022 Air Quality Management Plan

Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>South Coast Classification</th>
<th>Coachella Valley Classification</th>
<th>Attainment Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015 8-hour Ozone</td>
<td>70 ppb</td>
<td>Extreme</td>
<td>Severe</td>
<td>August 3, 2038 (South Coast)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>August 3, 2033 (Coachella Valley)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008 8-hour Ozone</td>
<td>75 ppb</td>
<td>Extreme</td>
<td>Severe</td>
<td>July 20, 2032 (South Coast)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>July 20, 2027 (Coachella Valley)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997 8-hour Ozone</td>
<td>80 ppb</td>
<td>Extreme</td>
<td>Extreme*</td>
<td>June 15, 2024 (South Coast)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(both South Coast and Coachella Valley)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979 1-hour Ozone</td>
<td>120 ppb</td>
<td>Extreme</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
<td>February 6, 2023 (South Coast)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Voluntary reclassification from severe to extreme in July 2019
**Key SIP Elements for 2015 8-hour Ozone Standard**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline Year Emissions Inventory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emissions Statement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasonably Available Control Technology Demonstration</td>
<td>Nonattainment New Source Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Miles Traveled Offset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extreme Area Only</td>
<td>Clean Fuels for Boilers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 2022 AQMP |

**Overall Control Strategy for Attaining 2015 8-hour Ozone Standard**

- Extensive transition to near-zero (NZE) and zero-emissions (ZE) technologies in mobile and stationary sources, where feasible
- Transition to cleanest available technologies if NZE/ZE not feasible
- Regulatory measures; Incentive programs
- Eliminate/minimize reliance on 182(e)(5) measures
- Seek legislative authority where applicable
- Seek new sources of funding for new/existing incentive programs
- Work closely with state and local governments to maximize reductions from residential and commercial buildings
2022 AQMP Control Measure Development

- Initiating three working groups
  - Mobile Source – On Road
  - Mobile Source – Off Road
  - Residential and Commercial Buildings

- Bimonthly meetings (more frequent meetings as needed)
- November 2020 to October 2021 (expected)
- Open to all

2022 AQMP Overall Schedule

**2020 Spring**
- Initiate emissions inventory and modeling preparation

**2020-2021**
- Control Strategy Development/Wor
ing Groups

**2021 Fall**
- Release Draft AQMP / Regional Workshops

**2021 Winter**
- Release Revised Draft AQMP / Regional Hearings

**2021 Summer**
- South Coast AQMD and CARB Public Hearings (June/July)

**2022 Spring**
- Release Draft Final AQMP

- Due to EPA August 3 2022

Initiate Advisory Group Meetings
- AQMP
- STMPR
2023 Ozone Attainment Challenge

Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards – South Coast Air Basin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>South Coast Classification</th>
<th>Attainment Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015 8-hour Ozone</td>
<td>70 ppb</td>
<td>Extreme</td>
<td>August 3, 2038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008 8-hour Ozone</td>
<td>75 ppb</td>
<td>Extreme</td>
<td>July 20, 2032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997 8-hour Ozone</td>
<td>80 ppb</td>
<td>Extreme</td>
<td>June 15, 2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979 1-hour Ozone</td>
<td>120 ppb</td>
<td>Extreme</td>
<td>February 6, 2023</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Progress in Overall NOx Reductions Since 1997

![Bar graph showing NOx emissions reductions from 1997 to 2023]

Last remaining 11% reductions needed

CAA Section 182(e)(5) for Extreme Non-Attainment Areas

- Allows for reliance on emission reductions from anticipated new technologies or improvement of existing technologies
- EPA approved Further Deployment measures in the 2016 AQMP under section 182(e)(5) – 108 tpd
- Contingency measures required 3 years prior to implementation of plan provisions (i.e., 2023 attainment date)
  - Provide full reductions assigned to 182(e)(5) measures
Contribution of Federal Sources (2023 NOx emissions)

*Includes international sources under the responsibility of federal government

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Federal Sources</th>
<th>36%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ocean Going Vessels</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal On-Road Mobile Sources</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trains</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aircraft</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Off-Road Mobile Sources</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California On-Road Mobile Sources</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Off-Road Mobile Sources</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area-wide</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stationary</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contingency Measure Plan for Further Deployment Measures Reductions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>2023 Reductions (tpd)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identified Emissions Reduction Strategies</td>
<td>24 – 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Incentive Funding</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Measures and / or Funding</td>
<td>67 – 69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Strategies</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Submitted to the U.S. EPA in December 2019
**Additional Incentive Funding**

- **2016 AQMP**
  - Estimated need over $1 billion per year over 14 years
  - Current effort will update this estimate based on latest information
- **Expected Future Funding (approximately $800 M over 4 years)**
  - AB 617-Related Incentives – $80-90 M/yr.
  - Carl Moyer - $40-50 M/yr.
  - Prop 1B - $30 M
  - VW Settlement - $67 M
  - AB2766 Subvention Fund - $22 M/yr.
  - Mobile Source Air Pollution Reduction Review Committee - $17 M/yr.
- **Additional Funding Needed**
  - Voting District Authorization Legislation - $1.4 B/yr.
  - Other Mechanisms - TBD
  - Expected 2023 NOx Reductions: 15 tons per day

---

**Potential Federal Measures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Measure Description</th>
<th>2023 NOx Reductions (tpd)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low-NOx Heavy-Duty Vehicles</td>
<td>Heavy-duty vehicles (above 14,000 lbs. GVWR) powered by low-NOx engines in 2023</td>
<td>Up to 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-NOx Ocean-Going Vessels</td>
<td>Ocean-going vessels coming to California powered by Tier 3 engines in 2023</td>
<td>Up to 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-NOx Locomotives</td>
<td>Locomotives coming to California powered by Tier 4 engines in 2023</td>
<td>Up to 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-NOx Aircraft</td>
<td>Aircraft NOx reductions assumption of 20% if emissions are held at 2012 levels.</td>
<td>Up to 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Possible Reductions Towards Further Deployment Commitment**
Up to 78
2023 Attainment Challenge

- Attainment of the 1997 8-hour ozone standard continues to represent a major challenge for the region
  - Regulations/programs adopted since 2016 AQMP fall significantly short of needed reductions
- South Coast AQMD is doing all we can to reduce emissions with current funding and authority
- Significantly more incentive funding is needed to accelerate turnover of existing fleet to cleaner technologies
- Without federal action and/or funding to address federal sources, attainment is not likely

Additional Challenge

- 2020 has experienced some of the highest ozone levels in decades
- Extreme, unusual, early and late season heat waves, wildfire emissions, and COVID impacts are all important factors
- Emissions continue to decline
- Very complicated to assess, but ongoing research:
  - Research contract with UC Riverside to evaluate “Air Quality Modeling and Big Data analysis of Meteorological and Emissions Impact on Air Quality”
  - Changing climate scenarios, “Representative Concentration Pathway (RCP)” as adopted in IPCC reports being evaluated
  - Evaluating biogenic VOC emissions from urbanized areas and year-to-year changes due to meteorological variations
  - On-going, in-house research in collaboration with academic institutes and research laboratories on the impact of COVID19 shelter-in-place order on Basin air quality