DOCKETED	
Docket Number:	18-IEPR-08
Project Title:	Energy Equity
TN #:	224914
Document Title:	Transcript of the 08292018 Joint Agency Workshop on SB 350 Equity Milestones and Implementation Progress
Description:	N/A
Filer:	Cody Goldthrite
Organization:	California Energy Commission
Submitter Role:	Commission Staff
Submission Date:	10/8/2018 2:12:15 PM
Docketed Date:	10/8/2018

# CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION IEPR LEAD COMMISSIONER WORKSHOP

JOINT AGENCY WORKSHOP ON SB 350 EQUITY MILESTONES AND IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS

CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION

THE WARREN-ALQUIST STATE ENERGY BUILDING

ART ROSENFELD HEARING ROOM - FIRST FLOOR

1516 NINTH STREET

SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95814

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 29, 2018 9:30 A.M.

Reported By: Julie Link

#### APPEARANCES

# COMMISSIONERS AND ADVISERS:

## CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION:

Robert B. Weisenmiller, Chair, Lead Commissioner for Electricity and Natural Gas

Janea A. Scott, Commissioner, California Energy Commission

David Hochschild, Commissioner, California Energy Commission

Karen Douglas, Commissioner, California Energy Commission

Alice Reynolds, Office of Governor Edmund G. Brown Jr.

Bryan Early, California Energy Commission (For Commissioner J. Andrew McAllister)

### CALIFORNIA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION:

Martha Guzman-Aceves, Commissioner, California Public Utilities Commission

Cliff Rechtschaffen, Commissioner, California Public Utilities Commission

#### STAFF:

Heather Raitt, IEPR Program Manager

## PUBLIC SPEAKERS

Jeanne Clinton

# I N D E X

1)	Page Introduction 7
	Heather Raitt, Integrated Energy Policy Report (IEPR) Program Manager
2)	Opening Remarks 8 Chair Robert B. Weisenmiller, California Energy Commission
	Commissioner Janea A. Scott, California Energy Commission
	Commissioner David Hochschild, California Energy Commission
	Bryan Early (for Commissioner J. Andrew McAllister, California Energy Commission)
	Commissioner Karen Douglas, California Energy Commission
	Alice Reynolds, Office of Governor Edmund G. Brown Jr. Commissioner Martha Guzman-Aceves, California Public
	Utilities Commission Commissioner Cliff Rechtschaffen, California Public Utilities Commission
	Richard Corey, Executive Officer, California Air Resources Board
3)	Overview of Overview of SB 350 Clean Energy and 13 Transportation Access Efforts and Workshop Goals Rhetta DeMesa, California Energy Commission Tabetha Willmon, California Air Resources Board Alice Glasner, California Public Utilities Commission

# I N D E X (Cont.)

4) Panel #1 - Understanding Community Needs and Increasing Local Outreach

36

Case Example: Ontario Transformative Climate Communities Program - Matt Abularach-Macias, California League of Conservation Voters

Moderator: Veronica Eady, California Air Resources Board

Panelists:

James Becker, Richmond Community Foundation Katie Valenzuela-Garcia, Staff to Assemblymember Eduardo Garcia

Jeanie Ward-Waller, California Department of Transportation

Violet Martin, California Air Resources Board

5) Panel #2 - Addressing Barriers to Clean Energy in Multifamily Building Infrastructure
Case Example: West Gateway Place developed
by Jamboree Housing, Michael Massie, Jamboree
Housing

Moderator: Bryan Early, California Energy Commission

Panlists:

Eugene Lee, California Energy Commission Sarah Lerhaupt, California Public Utilities Commission

Maria Stamas, Natural Resource Defense Council Stephanie Wang, California Housing Partnership Corporation

152

# I N D E X (Cont.)

6) Panel #3 - Financing Transformation: The Importance of Sustained Investment in Clean Energy, Transportation, and Workforce Development Case Example: Our Community CarShare Sacramento Pilot Project, Jaime Lemus, Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District Moderator: Tyson Eckerle, Governor's Office of Business and Economic Development Panelists:

Larry Rillera, California Energy Commission Bill Magavern, Coalition for Clean Air Bailey Smith, California Air Resources Board Sarah White, California Workforce Development Board

7) Panel #4 - Measuring Progress for Low-Income 205
Californians in Clean Energy and
Transportation Access
Case Example: Contra Costa County Weatherization
and Energy Efficiency Pilot Project, Amy Dryden,
Build-It-Green

Moderator: Commissioner Martha Guzman-Aceves, California Public Utilities Commission Panelists:

Pamela Doughman, California Energy Commission Aditya Sharma, Los Angeles Department of Water and Power

Joel Espino, The Greenlining Institute Maggie Witt, California Air Resources Board

## I N D E X (Cont.)

8) Path Forward for Addressing Energy and
Transportation Equity
Alana Mathews, California Energy Commission
Supervisor John Gioia, California Air Resources
Board
Member; Vice Chair, Contra Costa Board of
Supervisors
Commissioner Cliff Rechtschaffen, California
Public Utilities Commission

10) Public Comments 149

11) Closing Comments 152

Adjourn 261

Court Reporter's Certification

Transcriber's Certification

#### PROCEEDINGS

2.1

2.2

AUGUST 29, 2018 9:30 a.m.

MS. RAITT: Good morning. We'll go ahead and get started on today's Joint Agency IEPR workshop on SB 350 Equity Milestones and Implementation Progress.

I'm Heather Raitt, the program manager for the IEPR. I'll just go over quickly a few housekeeping items.

If there's an emergency, please follow staff to Roosevelt Park, which is across the street diagonal to the building.

And please be aware that we are broadcasting today's workshop through our WebEx conferencing system.

And so it's being recorded, and we'll also have a written transcript of the meeting.

We do have a very full agenda, so I'd like to remind our speakers to please stay within your allotted time. We do have a number of opportunities for public comment today. So at the conclusion of each panel, if you have filled out a blue card and wanted to give comments, you can go ahead and give the blue card to our public adviser and -- there she is in the back of the room.

And then for the folks in the room, you can go to the center podium and make comments. And please give the court reporter a business card if you have one and identify yourself.

And then for those on WebEx, use the hand raise feature. We will go ahead and open your line after we hear from folks in the room.

2.2

And finally, we'll open the phone lines for the phone-in-only participants.

And we'll be limiting comments to three minutes per person.

Materials for this meeting are all at the entrance to the hearing room and posted on our website.

And written comments are welcome, and they're due September 12th.

With that, I'll turn it over to the commissioners for opening remarks. Thanks.

COMMISSIONER SCOTT: Well, good morning and welcome everyone. This is Commissioner Janea Scott from the California Energy Commission. I'm just delighted to be here today and have all of our friends and colleagues here at the dais and out sitting in the audience with us.

As you all know, a few years ago the legislature, through Senate Bill 350, directed the Energy Commission to study the barriers to low-income communities being part of energy efficiency and renewable energy and also asked the Air Resources Board to study the barriers for low-income communities being involved in the clean transportation revolution.

And our agencies put those studies together. In the Energy Commission's report, we identified several barriers but also put in place 12 different recommendations for solutions to overcoming those barriers.

2.2

And so I'm really excited today. We've made some great progress, I think, on implementing those 12 recommendations. That's what we will hear about some more today as well as the progress that Air Resources Board has made in implementing their six recommendations.

And it's a really incredibly important topic, to make sure that low-income communities across California are part of the clean energy revolution that's underway here in California.

And I really appreciate the great collaboration amongst everyone, the Governor's Office, the Air Resources Board, the Public Utilities Commission, our Energy Commission team, and all of the other agencies that are working together with us to represent that. So I welcome all of our colleagues and friends here at the dais with us.

And I'm very much looking forward to the discussions today, so I will turn it to others to make some opening remarks. We can go in the order on the chart here or just feel free to jump in.

CHAIR WEISENMILLER: Again, I think it's an important meeting. I thank everyone for being here. And

we would like to just start sooner. So go ahead.

2.2

MS. REYNOLDS: Good morning, everyone. I'm Alice Reynolds from the Governor's Office. And I just wanted to recognize all the hard work of the agencies who have really been working collectively to put this workshop together.

Although ARB and the Energy Commission started with a pen on the Barrier Studies, the implementation work has really been a collaborative effort across all the agencies, because of course we're not looking at equity and justice as a standalone program but as permeating throughout all of our programs across the state.

And so I think that that is really reflected in what you're going to be hearing today, and I look forward to the day. Thanks a lot.

MR. COREY: And I'll be brief as well but really appreciate the progress that has been made. A lot of progress but a lot more to do in front of us. And the principles in terms of the opportunities really challenge us to more effectively address barriers.

To me, 350 is embedded in 617 incentive programs with many opportunities as we move forward in collaboration. And to me what was underscored and I think is going to even more so going forward is the collaboration amongst our sister agencies and others in community engagement. That is like at the core of this effort to

effectively implement these programs, is the outreach and getting -- continuing to learn from what is working, what isn't and how we can more effectively engage and partner with communities and the environmental justice community.

We're really excited about it. We're excited about this program and the discussions that will play itself out today.

So thank you.

MR. EARLY: Hello everyone. My name is Bryan
Early. I work for Commissioner Andrew McAllister, who was
hoping to be here but had to stay home due to a sick kid
but wanted to make sure that I was up here.

This is an issue that is near and dear to his heart. He knows that equity, as we transition to decarbonize our economy, has to be not just a component but a core feature of everything that we do.

So looking forward to the discussion today.

COMMISSIONER HOCHSCHILD: Good morning, everyone. David Hochschild with the Energy Commission. I'm a lead on the IEPR this year.

And as the Governor has noted many times, the two big challenges we face today are climate change and inequality, and we have to address both at the same time.

And everything we do here is a template for other states and other nations. And as we approach the Climate

Summit, I think it's even more important to demonstrate that we can do this successfully.

2.2

And I just wanted to thank both the Chair for his constant leadership on this issue and Commissioner Scott for being a lead for us here at the Energy Commission on this. Thanks.

COMMISSIONER GUZMAN-ACEVES: Good morning, everybody. Commissioner Guzman-Aceves with the Public Utilities Commission, and I'm looking forward to the dialog.

MS. DOUGLAS: Good morning, everybody. Karen Douglas with the California Energy Commission. I think you can see, both from the very full room and the very full dais, this is a topic that we've got a lot of interest in and focus on and we really are excited to -- extremely excited to hear from the panelists and the public today.

COMMISSIONER RECHTSCHAFFEN: Cliff Rechtschaffen with the Public Utilities Commission.

SB 350 was landmark legislation when we passed it for many reasons. Now, of course, we have new landmark legislation because that was two years ago and we can't stop and rest on our laurels every two years.

But one of the key parts of SB 350 was it did force us to focus on disadvantaged communities in a way that we hadn't before and also forced us to collaborate

among the agencies in a way that we hadn't before.

2.2

And you'll hear today about what we've done. And it's a pretty good story, but for those of you who won't stay until the very end, I think we're going to show you that each of the agencies has done quite a bit. But we're really going to focus also on what we haven't done, and I think we're going to be producing documents that show our progress in various areas, so we can't rest on our laurels.

We've done a lot of collaboration. We've done a terrific job of identifying the barriers, and now we're slowly working to try to address things through various programs. So it's a good story, but there's a lot more to be done now and in the future.

MS. RAITT: Great. Thank you.

So we'll open with an overview presentation from the staff of the Energy Commission, the Air Resources

Board, and the CPUC, starting with Rhetta DeMesa from the Energy Commission.

MS. DeMESA: All right. Good morning and thank you all for being here today. My name is Rhetta DeMesa, and I'm an adviser to Commissioner Scott here at the Energy Commission. As was mentioned, Commissioner Scott is our lead commissioner overseeing implementation of the Barriers Study.

My colleagues Tabetha Willmon from the Air

Resources Board and Alice Glasner from the Public Utilities

Commission will be joining me in just a moment to help go

over the overview panel and set the stage for today's

workshop.

Just briefly, the goals for today's workshop are to provide an update to the implementation progress for the recommendations in the Energy Commission's Barriers Study and CARB's Final Guidance Document as well as to discuss the path forward.

Just quickly by way of background, Senate Bill 350 places a priority on ensuring low-income customers, including those in disadvantaged communities, are able to participate in the benefits provided by clean energy and clean transportation.

The legislature directed the Energy Commission and CARB to identify the barriers to accessing energy efficiency, renewable energy, and clean transportation opportunities and to develop recommendations on how to address those barriers.

Our mutual goal really is to increase the awareness and understanding of key challenges to increasing access for low-income -- sorry, to allow for low-income and disadvantaged communities to have increased access over time.

In December of 2016, the Energy Commission

approved the Barriers Study Part A, which identifies 12 recommendations to address increasing access to energy efficiency and renewable energy. And in February of 2018, CARB released the Final Guidance Document which identifies six priority recommendations and key supporting actions to address the barriers to clean transportation.

Given that many of the recommendations in both reports cut across multiple agencies, the first recommendation we wanted to implement was establishing a task force to facilitate coordination among the various agencies.

So in May of 2017, the Governor's Office established an inter-agency task force that's comprised of over 15 state agencies implementing energy and transportation programs in addition to disciplines such as housing, public health, workforce development and water, just to name a few.

The task force meets regularly to ensure that there's ongoing coordination and alignment across the agencies as recommendations are being implemented.

We also continue to coordinate with local and regional entities and low-income residents to ensure that we can maximize benefits from our implementation efforts and more directly benefit the most disadvantaged communities across the state.

The task force collectively worked to identify priority recommendations with a focus on those that would most directly address barriers to access, maximize benefits to low-income residents and that could be implemented over a two-year period.

2.2

2.3

The Energy Commission and CARB have also worked very closely in the last three years to align our equity goals and implementation strategies where appropriate.

The workshop today is focused primarily on the progress that has been made around the priority recommendations, but we also want to acknowledge that the agencies have also been making progress on many of the other recommendations as well.

So with that, we're going to go ahead and jump into the progress on the Energy Commission's priority recommendations, which we are going to be discussing in more detail throughout the various panels of the day.

I also want to note that there's a handout on the table with a table that runs through each of the recommendations and provides the current status in a little bit more detail. It's actually on the back table and then tucked behind the agendas in the binders for those on the dais.

Starting with recommendation 1D, this was for the Energy Commission to develop an action plan for improving

opportunities for energy efficiency, renewable energy, demand response, energy storage, and electric vehicle infrastructure for multifamily housing.

2.2

In response to this recommendation, the Energy Commission, in coordination with five other agencies, developed the Clean Energy and Low-Income Multifamily Buildings Action Plan or CLIMB Action Plan as we call it.

The action plan identifies early actions to improve existing programs in the multifamily sector and lays the foundation to develop long-term solutions.

We'll hear more about the CLIMB Action Plan during Panel 2 later this morning.

Recommendation Number 2 is to look at community solar options for low-income customers and ensure the benefits are realized by those customers. The CPUC is the lead agency on this recommendation, and Alice Glasner will talk about it in a little bit more detail in a few moments. But in June 2018, the CPUC adopted the Community Solar Green Tariff Program.

Additionally, the Department of Community

Services and Development has an open solicitation making \$5

million available for community solar pilot projects that

are designed specifically to benefit low-income residents.

Recommendation Number 3 looks for a strategy for ensuring the necessary workforce and education

opportunities are available to support a low-carbon economy.

2.2

The California Workforce Development Board is in the process of developing a state plan to address this.

Sarah White will likely touch on this a little bit later in the day. But the California Workforce

Development Board hosted a series of consultation meetings with a variety of constituents to support the development of that report. They plan to have an executive summary of the report available during the Global Climate Summit next month.

Recommendation Number 5 required collaboration across agencies to make sure there are common metrics and indicators for the various Clean Energy and Transportation Programs.

In June of 2018, the Energy Commission released the 2018 tracking progress report for Energy Equity which is designed to help identify opportunities for clean energy investments and to track progress for improving access to clean energy technologies in low-income and disadvantaged communities over time.

An interactive web mapping tool was also developed. Pam Doughman, our staff lead here at the Energy Commission on that effort, will be giving a presentation on that later this afternoon, so you'll be hearing more on

1 that.

2.2

And then finally Recommendation Number 6. Again, this is another CPUC-led recommendation looking at increasing access to low-income and disadvantaged communities for renewable energy.

In June of this year, CPUC adopted the

Disadvantaged Communities - Single-family Affordable Solar

Homes Program and the Disadvantaged Communities - Green

Tariff Program, which Alice will talk a little bit more about.

CSD also plans to release an RFP this fall that will make \$10 million available to support energy efficiency and solar for low-income farmworkers.

That covers the priority recommendations in the Energy Commission's Barriers Study. Now, I'm going to transition into the remaining recommendations.

So Recommendation 4, which calls for the development of energy upgrade financing pilots, CAEATFA was the lead agency on this recommendation, and they're implementing financing pilots for energy efficiency retrofits in IOU territories. That's where they're starting. They're hoping that should additional funding become available, they would be able to expand those broader and make them more statewide.

Recommendation 7 was to enhance energy-related

affordable housing tax credits. The California Tax Credit Allocation Committee, or TCAC, has integrated a point system into their credit programs which allows for additional points to projects that incorporate renewable energy and energy efficiency measures.

2.2

Recommendation 8 was to deploy regional one-stopshop pilots to provide technical assistance, targeted out region funding services to low-income customers.

The Energy Commission and the Public Utilities
Commission, including both Commissioners Scott and
Rechtschaffen, have had a number of meetings to discuss
possible pathways for the development of a one-stop-shop.
But unfortunately, given the complexity in developing a
comprehensive one-stop-shop, which is really what the
recommendation was getting at, it was determined that
additional funding resources -- additional resources need
to be available.

So that's one we're still continuing to look at but not have made a lot of progress on, unfortunately.

Recommendation 9 calls for investigating the need for heightened consumer protection. There are a number of agencies that are taking action in this space.

The Public Utilities Commission will talk a little bit about some of their efforts, but I'd also like to add that the Contractors State Licensing Board has a

Solar Task Force which is working to identify ways to reduce the number of complaints they receive relating to predatory practices.

2.2

2.3

And then the Energy Commission has identified a number of actions in the CLIMB Action Plan relating to consumer protection as well.

Recommendation 10 calls for funding to be made available for better collaboration and coordination with CBOs. Again, this is another recommendation in which additional resources still need to be identified for further implementation.

Recommendation 11. This recommendation calls for R and D funding to include targeted benefits to low income customers in disadvantaged communities. This recommendation was actually codified with the passage of AB 523 which directs 25 percent of EPIC's TD&D funding to go to disadvantaged communities. The EPIC team is currently on track to meet if not to exceed this target.

As of this month, just over 40 percent of their TD&D funds that were encumbered this year have gone to disadvantaged communities, so we're doing really well there.

And then finally Recommendation Number 12 calls for increasing contracting opportunities for small business in low-income and disadvantaged communities. Through the

2018-2019 budget GO-Biz received \$23 million to establish a program that will augment small business services such as one-stop -- such as one-on-one consulting and low cost training.

And with that, I'm going to go ahead and transition over to Tabetha.

2.2

MS. WILLMON: Good morning, everyone. My name is Tabetha Willmon. I am working in the Clean Transportation Outreach Section at the California Air Resources Board.

I'm going to refer to it as CARB going forward.

Rhetta talked a little about the process that we took to identify the barriers for low-income residents, and CARB's focus was really looking at barriers to access and clean transportation and mobility options.

We heard from stakeholders that if we really want to understand the clean transportation and mobility issues, we need to be talking with low-income residents in rural, urban and tribal communities as well as with the various community-based organizations in those communities.

So in 2016, CARB participated in a number of community and public meetings. And through these events, we were able to engage directly with the residents and directly with community-based organizations to receive feedback on what they feel are their community-specific challenges.

We've also held a number of ongoing meetings with various state agencies who have programs and projects related to clean transportation and mobility options. And this result -- the result of this effort was that we were able to put together a number of recommendations, which we presented in our SB 350 Guidance Document that was released in February of this year.

2.2

2.3

The recommendations that are listed here are our key and priority recommendations. These were prioritized based on feedback from the community and community input as well as working with the task force and the various agencies on the Governor's Office task force.

The first four priority recommendations are going to be part of the Panel Discussion Number 1 that's going to be happening today. And we'll be talking -- during that time, they'll be talking about these in more depth. And as shown on the slide, it's important to note that these are ongoing efforts.

The first recommendation is to expand community needs assessments. This effort is being led by Caltrans in close collaboration with CARB, state transportation agencies and local and regional entities.

The goal of this effort is to better understand the specific unmet transportation needs within communities by prioritizing and expanding community needs assessment.

And this is one of the things that a lot of the folks on the dais mentioned, that community needs and basing programs on specific needs is really a core foundation and focus of SB 350.

2.2

This project is looking to ensure that the feedback that we get is incorporated into transportation and land use planning and investment programs. And this effort really is foundational to a number of the various recommendations that are in not only our report but the Energy Commission's report.

Priority Recommendation Number 2 is to increase education and awareness of clean transportation and mobility options by developing a targeted outreach plan, or what we are calling a roadmap. This effort is being led by CARB. We are working with a couple of different levels of working groups. We have a state agency level working group and we also have a stakeholder working group of community representatives.

And the goal of this effort is to develop outreach best practices as well as a roadmap of actions that we can take going forward that focus on how we can better collaborate as state agencies and local and regional entities, how we can produce outreach to low-income residents specifically for those who are in tribal communities or rural and urban communities, based on their

specific community needs, and this is where the tie comes back into the Recommendation Number 1.

2.2

We are looking to how we can streamline delivery of information to the various audience types in communities and how really we can improve the ability for low-income residents to apply for incentive programs. And so we are working on an early draft of this, and my colleague Violet Martin is going to be talking about this a little bit in the first panel.

The third recommendation is the development of a one-stop-shop to apply and qualify for low-carbon transportation equity projects. And this also includes a coordinated community-based outreach component. CARB is the lead entity on this project. We are working in close coordination with the Energy Commission, Public Utilities Commission, and Housing and Community Development.

This effort is being done using some of the Volkswagen settlement funds. Grid Alternatives is the grantee that's been selected to lead this effort. And the task at hand is to develop a single application for low-income residents and consumers to apply and qualify for the clean transportation programs.

The initial focus of this program is on clean transportation programs but I think the hope is really to expand this, to become much more. And it ties into the

Energy Commission's recommendation of making this a program where low-income residents have one place to go for all of the climate investment programs and all of the low-income incentive programs that they're eligible for.

So, you know, expanding it to apply to clean energy programs is one of the things we really want to focus on, moving forward.

We are, like I said, working really closely with the Energy Commission and the Public Utilities Commission as they have similar recommendations in this area.

The fourth recommendation is to develop grant and solicitation best practices based on lessons learned. For example, the low-carbon transportation and other related programs.

This effort is also being led by CARB, and it is to again, look at the lessons learned and identify best practices or recommendations and improvements that we can build into the grant and solicitation competitive process so that low-income residents have better opportunity for participating in these types of programs.

We are coordinating very closely with the Strategic Growth Council related to their technical assistance program that they are overseeing, so there is a lot of sister agency coordination that's happening with all of these programs.

Recommendations 5 and 6 are going to be talked about a little bit more in detail in Panel 3 today.

2.2

Recommendation Number 5 is to expand access to good quality jobs, training, and other economic opportunities in order to maximize the benefits coming from these investments. This is being led by the California Workforce Development Board, and they are working very closely with a lot of -- the various state agencies who are overseeing the investment programs.

We want to ensure that the investments are made to support access to good quality jobs and workforce training opportunities. This includes expanded vocational training, pre-apprentice and apprenticeship programs, and it really closely aligns with the effort of California Climate Investments to track job opportunities and job development.

And Sarah is going to be talking more about this in Panel 3 today.

Recommendation Number 6 has to do with expanding funding and financial opportunities for clean transportation and mobility projects.

Of course, there are many efforts underway. In support of this recommendation, we are continuing to work through the task force and identifying potential funding opportunities and where there may be opportunities to

leverage other funds to be working together.

2.2

Some additional efforts that we included up on this slide are -- an additional effort is the development of metrics to measure progress in addressing barriers to clean transportation and mobility options. And this is going to be talked about a little bit more in Panel 4.

CARB is working to develop metrics to be able to measure and track progress to clean transportation and mobility access for low-income residents and disadvantaged communities over time. We will be developing these in close collaboration with the Energy Commission and we are hoping to be able to complement the energy equity framework and indicators project that they've been working on, so we've been working closely with them on developing a mechanism to work together and go forward.

I think another important piece to note -- it's not up on the slide but -- is that to increase access and pursue all of our equity goals, we acknowledge that there is a lot of cross-pollination going on -- and Richard touched on this in his opening remarks - that there's a lot of cross-pollination in many of the efforts across various agencies.

In particular, within CARB, the California
Climate Investments, the Zero-Emission Vehicle Action Plan,
our AB 32 scoping plan, our Air Quality Improvement

program, AB 617 where we're focusing on community air protection, SB 375 where we're looking at developing sustainable community strategies.

2.2

2.3

There -- I could probably go on and on. I won't.

But as you can see, there are a lot of cross-efforts and a

lot of coordination and collaboration that we are working

together on and making sure that we have a united effort

that's leveraging each other's efforts.

So in addition to the priority recommendations, we also wanted to highlight a few critical efforts that are ongoing in support of the SB 350 goals as well as additional recommendations included in the Guidance Document where we've made progress.

The first is light-duty vehicle ownership projects. The legislature provided funds with the low carbon transportation investment fund to continue our clean vehicle ownership programs. And some of the example of these programs are our Clean Cars for All; our finance assistance program, which is targeted for low-income and moderate residents; and also the California Vehicle Rebate project, of which there was a specific allocation for low income residents.

The second is our Zero-Emission Vehicle and supporting infrastructure. This is aligning with the Energy Commission recommendation. CARB has allocated funds

towards vehicle infrastructure, including multifamily or family dwellings. And in addition, both our Clean Cars for All and our finance assistance programs offer funding to infrastructure for those purchasing battery electric vehicles so they are able to charge their vehicles.

2.2

The third is our heavy-duty vehicle infrastructure program. CARB has allocated low-carbon transportation investment as well as Volkswagen settlement funds to support zero-emission vehicles in public transportation and school bus fleets.

And an example of this is the rural school pilot project where over \$40 million has been allocated to purchase of zero-emission vehicle school busses.

The transformative clean transportation and mobility projects, this also will be touched on in Panel 1. This aligns with a number of the Energy Commission programs. And I want to note that there are multiple low-carbon transportation projects underway this next fiscal year.

The Green Mobility in Schools pilot project is one example. It funds zero-emission vehicles, charging equipment, clean mobility options for kindergarten through 12th grade schools and school districts that are within disadvantaged communities.

And the last item is "Understanding Community

Impacts." This effort builds on CARB's Priority

Recommendation Number 1 for community needs assessment and really our broader climate investment programs.

2.2

We're working to maximize other economic, environmental and public health benefits beyond those of just achieving greenhouse gas emissions. We want to focus on including lessening the burdens of climate change and of local air toxics programs. For example, displacement is one of the areas that we are really truly trying to focus beyond just greenhouse gas emission reductions.

So one of the key messages that I want to convey today is that this is all an ongoing effort and one we absolutely plan to move full steam ahead with.

So with that, I will turn it over to Alice.

MS. GLASNER: Good morning, everyone. Alice Glasner from the Public Utilities Commission. I'm going to give a brief overview of CPUC developments with respect to Barriers Study recommendations.

First, Barriers Study -- Barriers Recommendations 1 and 1(d). The task force initiated a new venue for coordinating efforts for low-income energy programs. As you'll hear today later, coordination activities included agency contributions to the Multifamily Building Action Plan or CLIMB, as it's now known.

CPUC supported its development by including

information on low-income weatherization and energy efficiency programs, information on multifamily building efforts including the common area measures, prioritizing stakeholder involvement in working groups, and our efforts to include multifamily building residents in electric vehicle charging programs.

At the CPUC, we have new solar programs for low-income residents. The first one is the Solar On Multifamily Affordable Housing or SOMAH. This program has been launched and will have about \$90 million per year in incentives with the goal of installing 4,000 systems through 2026.

The next three programs were approved in June and focus on disadvantaged communities. The DAC-SASH is a rooftop solar program where incentives will be available for single-family homes in disadvantaged communities.

The DAC-Green Tariff is a program where customers may opt for utility solar located in a disadvantaged community in the same IOU territory and customers will receive a 20 percent discount on their bills.

The Community Solar Green Tariff will fund locally sponsored community solar projects in disadvantaged communities with at least 50 percent of generation capacity for low-income residents in disadvantaged communities.

These follow in the footsteps of existing low-income

programs such as the Multifamily Rooftop Solar Program, MASH, which will be sun setting, the SASH single-family low-income solar program, and the Solar Water Heating Program. And those two programs will continue.

2.2

Barriers Recommendation Number 9, Consumer Protection in the Clean Energy Economy.

First, with the Contractors State License Board and the Department of Business Oversight, we are working to put in place consumer protections for customers who wish to participate in solar programs and to provide resources for existing customers with solar.

Next, the CPUC is developing procedures to provide more protections for customers from core transport agent companies that may market natural gas services to customers without clear business disclosures. And these are very important in low-income and disadvantaged communities.

Finally, I'll leave you with a short list of CPUC responsibilities with respect to SB 350 and disadvantaged communities. These are to increase renewable electricity procurement to 50 percent by 2030 in order to decrease GHGs and pollutants, to implement customer energy programs to increase energy savings, affordability and to reduce pollutants, to consider potential economic and environmental benefits for communities burdened by adverse

socioeconomic conditions and pollutants and clean energy program design and implementation, and to create a Disadvantaged Communities Advisory Group with the CEC to provide expert guidance.

2.2

And we've already had two meetings of that advisory group.

And those will end my comments. And thank you very much.

MS. DeMESA: So this slide provides links to the CARB and Energy Commission Barriers Report for your ease of reference. And this is -- also this presentation is posted on the web for you to access.

Just to do a little bit of panel framing before we begin our first panel, I wanted to mention that today's workshop is designed to not only highlight our progress to date on many of the recommendations that we've just outlined, but we also want to show you how we are seeing these interrelated projects being implemented across the state and share some of the benefits with you that we're seeing play out for low-income residents and others across California.

A few things to keep in mind today, as we have a lot to cover in a really short time frame, we'll do our best to stay on schedule -- and I think we're doing pretty good so far. The dais will also provide the same reminder

as needed if we start to get behind. So thank you.

2.2

2.3

We have broken the discussion into four panels today based on our priority recommendations. And we talked a little bit about some of those and which panels they would be discussed in.

They'll build on one another and we've also built in opportunity for public comment within each of those panel discussions.

Each of the discussions is centered on clear tangible examples of work that's being done at the community level to meet our SB 350 air quality climate and equity goals.

And so we look forward to sharing our progress and also hearing from you today. Thank you.

MS. RAITT: So I'd like to go ahead and ask our panelists for the first panel to come up to the front tables, please. We have places for you. And our moderator.

The moderator is Veronica Eady from the

California Air Resources Board. And the case example is

from Matt -- I'm sorry, I'm going to not pronounce your

name correctly -- from the California League of

Conservation Voters.

So with that, want to go ahead?

MS. EADY: Thank you. Hi. I'm Veronica Eady.

Good morning.

2.2

2.3

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Just a question. Are we expecting one more panelist from the Joint Committee on Climate Change Policies?

MS. RAITT: Not that I know of.

MS. EADY: Okay. We're running a little bit early, but we are expecting one more panelist, Katie Valenzuela-Garcia, whom many of us know. She's staff to Assembly member Eduardo Garcia and to the Joint Legislative Committee on Climate Change Policies.

But we will get started and maybe allow Katie to go last.

I'm real excited to be here today. SB 350 is a very important piece of legislation and I think that it is setting models for other work within our agencies, as you'll see throughout the day.

What this first panel is going to address is community meetings and community outreach. Inclusion and community partnership are key to the implementation of SB 350 as well as many pieces of legislation we're working on within our agency. We have lots to learn from local residents and -- to build effective community outreach.

So this discussion, the first panel discussion, is foundational to all SB 350 works, so it makes sense that we're going first.

We're going to attempt to better understand community needs over time and refine methods of engagement and outreach and partnership building. And the panelists we have today will share with us best practices around these themes as well as trust and mutual understanding.

2.2

We have built three years of state, local and regional community partnerships and they're strengthened by the many related efforts going on under SB 350.

So you heard Tabetha lay out the themes that we're going to discuss in this panel, the first four or five of the CARB recommendations and the CEC recommendations.

So I'm going to begin by introducing each panelist, and I'll allow them to give us a sentence or two about their background.

After we have the panelists -- if Katie

arrives -- then we'll have a case study by Matt Aubularach
Macias from the League of Conservation Voters. But I will

start us off this morning with James Becker from the

Richmond Community Foundation.

So thank you, James.

MR. BECKER: Well, thank you very much. It's a pleasure to be here and a pleasure to talk about community engagement with you.

I am the president and CEO of the Richmond

Community Foundation located in Richmond, California, not Richmond, Virginia, as somebody always asks.

2.2

2.4

The Richmond. We are the Richmond. And we look at our work as mobilizing the power of connection to build healthy, thriving communities with an equity lens on the work that we do.

We work in five areas. We work in the areas of education, economic development, safety, health, and the environment. And we do it through what we call our three strategies for effective engagement. We call it coach, connect, and contribute.

We work with residents on a coaching strategy to be really effective in how they engage with others who come from government or come from other areas.

We connect them with resources that they need to be able to the kind of work that they want to accomplish.

And then we contribute both time, talent and resources to their work.

Am I supposed to continue with my pitch or --

MS. EADY: Please do.

MR. BECKER: Okay. All right. I wasn't sure how the introductions were worked in. But I'm going to go through it and we'll move on.

MS. EADY: No, please do.

MR. BECKER: All right. Thank you.

So before we even start community engagement, we do a lot of homework, right? We have to know what's gone on in the past. We have to know what community engagement residents are already involved with, because why create something that they don't need if they've already got a system in place that works.

2.2

So we spend a lot of time doing that research and reaching out and contacting and connecting with people who do this work in community and who are really good at it.

Once we start bringing groups together around a particular project, there are some key things that we have to do to make sure that the projects work.

First, we have to set expectations, and we do
that in two ways. We looked at expectations around time
commitment and around the resources and the engagement that
we expect from both residents and from the folks from out
of town, as they're often called. They come in and want to
work in the community.

And we set expectations for what decisions we can actually influence. And to me that's always been one of the critically important areas, because we often disengage communities when we go in and ask them for input and we don't clearly define and help them think about what that input is and then say, "Oh, no, that's not the input we want." Right? That turns people out immediately.

We work really hard to build authentic connections. And in fact, I'll give you a quick example here in a minute, but in our work we have actually closed our main offices and we've actually moved into the community where we work. So we've taken a step to really be authentic in the connections that we want to create.

2.2

And then we celebrate progress. You have to acknowledge the small wins, because some of these projects take a very long time.

I'm going to give a quick example. This is an 18-year community engagement process that we've been helping to lead. It's called the Nystrom United Revitalization Effort. It takes place in the Iron Triangle, Santa Fe, and Coronado neighborhoods of Richmond, which for many years was considered ground zero for homicides that we had that were destroying our community.

Residents in this neighborhood have faced generations of systematic disinvestment and displacement through strategies like redlining. They'd create historic challenges for our community. And residents face numerous structural barriers to achieving their goals.

We didn't want to continue a mainstream culture of decision makers and institutions not listening to residents, so when we began this project 18 years ago, we wanted to recognize and build their power.

We spent a year of planning. We came up with five community redevelopment strategies, and this body -- which includes now our board of supervisors, our city staff, our county and everyone else, and the majority of residents in those three neighborhoods -- has maintained itself for 18 years.

2.2

The city council and the school board even adopted resolutions so that if the council is changed, there's still a commitment to this work, which we find very promising.

So that being said, as this opportunity came forward for us to partner with Transform around mobility hubs and the target zone was the Coronado neighborhood, we knew that we had an existing process that they could use to become engaged.

But first we had to ask them. So we actually went to the resident bodies that make up this Nystrom Revitalization Effort. We said, "Here's an opportunity for you. Transform has come to us and they think it's a good idea. What do you think?" So we discussed it, we debated it and the decision was made that: Yeah, I think this would help our community. We're excited to see that this is going to work.

So their work now and our work with them moving forward is around determining location, systems for

implementation and all of that. It makes sense for the neighborhood where this project wants to locate. So we're going to work very hard with that.

Now, this has actually impacted some of our other work. We use an innovative social impact bond which is private capital to reclaim boarded up abandoned homes in the cities, and now that this project is on line, the residents now want us to work not only on affordability of the homes for purchase but affordability on the homes for maintenance. And so we're now working to achieve a zero net energy standard on the projects that we're working on on the housing side.

So all of this happens because you set an equitable table for grass roots and grass tops. Everyone has the same authority, the same ability to engage. And after the years that NURE's been in place, this coalition of residents and leaders -- and city leaders, sorry -- we've brought more than \$58 million in investments into the neighborhood.

So a neighborhood that was once the place everyone wanted to leave is now the place everyone wants to stay because we have great parks, streets, school facilities and housing and people who are engaged.

Thank you.

MS. EADY: Thank you. So we've been joined by

Katie Valenzuela-Garcia.

And, Katie, just to bring you up to speed, first of all, sorry that we started early.

MS. VALENZUELA-GARCIA: I wanted to congratulate you all, actually. It's the first time I've ever had this happen.

MS. EADY: Yes, apologies. Things are going more quickly than planned, I guess. But anyway I just gave a few opening remarks about the importance of inclusion in potential equity and how those themes are really foundational to SB 350.

So I know you as -- in a number of roles. I will say that you are staff to Assemblymember Eduardo Garcia and the Joint Legislative Committee on Climate Change Policies and I've invited the panel to say one or two sentences as well about themselves when you open.

MS. VALENZUELA-GARCIA: Okay. Hello. Yes, it is true, I do work at the legislature so I put my phone off the table so you don't hear it trying to vibrate off right now.

But I'm here today actually as a resident and community organizer here in Sacramento. I'm on the -- we're helping start a community land trust here. I help organize our neighborhood coalition, and in general I've been kind of glutton for punishment for doing a whole lot

of stuff in my non-State time so that I can try to help make change here in the City of Sacramento.

2.2

So I want to -- I know you all have probably seen all the really cool bike lane infrastructure improvements that are happening here in downtown. What you might not know is that that's the result of a 2016 update to the Bicycle Master Plan that I participated in as an organizer in Oak Park.

Back then, the city staff didn't have the resources to do extensive outreach so they were essentially doing 5:00 p.m. meetings at City Hall on Wednesday nights, and obviously a lot of my neighbors couldn't participate. So we decided to step up, because like I said, we're gluttons for punishment.

So we canvassed every single house and apartment in Oak Park, and we asked them the question about what they'd like to see different about transportation in our neighborhood.

We found out what improvements had happened that they felt like had worked, what improvements they felt like weren't working and why. We even found out why folks prefer to cross at unmarked intersections because sometimes they felt more visible to traffic than they did at the intersections that actually had the crosswalks or HAWK signals.

So we collated -- I think it ended up being about 100 individual site specific recommendations for what is a very large neighborhood just southeast of downtown. And we presented all of this to the city. We felt really proud of ourselves, like "Here's the improvement. We did it for you." Unfortunately, none of that input actually made it into the Bicycle Master Plan.

2.2

At the time, staff told me that they didn't consider that data to be valid. But that also shouldn't have been super-surprising to me. I was obviously pretty disappointed at the moment, but I had seen it happen a few times before.

The neighborhood just to the east of us, Tahoe

Park, had actually gotten a grant from the California

Endowment to do professional level lock audits across their entire neighborhood, and that had not made into the city's plan, because again, the City decided that that data was not valid.

I had watched really well paid consultants plan

Mack Road improvements for South Sacramento and their plan,

their master idea to prevent illegal crossings, was to put

fences in the medians.

The issue that they weren't addressing was the fact that that bus now only came once an hour and the crossings to get to the bus stops were really far apart.

And that's what was pushing residents to cross illegally on what is a very dangerous road that has claimed several lives I think just this year alone -- illegally at those intersections just because they needed to get to the bus or they were not going to get where they needed to go.

And finally I think probably for me the most egregious incident of community input being ignored was an intersection that did make it on to the city's list, it was 58th and Fruitridge Road near West Campus High School.

It had been on the list for 10 years and had been passed up every single year for the stoplight they needed for different priority projects until a student at West Campus who was ironically and sadly advocating for that crosswalk to be improved was struck and killed in that crosswalk.

At that time, we were able to raise private money to pay for the stoplight that was improved because the city, after that student was killed, had decided to put their publicly funded stop sign at a three-way intersection in a residential neighborhood in the pocket.

So I say all these examples to you because -- sorry, I lost my place in my notes. I'm a little energetic.

I've watched the City of Sacramento pour hundreds of thousands of dollars into consultants who lack the

community perspective to plan and implement projects that meet the community's needs, all while communities who have lived experience and expertise and some really good ideas about what they need get pushed to the side and get left out of the planning equation.

And this goes much more deep than just community input because originally some folks say well, community input, you need a consultant. I just watched the bike lane improvements go into a more affluent neighborhood right next to Oak Park when those community residents I think literally had like a clipboard survey.

So they didn't do nearly the level of work that we did in Oak Park and yet they got their bike lanes and we still haven't seen any of the improvements in Oak Park that we had slated for. In fact, they just put in a bunch of HAWK signals on Broadway at the wrong intersections. It wasn't the intersections residents say they felt were safe for crossing.

And I'm not saying this to light up the city of Sacramento in a negative way. These stories are pretty similar to the stories I hear from other environmental justice and community advocates across the state. And what it points to is the fact that the low-income barriers to transportation go much deeper than where you hold your meetings and whether or not you have different color dots

for your maps.

These communities were built on segregation.

They were built and disenfranchised from power. They were built to create the inequity that we see in our communities today.

All of that -- and until we really identify and address the root cause of what's creating the inequity and really recognize what we're dealing with, we're going to continue to perpetuate the same challenges.

We know that communities who then eventually win their much-needed bike lane improvements then turn around and are subject to gentrification and displacement concerns because the cities refuse to pass inter-sectional policies that might consider transportation and housing to ensure the folks who are supposed to benefit from those improvements actually stay there to be able to use them.

So I say all of this not to say like "Woe is me and it's terrible." I think that there are like really clear processes that we keep butting up against that would really help with this.

And, obviously, some of it counts on how the people who are doling out the money hold them accountable. Not just for the plans and processes they put in place, because obviously accessibility -- not holding your meetings at 5:00 p.m. in downtown Sacramento on a

Wednesday, those are sort of foundational points. But also do you have an anti-displacement strategy in place.

The cities keep saying, "We can't do it. It's too expensive to adopt anything around rent stabilization," as we see rents skyrocketing and as my home in Oak Park grew 50 percent in value in just a year and a half. That's something that the city can do something about, but they just refuse to act on.

So the funders who have the money can push and say "We are looking for this" when we are looking for equitable transportation investments. That's going to be sometimes the open door that advocates need to be able to step in and push for the changes that they feel like they need.

But the other thing is just the time and the space for them to do it right. Sometimes the thing that will give some cities the out is they'll say, "Well, this grant is due in two weeks, so sorry." Or they'll say, "Oh, gee, we need to get this bike master plan update because the ATP applications are rolling out next month."

So I think the longer time range -- horizons we can give to city departments -- because they do need to build their own capacity and they do need to take time.

You can't just drop in to Oak Park tomorrow and say, "Hey, I've learned from my mistakes. I'm here to help you."

That's not going to work.

2.2

2.3

It's going to take them a long time to adopt that. But if you hold them accountable to that, you give the space to do that, you let them use their resources to do that -- because it does cost money to build capacity at city and county planning departments. It's not going to happen overnight for them. And deep ISE (phonetic) training alone can take months and cost a lot of money, but it's important for them to understand, as the previous speaker said, what dynamics they're playing into.

And really in the end, I think until we really recognize and shift that at the state level, we're not just not confronting inequity. We're sort of complicit in perpetuating it. And I think that's ultimately the goal today, is we know that gentrification happens when we result in transportation improvements.

That's why you see people protesting bike lane improvements. And everyone says, "Why are they protesting that? They've been asking us for that for years." It's because we're not looking at what the community actually needs and designing our funding programs to push cities and local jurisdictions to do what they need to do.

Thank you.

MS. EADY: Thanks, Katie.

Next, we're going to turn to some public

agencies. I want to introduce Jeanie Ward-Waller who is with Caltrans. And of course Caltrans is one of our important sister agencies involved in the implementation of SB 350.

2.2

MS. WARD-WALLER: All right. I feel like I'm in the hot seat following Katie. That was a great, I guess, lead-in to what I'm going to say. And so I'll back up, introduce myself.

I'm Jeanie Ward-Waller. I'm the sustainability program manager at Caltrans. I've been at Caltrans for almost a year, so I'm new to state agency work, but I come from advocacy. I have an advocacy background in active transportation. So a lot of the stuff Katie's talking about is really important to me, really resonates with me but is really challenging for Caltrans as a state agency.

So I'm going to talk about our role in SB 350 and what Caltrans has sort of pledged to do, what we're doing already on outreach to low-income communities. But I also want to be really clear up-front and acknowledge that this is a really challenging space for us to be in.

Caltrans is certainly an agency that has been destructive to low-income communities. And the state highway system, the national highway system has really divided and created a lot of the inequities in these communities that we're now trying to work to correct.

So just finding a way to be in this space and be comfortable with acknowledging that we've been complicit and creating transportation barriers in communities is really important for us to be able to acknowledge and talk about.

So I think one of the biggest things that we have to get better about doing, and this is part of our plan, is talking about these issues and talking about it in a real way that acknowledges the historic damage that we've done in communities.

So to get to sort of what we've committed to -Caltrans does do a lot of planning from a statewide

perspective. Our relationship directly to residents and
their local transportation needs and the types of things
that Katie's talking about like stop signs and crosswalks
is -- there's a little bit of a disconnect.

It's hard to get folks to engage in transportation planning at a state level when they can't see the direct improvements that they're going to get in their community on their corner on their street.

So we have to get better about helping folks to understand how state planning does benefit them and why there's a reason for them to engage at the state level.

So the specific recommendation in the CARB report that Caltrans has been tasked with is expanding assessments

of low-income residents, transportation and mobility needs and ensuring that feedback is incorporated into transportation planning.

2.2

This work largely centers around our partnerships with local and regional agencies that are often the implementers at the local level of a lot of these transportation improvements.

So one of the most important things that we've highlighted in our SB 350 plan is educating, working with, and talking to our local and regional agencies about this work and getting them more engaged in it as well.

There is a lot of outreach that happens through the regional transportation planning process and through local general plans around low-income communities' needs but we need to do better, and Caltrans has a role as the Department of Transportation in really pushing our partners to do more.

We also have several ongoing planning processes that are really relevant to this work and already do have an equity focus. So I want to just highlight a couple of those and, you know, what we're doing to sort of really embed the message of SB 350 and the need to expand the focus on disadvantaged communities through those plans.

The first is we've just kicked off our district active transportation plans. And that's a five-year

consultant contract where we're going to do in all 12
Caltrans districts around the state, plans for biking and
walking infrastructure that is really focused on the state
highway system and how we are improving our facilities, our
Caltrans owned facilities to improve transportation in
these communities.

2.2

And, you know, looking at both travel along the state highway system but also across the state highway system. And often, you know, the freeway interchanges or major freeways are huge barriers to travel in these communities.

So that -- as I said, that contract has just kicked off. It's a five-year effort, and we really are going to be looking for our local agencies, regional agencies and community residents to engage deeply in process and push those plans to really identify projects that will improve these communities.

The second thing is the statewide transportation plan. We call it the CTP, California transportation plan, that's our long-range statewide plan. And that also, working with CARB, helps us identify how we're getting to our state climate goals by 2050.

So it is an important plan. Again, it's at a statewide level. So how do we get residents to engage in the process and make it meaningful. There are a couple of

venues for that. We do tribal listening sessions. We do focus groups with residents. And we also do scenario development workshops.

So that effort is also underway. We've already started the tribal listening sessions and the focus groups. And again, you know, we ensure that there are disadvantaged and low-income folks represented in those venues.

The third thing is our sustainable transportation planning grants. That's a program that got a significant boost from SB 1. It's 25 million a year in planning funds. And 50 percent of that program has to go to disadvantaged communities.

The next round of guidelines update for the program for 2019 is underway now and there are workshops at the end of September in L.A. and Sacramento. And so that's another venue to make sure that those planning funds are really being used in a meaningful way to support disadvantaged community assessment of their transportation needs.

And the fourth thing I want to highlight is technical assistance. And we do a lot of technical assistance through the climate investment programs primarily, and there are two transit programs and then also the active transportation program working with the Strategic Growth Council and our other state partners.

We have been doing a lot of technical assistance to disadvantaged low-income communities to help them get access to those funds.

So those are the things I want to highlight. Maybe I'll stop there and we can discuss more.

2.2

2.3

MS. EADY: Thanks, Jeanie. Great.

And finally, before we get to our case example, our final speaker or presenter is my colleague from CARB, Violet Martin.

MS. MARTIN: Thank you, Veronica. I'm Violet
Martin. I'm in CARB's Clean Transportation Outreach
section.

And a lot of the work we do, it's really evolving and I think that it's really about connecting to communities, to residents and ensuring that their needs are met through outreach and education.

So with that, I want to essentially describe the strategy that we're working on and the recommendation that's outlined in the Barriers Report. So in an effort to understand the transportation needs and improve awareness of clean transportation and mobility options of low-income residents, CARB's Guidance Document prioritizes the need to do three things.

The first is to develop an outreach plan or roadmap targeting low-income residents in rural, urban,

tribal, and disadvantaged communities. That ensures outreach efforts include state and local transportation, energy, health, and air quality programs.

2.2

Second, we want to make sure we design outreach and education materials that are specific to community needs across the state and are relevant, accessible and available in the languages in which the communities speak.

Third, we want to or we are tasked with expanding and better coordinating education, outreach and exposure for clean transportation and mobility options, including incentive programs.

So developing a comprehensive outreach plan and roadmap involves a proactive process that requires a keen understanding of the target audience and the barriers they face, while also fully engaging with and being responsive to this target audience, low-income residents, and also developing partnerships.

To ensure the process for developing an outreach plan is collaborative but also incorporate all these other elements, we rely on a framework and cross agency partnerships that the task force has essentially helped refine.

In addition, we have organized an external work group comprised of partner state agencies, air districts and incentive program administrators, all of whom have a

diverse and well-rounded outreach background and are also very well acquainted with the barriers and unique needs of underserved communities.

2.2

2.3

The work group meets regularly to discuss what a statewide outreach plan looks like and what components are integral to improving information access and streamlining outreach efforts.

In addition, we have consulted with many stakeholders and are working to integrate their feedback.

We also are considering community feedback provided during the initial public process to understand the barriers, and we have plans to solicit additional community input.

We are preparing to release a draft outreach roadmap next month that serves as a stepwise process or framework that will pave a -- for developing a meaningful, effective and achievable statewide outreach plan that can be tailored to reflect community specific needs.

So tying together the SB 350 directive and the collection of expertise guiding this effort, the roadmap emphasizes the route that will improve state and local coordination, content development, tailoring and delivery of information to low-income residents and will increase awareness of clean transportation and mobility options through improved education and access to information.

So in the roadmap, we emphasize maximizing coordination with related agency efforts, including California climate investment programs and other SB 350 priority recommendations that have an outreach or educational component, such as the development of the onestop-shop pilot application, which is -- and also expanding the community needs assessment that Caltrans -- or Jeanie just mentioned.

So tailoring outreach based on community identified needs, along with a streamlined application qualification process, can aid in significantly increasing the ease and ability for low-income residents to access clean transportation options and incentives.

The roadmap is intended to develop a cohesive and comprehensive outreach approach that can be used to those who conduct community outreach at the state, local and -- well, the state, regional and local level.

The roadmap is currently designed in a phase or step approach and they sort of -- each step sort of builds on one another.

The first step requires an effort to evaluate existing outreach programs so that we can identify elements from various campaigns, including their target audience, their objectives, key messages, marketing channels, metrics and campaign outcomes.

From this, we can potentially find meaningful ways to better align these programs, compile lessons learned, best practices and map outreach gaps.

2.2

Second, it is critical that we build and maintain partnerships to augment the inherent efficiencies of working together, leveraging resources, coordinating events and collaboratively developing outreach materials.

Developing a strong partnership network or a coalition will ensure information is transmitted, accessible, current and relevant. It also has the potential to streamline outreach and expand outreach -- or the reach of clean transportation program awareness and participation.

Third, the key to tailoring outreach is really understanding the audience, in this case identifying the specific community elements that determine what information is needed and how best to deliver outreach messages.

And based on the community identified needs assessments, we can develop a statewide and regional community specific strategies over time for improving clean transportation and mobility option awareness for the target audience.

Lastly, we need to ensure we have a way to evaluate the effectiveness of outreach efforts and tools to help us visualize campaign results.

So developing metrics, which is going to be

discussed in the fourth panel today, is an essential first step toward monitoring, assessing and improving community outreach strategies in evaluating whether the efforts are leading to increased information access and community awareness of clean transportation programs.

2.2

2.3

So each of these roadmap elements entails a series of recommendations that lay a path that leads to tailored community-led outreach through customizable templates, toolkits and support.

This effort requires strong interagency coordination and feedback, but it also is imperative that the roadmap itself is thoroughly reviewed by stakeholders to ensure we are developing effective relatable process.

We also want to reach out specifically to case study communities, particularly those that represent tribal and rural communities to ensure we're developing an approach that can be adapted to reflect their unique outreach needs.

So this captures the essence of the current roadmap status and lessons learned, but I also want to conclude by thanking all of those that have been involved in the process.

There's a lot of people out here today that have really helped guide how we are approaching this and we've received some incredible feedback and ideas. And I think

that our work -- our collaboration is really sort of setting the stage for how this progresses moving forward.

And I generally like to avoid platitudes, but I felt compelled to mention that the journey we're taking to develop the outreach plan I think is every bit as important as the destination. So we look forward to further collaborating in the process with all of you going forward.

Thank you.

2.2

MS. EADY: Thanks, Violet.

Finally, I like to open it up to our case example. So next we'll hear from Matt Abularach-Macias before we open it up for questions.

MR. ABULARACH-MACIAS: Thank you.

How's everyone doing? Awesome.

I'm Matt Abularach-Macias, and I am an organizer for the California League of Conservation Voters and CLCV Ed Fund. And I grew up in California's inland region, also known as the Inland Empire, which covers San Bernardino and Riverside Counties.

And when I started to think about what I wanted to say today on the panel, I really wanted to jump into a story of success for the residents of Ontario and how our community engagement -- or I like to think of community power building -- led to earning a \$35 million investment for this long-ignored community.

But there was something else that was on the tip of my tongue and realized I needed to start the conversation from somewhere else, some of which has already been actually touched upon today.

2.2

I might be preaching to the choir a little bit.

But I think TCC, Transformative Climate Communities and bills like AB 1550 or SB 535 or SB 350 are steps in the right direction. But it really begs the question why do we need laws or policies to state you can't forget these parts of your community? Or: Here's a special allocation for this community because everything else we do usually doesn't benefit it.

Where did we go wrong as a society that it isn't natural to think of everyone in our cities and state as an intrinsic part to our community as a part of our consideration for policy impacts?

So as great as it is that we live in California, and California is leading the way with climate policies and even working to do so in an equitable way, we need to acknowledge that we're having this conversation here today because we have failed along the way as a society. We have historically excluded low-income and communities of color from this decision-making table. So now we, the state, are trying to learn the best way to work with these communities to implement policies and programs.

I just want to sit on that for a second to really frame today's conversation.

2.3

So when I talk about communities and community engagement, I'm really speaking to the experience of bringing low-income and communities of color to the decision-making table, which many folks have acknowledged here today already.

Changing our culture of exclusion to one of inclusion. Moving those at the margins to the center.

Community engagement is the key for inclusion and is part of the process to create a more equitable world.

And I'm not usually someone to be very pessimistic and at my core I'm a very positive and hopeful person, and I think we can do better and we're on the pathway of figuring it out.

And part of the beauty of today is that everyone is here invested in changing the business-as-usual mentality that has pervaded the development of our state.

And -- well, at least I think we all should be; otherwise, why are we here, right?

And I say all that to lead to the story of the experience of Ontario being awarded one of the inaugural Transformative Climate Communities implementation grants and the role community engagement and inclusion played into that process.

Initially, when I learned about AB 2722, which is the TCC program, I though the word "Transformative" in "Transformative Climate Communities" denoted what SGC quotes as "The program funds development and infrastructure projects that achieve major environmental health and economic benefits in California's most disadvantaged communities."

2.3

So I really saw it as the very tangible things we saw, the new projects being built and the reduction of GHGs.

However, after going through that whole process,

I really came to learn that the most transformative part of
the program was the way that it turned the tables of
decision-making and put the community in the driver's seat.

Not just city managers and planners, not just elected
officials.

And I'll be the first to acknowledge that it's a lot easier said than actually done. However, I do think TCC is a great start and a great potential model for how we can transform communities and engage communities. How to re-include voices that have been left out and how to implement climate justice and adaptation policy with equity in mind and heart.

So the formal process for TCC for us, actually started a year and a half, maybe almost two years before

the program was awarded in January 2018 so probably in midto early 2015 -- or 2016, not '15, sorry.

And I was going to say that it was a grant, but there's aspects of it that are actually more like a loan than necessarily a grant, but that's another conversation for another time.

Monica, we can talk about that later.

And Inland Empire is part of the state that, you know, has long been ignored and underrepresented in California's political and policy psyche. We are currently in a period where more recognition and attention is being paid to our region, and I think we finally have some good state level leadership that reflects the needs of low income and communities of color that make up our community.

However, community-based organizations, organizers, and advocates in the region have long noticed the problem with the lack of resources and attention given to the IE. Working in our community, we were seeing how residents -- and we continue to see how residents have been dealt losing hands, but they still find ways to win.

There are folks living in the IE in some of the most disadvantaged -- quote, unquote, "disadvantaged" census tracts in California, which means the poorest and most polluted communities in our state and our country.

But that has not stopped them from working hard

to create a better life for themselves and their children.

However, they are tired of getting sick and they are tired of struggling to make ends meet.

2.2

And the organizations and advocates, as well as local governments in the region, have also known that many of the state's programs through GGRF that could confront some of the problems were not making its way to our part of the state.

And it was just something that a lot -- we would hear a lot in our community from our leadership, that "OH, GGRF doesn't work for us. You know, these programs aren't going to work in the IE." I'm sure you all have heard it here.

So there is this geographic inequity that exists where there's lack of public dollars and also private funds coming to the region.

So myself, CCAEJ, which is Center for Community Action and Environmental Justice, and partners within the County of San Bernardino decided to meet and come together to think about how we can bring these work sources to the community.

And so we began meeting and realized that TCC would be a great opportunity. And so I'm just kind of giving an overview of the story of how we got to that point, right, and what it took.

So when TCC came about, the first thing we had to figure out was where would we apply. We knew that we had to work in unison in order to even be considered. So we had to figure out where in our region would be the best place that this program would fit.

2.2

And I say "we," because it's not just me but all the organizations, residents and local stakeholders who were part of this process.

And so in trying to think about where this would happen, we felt like we were a little bit behind where folks in Los Angeles and Fresno were already ahead of us in planning for this. They knew that there was some sort of allocation going to come to that part of the state.

So we weren't even sure what was going to happen, if we would be competitive or if they would even look at us for an implementation grant, just because of certain reputations that existed about the Inland Empire.

And we also knew that SGC wanted to roll the program out quickly and demonstrate success as soon as possible, so really on a truncated time line. And it also felt like, you know, they were trying to eat the cake while it was still baking.

So even though the idea for applying for a TCC may have started a year and half before it was awarded -- and also I think contracts still have not yet been signed --

- the work to earn the application actually -- and fulfill the letter and spirit of the program started years and years ago through community power building.

If that early investment from advocates, organizers, community organizations had not taken place years before even the concept of TCC existed, then we would have not ever been eligible and/or earning of the grant.

So when we landed on Ontario, the key was that -- and just to give you all an overview. There were other places in our region that we felt were just as in need and just as critical for us to try to fight for this kind of investment.

However, Ontario, just to honest about it, is a little bit better resource and already had some more private investment and foundation dollars going into there, so it already felt like they had an infrastructure that SGC would be looking for in order to successfully implement and show — demonstrate success of the program.

What that shows me is that sometimes even in addressing inequities there's going to be perpetuated inequity in that the places that we actually look at first are the ones that are already going to be better resourced, so those places that are and still continue to be underresourced and overlooked is because there are still so many challenges there that state programs are willing actually

to go in there and look at them.

There is change to that, and I know with AB 617 coming up, there is real -- a lot of excitement in the area to see how we can give attention to those ignored communities.

So Ontario started about six years ago with a private grant from Kaiser, and they wanted to build heal zones or healthy parts of cities and communities. And so with that grant, they built -- they centered their heal zone on a community garden. And the community garden provided organic foods to a food desert, a low-income predominantly Latino community in the city of Ontario.

Around that, they also provided infrastructure changes to parks, some active transportation changes for sidewalks, and also provided different community classes. But most importantly -- and I think the biggest success is -- they hired local residents to administer the programs, to become community advocates, to do testing of health of different health -- monitoring health.

And so basically what happened was in the six years the city of Ontario had just some I think good planning staff that was concerned about the public health in the community, found this grant and started to really do in-depth community engagement work, go household to household, hold several meetings, do a lot of research.

But all that was really being led by the local residents who are most affected in that community, while at the same time providing jobs in a way that hadn't been done before and being creative.

2.2

Even Kaiser at first was a little skeptical about -- thinking, "Oh, this community garden is going to fulfill the promise of this initiative we have." But they took that risk and it turned out to be like a shining star for the region and nationally getting awards as well.

And so that six years of engagement led to us being able to build community leadership, build community power and really change how the planning staff interacted with the local residents in making planning decisions.

I know something that we were thinking about often is, a lot of times when working in international development in developing countries, there's investments in infrastructure or even sometimes governments that thought "Oh, this is going to be what's going to help that country" or -- but then they realize, oh, those have tended to fail because they never went to the people of those nations or those places to ask them what is it that's going to work for them.

So in working Ontario, that's what we started to do. We started to go to the communities and look at them as the experts of their own communities and ask what is it

that you need, much to what some of our other panelists have already described.

2.2

And so there was -- sorry about that. Yes, so this process happened six years prior to TCC even being a concept. And so when TCC came around, the thought wasn't: Oh, how do we start a whole fresh new type of engagement with our community in order to win a grant.

It was: We already have this system in place that's been developed and it happens to fit within the structure that this program was looking for. And let's insert what we already have working for us and use our community as our experts and use the knowledge that we had acquired for six years.

Because there's lists and lists that the city maintains of different "asks" (phonetic) the communities have. And a lot of that is years and years of opening communication and trust building.

And so when we applied, we just used the knowledge that we had already acquired. I'm sure like some of the success of TCC is engaging the community in a different way. But it is not because of TCC that this happened, but it's because of other investments that happened way before, that this was even possible.

And I want to emphasize that because I think it's not going to be just a state program, a new idea or a new

concept that will come and create equity. It's almost like jumping in halfway through the race, right? The starting line was way back. And we should look to what's already been happening in communities before jumping in and trying to implement something in communities.

So I want to speak to some of the challenges that we learned or faced in our experience in Ontario.

And one I already mentioned is that Ontario for San Bernardino County is already one of the better resourced communities, albeit not all of the resources are going to the parts of communities that need it the most. And that was something that needed to change and they had staff that was already in the process of shifting that paradigm.

But it was something that I think we should acknowledge because there's other parts of the region that we frankly did not push for an application because we knew that it still had a lot of challenges to overcome for the state to want to make an investment there.

And also the other big challenge is bureaucracy, working in local governments and with government as a whole. Obviously, governments have a lot of legal issues and liability issues that they are concerned about. And that's why certain processes exist and are in place.

And as the other panelist -- the staff member

from Assembly member Garcia's office mentioned, cities and governments need time to be able to do things because they have to jump through so many loopholes, get approvals, go to different boards, get approvals and all pass through legal in order for it to even be implemented.

But sometimes that kind of extra time isn't given to us because a need for a rapid turnaround. And if that's the kind of programs that we're going to be implementing, that's not going to work for communities. That's not going to lead to great community engagement.

And the other thing that I thought was a big issue coming up is, because of the program objectives wanting to be fulfilled and because it was public dollars that were being spent to implement this program, there was an unwillingness to take a risk or to take a chance on something that hasn't yet proven to work.

And in order to create transformation, we really have to do things differently than were done before. And so if we're not willing to those risks and take a chance on some new concept or idea that didn't exist before or something that doesn't have a proven record or something that isn't already shovel ready, then how are we really going to create transformation? We're just trying to fit all the wheels we already have instead of really creating new ideas.

I already mentioned expedited time lines.

Sometimes time lines just don't work to really get in-depth thorough community engagement.

Also, in the City of Ontario specifically -- and this is actually something that is a regional issue, is there's contradictory policy goals. The state has goals to reduce greenhouse gases and to reduce pollution burdens in disadvantaged communities.

However, we still see local governments making decisions, planning decisions that don't reflect that by approving developments such as warehousing and logistics for our region that are known to bring increased pollution and increased burdens to a community without much benefit to the community that lives there.

And this gets into other issues of displacement such -- that have also already been mentioned.

The other thing is, it's not just about working with advocates as a state program. It's easy to use advocates in the community or community organizations as your access point.

And I highly recommend investing in those organizations and those already existing advocates as your kind of gateway or maybe a legend for how to navigate within that community, because again, we don't need to add new programs in but how can we fit this program into

something that already exists. But really see the advocates and community organizations as a conduit or, yeah, like a legend to actually speak to residents themselves.

It is not enough to have me, a member -- somebody as part of nonprofit organization that's fairly well-funded in the state to come and talk to you all. But it would be very different to have, you know, a resident in the city of Ontario who will actually benefit from the improvements or changes to her quality -- or their quality of life.

So I think that kind of leads me to like just say some of the things that have already been said in some ways about just some insights and things that really work.

In order to properly engage communities and like get to something successful like what we were with Ontario Together or the Transformative Climate Communities grant application and award, it takes time and it takes long-term investments.

Communities -- you just can't come in, expect to get what you need and leave. You have to build trust over time. You have to show that you're there, because folks have so long been taken advantage of. They've seen programs come in and leave. They see people come and leave, and they're still stuck with the ramifications or impacts of whatever is done or not done.

Always see communities and the members of that community as the experts. They know what they need, they can tell you firsthand what the experience is there and what's going to be the best way to invest or make changes there.

2.2

I think -- can't say this enough -- it is building trust. I think something I've also learned, it's so important to follow through on your word and also not make promises that you can't keep, but keep an open mind and ear and think about -- and find those ways to get the solutions that community members need. And obviously make the necessary accommodations.

Something in Ontario that we do is we pay residents to be the leaders in their community, to come to meetings, to reach out to their own community members, right? So that's an economic barrier that sometimes would exist, but we are working to turn that over.

Provide childcare at meetings. Provide translation interpretation, not only in speaking but also in materials. Those sometimes get overlooked because, oh, it's too expensive. It's so much extra cost. And oh, we can't do this. Oh, our staff is only going to work on the weekdays and we can't hold weekend meetings.

Well, we need to think of other ways to make accommodations for these communities because a lot --

oftentimes, as you know, they're working, they're trying to make ends meet. And sometimes what works for those of us who are on salaried positions and 40-hour workweeks doesn't work for those who are paid hourly wages and who knows what kind of schedule.

2.2

Also it's important to look at impact versus intent. Our intentions may be good to help communities but sometimes just trying to implement some kind of program or going in there without doing the full research ahead of time or without working with the right people listening can have bad impacts.

And also just recognizing that it's not going to be perfect. That's something we really learned through our process with TCC, is that things changed all the time. And what we initially wanted to do isn't the end result of what we got or what we are working towards.

And there was a lot of mistakes made, and it's challenging. It's really challenging to do community engagement really well. And that's probably part of the reason why it hadn't been done. But there has to be a willingness to do that work and also knowing that we're going to make mistakes and be okay with that. Like I said earlier, be willing to take risks and leave room for failure.

So looking ahead, I really think -- I'm excited

about the direction we're going. I hope that some of the models or other things that happened with TCC -- and I'm sure you can talk to SGC about their experiences as an administrator of the program.

I'm excited to see that there is more emphasis on looking at low income and communities of color that have been long ignored. I'm excited that there's other concepts popping up from our experience like regional climate collaboratives that is in a bill this year, authored by Senator Connie Leyva from our region.

Ultimately, I think it's smarter to work equitably. It's smarter to put those at the margins at the center because when we lift our bottom, we lift everybody up.

And I think there's still a lot to learn. I do think we need to look at our impacts not just from what looks good from us at a bird's-eye level but really measuring our success by the perspectives of those living the impacts.

So trust me when I tell you that the way to get there is looking at low-income and disadvantaged communities as part of our solution. That's something we really learned in our experience.

And while we're some time away from an equitable world, I believe that we can turn the tables on decision-

making and include voices that have been left out. And with that, we will pave our pathway to get to an equitable world.

MS. EADY: Thanks, Matt. You have given us a lot to think about.

And thank you for mentioning Strategic Growth

Council and the really great model that they provided for
all of us sister agencies. And you mentioned Monica

Palmeira, who is here and we all work very closely with
her.

So I'm going to open it up for questions now, and I do want to apologize on Katie's behalf. With just two and half days left in the legislative session, she had to go back and address some emergency that's brewing over at the Capitol.

But we do have a lot of other great people to hear from. And so I guess I'll ask an opening question and then I'd like to open up to the dais for those of you who have questions, and then if we can spare a few minutes at the end if there are any questions from the public.

So, Matt, you almost -- you've pretty much answered what my opening question is, which is what does community engagement look like? What does partnership with communities look like in -- let's look towards 2019.

And I want to open that up for all of you to

1 | answer. Whoever wants to start.

2.2

MR. ABULARACH-MACIAS: I mean I already touched on some of these things, right? I think it's just giving - breaking down barriers that have previously existed for voices that haven't been included to be included, providing economic incentives, providing long-term investment and communication within those communities.

That's why I really like Senator Leyva's concept of climate collaboratives that I think would be administered through SGC. So that way there is already a state infrastructure that is working with local residents, working with local organizations, and in a structure that is long-term to figure out the best ways for us to reach our policy goals.

MR. BECKER: I'll add something as well.

MS. RAITT: Can I -- I'm sorry, could I just ask that you identify yourself for folks on WebEx. Thanks.

This is Heather myself, sorry.

MR. BECKER: Jim Becker from the Richmond Community Foundation.

You know, one of the things that I think is critical in this work is that despite the best models that we create, in the end it's all about respect. When we engage in communities, we have to remember that we are guests and as such, we have to behave appropriately.

I mentioned at the beginning that we moved our foundation offices into the neighborhood that we were doing the most work in. But I still go home at night. And I go home to a different community. And so every day I'm there, I have to remember that I'm a guest and I'm there because the community has asked us to be there.

Thank you.

2.2

MS. WARD-WALLER: This is Jeanie Ward-Waller with Caltrans.

I love what both of you have said. I think trust and respect are at the core. And just one thing that I would add, and I touched on this a little bit, is you know, being honest about the outcomes that's happening in these communities and why those outcomes have resulted over many years of public investment.

And so from Caltrans perspective, I think you know I mentioned, talking about the historic work we've done and how that has created some of the problems in these communities, many of the problems. Being able to talk honestly with communities about that I think is really important.

And we don't always have the dialogue to have an honest conversation and the words and the language. And so one thing I want to mention for 2019, Caltrans is one of the agencies that's participating in the Government

Alliance on Racial Equity.

2.2

This is the learning year. Next year we'll participate in the implementation year. But that's been a really meaningful program for us. We have a whole team participating in that, and we're identifying our action plan for 2019. And a couple of things that we're prioritizing is our work with external stakeholders and also our training and education to teach our staff, help them to learn the language to really talk to communities in an honest way and foster some of that trust.

And the last thing I just want to say is engaging just for the sake of engaging is not helpful to these communities. We have to actually deliver and meet their needs.

And so I think, you know, the second part for us is ensuring feedback is incorporated into planning and then also in investment. And that's the hard part for us. We can go, we can talk, we can do planning. But then, you know, how does that actually result in investment and benefits back to these communities. And that's something we really still have to struggle a lot with.

MS. MARTIN: I think that understanding communities a bit better is really integral to a lot of the underlying needs for outreach. And each community has a unique web of relationships and history, strengths and

conflicts that define it. And it's really something we're just starting to scratch the surface of, and we really need to develop a better understanding of the varying communities into -- you know, build this understanding in 2019.

But I also think that it's important to really emphasize the things that have already been said here, and that's, you know, transparency in managing expectations. We really need to be up-front and be respectful of people's time and show them or tell them exactly where their input would be helpful.

And not go to communities with a plan that's already 95 percent developed. It's a two-way street, this whole process. And so we really need to leave some avenues for them to provide input and then be able to incorporate that.

MS. EADY: Thanks, Violet.

Do you want to add something Matt?

Okay. Do we have any questions from the dais?

MR. COREY: I had a follow-up question. I think

21 it's primarily directed at Jeanie, it could be others as

22 well.

And I know that you have been, and the other panelists, strong, strong advocates for enhanced mobility options at the community level.

But when I think about local transportation decision-making, prioritization, ultimate funding -- and I think Matt touched on this -- many of those decisions aren't really aligned well at all with those objectives.

2.2

And given the role you have both at Caltrans and the wealth of experience you bring into this -- and you touched on some of this. But drilling down a bit more, what are those levers to influence outcomes that are far better aligned with equity, climate, air quality goals and going all the way down to the local level? Because we know funding comes from local, state -- it's not just Caltrans funding -- and federal.

What are those levers and how do we better use them?

MS. WARD-WALLER: That's a complicated question.

I think some of the levers are just capacity building in the communities and the sophistication of sort of the dialogue within the advocacy community. And in a lot of -- you know, working with community residents has just I think increased vastly. And a lot of that probably does come from some of these planning investments and the technical assistance. So I think those pieces are key.

But, you know, the work that the legislature has been doing and really driving the climate investment programs, driving investments to disadvantaged communities

like TCC I think is key.

2.2

Caltrans funding is still primarily driven by what are the maintenance needs on the state highway system, not which communities have been disinvested for transportation. Primarily, our funding is focused on maintaining the state highway system. And then we do planning, but that's not directly connected to our primary funding stream.

So there's still some challenges to work out, and I maybe won't talk about the levers for that. But I think, you know, the work we've been doing with ARB, with SGC, with our state agency partners is really helping move us in the right direction.

So I'm seeing a real change in how we're talking and thinking about these issues, but how the investments are driven I think, you know, there's still a lot of challenges.

COMMISSIONER SCOTT: So this has been a really excellent dialogue. This is Janea Scott.

I think I -- I'm really struck. Many of the themes that we have heard, as you all have spoken to, our themes that we have heard for years and themes that certainly came through as we carried out our Barriers Study and themes that we are thinking about how do we address.

And some of these are really hard, really

intractable issues. And many of our pilot programs, as maybe Matt pointed out and others, kind of are scratching at the surface but don't necessarily dig as far deep into sort of the social fabric that we need to change in order to get there. So that it's just something that I've been thinking about.

Another theme that I heard from Katie and Jim, and you Matt, is the amount of time that it takes for the community to start working together and to be ready for when money from Transformative Climate Communities or Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund or Energy Commission programs are there. And so one thing that might be of interest for all of us is to think about working with the philanthropic community a little bit more as well, to help build some of that capacity, so that when these grants are here and they're ready, the communities are also ready.

I think the Commission does some planning type of grants. But to your point, if you're not ready to start planning, even the planning grant may not be as helpful as we would like it to be. And so I'm really kind of thinking about how do we take some of that information and weave it into what we put together when we're putting out the planning grants.

And we have a lot of -- we call them community readiness grants that we're putting in place. And if

there's a way to structure those to make them more effective for communities who are trying to get ready for the transformations that we're talking about.

2.2

I think the -- another theme I heard was making sure that we put some more time in, and I think that that's really important as well.

Our time pressure sometimes from the state side is that we have two years and then the funds go away. So there's only so much time we can build in. But making sure that we kind of take advantage of the longest window that we have in there I think is something we should certainly be thinking about, especially when we're working with local communities.

Picking up on communities that already have the engagement, figuring out how to better engage so that we're not starting from scratch when we don't need to. And just trying to think about how we get that kind of information into our processes is worth thinking about how to roll the dollars out.

And then some of these things take a long time, right? It is -- we like to demonstrate some short-term successes, of course, so that the legislators and other folks who are putting money in can see that, oh, you're getting a bang for your buck. You're getting some value for your money.

But, Jim, I think you mentioned it in your -- how do we celebrate the milestones, the milestones along the way, so that you can see that there is kind of this longer planning horizon and we're making progress towards getting there. And so each of these things is a critical component.

2.2

So I don't know that I necessarily have questions for you all, but it's just things that sparked in my mind as we talked this through. I think the one other one -- actually there's a bunch.

But the last one that I'll mention is putting our dollars out in a way that these pilots that we are doing are scalable, so that we're learning lessons, that we make sure that we can share those lessons, and then that they're scalable, right? So, "Oh, wow, this is a great idea."

And, just as you said, maybe we took a little risk and it worked out great. How do we then make it scalable or how do we make it replicable in other communities?

And so that's always a component that I'm looking at when we're thinking about how to invest the transportation dollars that the Energy Commission has.

So just some thoughts of things that were sparked as you guys were talking.

Other questions from the dais?
Yes, please.

1 MS. REYNOLDS: So my question is for Matt.

And I really appreciated you describing the evolution of kind of starting with the community garden and the health study, leading up to the TCC grants.

For me I think it would be really good if you could take the opportunity to talk a little bit about the elements at the TCC grant program in little bit more detail, because I think that kind of would show, you know, where -- you started with where you came -- you know, the beginning and then yet leading up to TCC.

And even though this panel is focused on community engagement, maybe you could add a little bit more detail on elements of the proposal as well as some of the anti-displacement parts of the proposal.

MR. ABULARACH-MACIAS: Yeah. At some point I meant to include that in the conversation, so I appreciate the question.

MS. REYNOLDS: You touched on it but just a little more detail.

MR. ABULARACH-MACIAS: So our TCC application and concept included -- our biggest project was affordable housing, also included a really awesome composting and waste management program. There's going to be solar.

And also another big investment is going to be around active transportation modifications for the city,

which all came out of starting with our heal zones and the healthy Ontario initiative, where we kept hearing from community residents and through these programs, we got to really just have conversations and build formal and informal places where community could meet.

Like, for example, the community garden not only serves to feed people and give people organic options in the community but also a gathering place and a place for civil society to build, right?

And in those conversations, something that folks were able to bring up are: Well, we keep having folks get hit by cars or our crosswalks are unsafe or our kids aren't being to get to school safely. Or, oh, all community is bikeable. People really like to bike in this community, but sometimes it's not like the most safe biking place to get from place to place.

Or, oh, we have this community garden but we want a bigger garden. Well, in order to have a bigger garden, we need more food for the plants or the vegetation to grow. So we need some sort of composting kind of system to create new soil.

Or, oh, you know, a lot of -- overwhelmingly and it's not just unique to our part of the state -- housing is too expensive. We can't afford to live here. Maybe we're going to leave. Our kids can't live in Ontario. And so we

need to develop affordable housing.

And also through the program, we started to really -- to pay our own residents to help us gather information, to do the studies, to talk to their neighbors.

And that's also part of the way we're going to be implementing our TCC program because community engagement is a portion of our grant. And so that's also going to continue, and it's going to help us grow our resident-led community engagement workforce.

COMMISSIONER GUZMAN-ACEVES: Thank you.

Thank you, everybody. And thanks also to Katie who was here and kind of mic-dropped it all before going.

I do think that you've raised a couple of really core points, which is at a core, I think many of our state agencies don't feel the obligation to make up for the historical injustices, disinvestment and racism that exists in California today.

I think that's a fundamental deficit in our state agency culture, and I want to even say statute because I think we have no statute now that really directs us to do that. But it is a fundamental problem in our ability to think creatively, think new and to adjust our programs in that way.

Fortunately, we have leadership here that does see that recognition, so we're making -- we are turning the

dial a little bit, but it is -- it's fundamental and we have to institutionalize that, and that's our responsibility.

2.2

But it is part of the problem in that our core function is state highways, our core function is electric reliability, among other things, and our core function has to be environmental justice and making up for our institutional and historical problems.

So I just want to recognize that. I wanted to get into a much more tedious thing which we've encountered in many of our attempts of improving community workshop, which is there is a benefit to clarifying our laws. And I would invite all of you to join us in this effort so that we can pay for childcare, pay for food.

And certainly partnering with our foundations is something we've been doing to make up that gap, but it's a problem. You know, we're kind of hindered in a really unrealistic way.

And we could collaborate on very simple legislation that would authorize that, because we have -- I know Commissioner Peterman started the trend at the VC of using her own personal budget, her own income, her money to pay for food at some of the community workshops because we're meeting in the evening.

I mean this is like Organizing 101.

So I would invite that as an action that we can work on together of giving -- you know, nothing -- we're not going to have crab salads, but let's have like pizza and donuts, I don't know, something to keep people there for a little bit.

2.2

The other is something that was -- that is really -- to use the word "transformative" with the TCC program -- is that those areas were selected. The top five percent was a very small universe.

And at least in our world, and I know in a lot of other worlds, we do do shovel ready and we do prioritize matching grants and we do prioritize other things that are not poverty, that are not disinvestment and lack of infrastructure. And the legislature and ourselves do push for timeliness. You know, it's been too long. We want to see the investment in community.

So there is that -- there's that -- really it is a paradox. It's a healthy struggle. But I will say that, you know, there certainly is an urgency to making these investments happen. So we have to be cognizant of the fact that we have to balance that.

But I do -- I think there is something very large for us to learn from the TCC program. And I wanted to share a thought which I want us to maybe think through as we move forward together in that we have a universe of

communities that we could really focus on for the next few years.

2.2

We have the TCC communities. We have the 617 communities now. And we have a couple of proceedings in our world where we're refocusing on communities in the San Joaquin Valley.

I would challenge us to be able to really try some of these things out. So even if -- let's say this legislation passes or not, but the one-stop concept would really focus on the sense of communities that can build upon -- you mentioned solar being one of your programs.

We want to make sure we're providing the technical assistance of what Southern California Edison can offer in those areas, because those are new programs and have we even briefed you guys on that. Those are the kind of overlaps in terms of the one-stop concept that we really want to maximize on.

So I just want to invite that, that certainly we could commit to prioritizing in the vein of the TCC certain communities that we all seem to be coalescing around anyway.

COMMISSIONER SCOTT: Let me just check with Heather right quick to see whether or not we have any public comment. We did say we'd do a little moment for public comment. Do you have any blue cards or hands on the WebEx?

MS. DOUGLAS: Janea, while Heather looks, let me jump in with a quick question --

COMMISSIONER SCOTT: Yes, please.

2.2

MS. DOUGLAS: -- which is this. You know, I've been hearing, and it's resonating with me, the theme of capacity building and long-term relationships and nobody jumps into an area that just isn't ready and makes a huge difference. You really have to build on the work that's done organically and locally and so on.

And so that reaches the paradox that you're talking about, Matt, where it's like the community absolutely needs help, but then you turn around there are other communities around you that need even more and aren't in a position to apply or take advantage of these opportunities.

So do you have some thoughts as to what kind of investment in capacity building or kind of simpler applications kind of -- you know, like the garden. You know, what are some of the ways that we could incubate the next round, even as we move forward and focus on some of the communities that have been able to get these kinds of grants?

MR. ABULARACH-MACIAS: I wish I had the best answer for that. I'm not assuming that I do.

I do think, however, something that Commissioner

Scott touched upon was aligning with the philanthropic community, and really I think the philanthropic community could potentially give us opportunities to take more risk. They don't have as many like liability issues for implementing projects or funding programs.

2.2

2.3

And so for me I think that's a good place to start. And I guess we can ...

MR. BECKER: So I'll add to that. As someone who runs a community foundation and works in philanthropy every day, you're absolutely right that philanthropy has to change.

I mentioned at the very beginning that our strategy is called coach, connect, contribute. And that's exactly for that reason. We want to make sure that when opportunities like this are presented, that the communities that we serve in West Contra Costa County are ready to take advantage of those.

I really believe that that's our responsibility as a community foundation. And those of you who have community foundations in your region, both on the dais and in the room, reach out to them and really make them accountable to this kind of work, because it's absolutely essential.

MS. WARD-WALLER: Can I just provide -- chime in on this one from the transportation perspective. And this

partly helps me tap my background in advocacy working for Safe Routes to School National Partnership.

In the transportation space, school-based investments are really great incubators for getting people engaged in transportation.

And Safe Routes to School provided a terrific model for a place where parents, children, families were gathering every single day and seeing all kinds of safety issues. And kids get hit and a community will just be up in arms, and a school is a really galvanizing place for people to get together and organize.

And so making small improvements -- sometimes it's a stop sign, it's a crosswalk, the kinds of things that Katie talked about, the things that people really see and viscerally appreciate and make a really tangible benefit in communities. And then suddenly people become transportation planners. All of a sudden, they're looking around like, well, where else can we do this? Where else can we put a bike lane or a stoplight?

And that can really get people engaged in a bigger transportation planning and policy discussion, starting from really small improvements that are places that are very personal to people for the period of time where their kids are going to school.

MS. RAITT: This is Heather. We don't have any

public comments so far.

COMMISSIONER SCOTT: Okay. Great. So if you would like to make a public comment and you're in the room, please be sure to get a blue card and get those to Heather.

If you're on the WebEx just remember to raise your hand on the WebEx.

We are also happy to take written comments and will be taking comments periodically throughout.

But if there's no public comments right now, we have about five more minutes for questions from the dais.

Do we have a couple more questions from folks here?

COMMISSIONER RECHTSCHAFFEN: This is Cliff
Rechtschaffen. I kind of had a follow-up to Commissioner
Douglas's question and too bad Katie is not here.

I was really struck by all the extraordinary efforts she had engaged in to make up for the deficit in the Sacramento City planning process. But that's not sustainable.

So the question I suppose is what structures do we need to have in place to have permanent capacity to replace what Katie and her group did permanently? Maybe it's the one-stop-shopping efforts which are either physically or virtually in a community is part in that direction. I don't know if there are other thoughts.

We've just talked about partnering with the philanthropic community for that.

But if we're going to strategically use our investment and outreach and technical systems, where should we put it to make sure that we don't have to rely on heroic efforts when government is overlooking the community?

MR. ABULARACH-MACIAS: Something that I know exists in many of the disadvantaged communities as identified by CalEnviroScreen are already environmental justice organizations working on these issues in those areas.

So I think they're probably the places that you should turn to first, because community already has built relationships with them and probably could be a great access point to turn to. And so investing or communicating openly with a lot of the environmental justice organizations across the state.

COMMISSIONER SCOTT: So I did receive one public comment, so we will take that one comment and then we will transition to our 11:45 panel. And that's Monica from SGC.

MS. PALMEIRA: Hi. Good morning, everyone.

I was trying to hide in the corner, but then Matt called me out. So I thought -- and thank you, Veronica, as well. So I thought I should show my face.

So I really appreciated the conversation today

about outreach and community engagement and I work closely with almost all of you.

2.2

I just wanted to offer a reflection from my role and where I am at Strategic Growth Council that I think has led us to have some really important relationships that have facilitated the work that we do today and really help build that trust with communities. And it is actually fairly simple.

You know, first is -- my whole job -- me, myself -- is to do outreach. That's what I do and that's my whole job.

Second, I was hired based off of my experience in community engagement and organizing, like Jeanie. I think that was recognized as an important background to have for a job like this.

And then third, and importantly, I was given the room, the time, the flexibility, and the travel budget to travel around the state and meet with folks one-on-one not for a workshop, not with an agenda, but just to meet people.

Matt, I think the first time we met was at a Starbucks outside of Carousel Mall in San Bernardino. And we talked for like two hours, and that's why he feels like he can call me out in front of all of you important people today, because you know, we were able to have that informal

interaction.

I feel like for a lot of my counterparts at other agencies, that privilege is afforded to people in higher levels of leadership and not staff folks like myself.

So I just wanted to put that out there for you all, because I think it's allowed us to be able to build some programs and be able to deliver on community feedback because we have those relationships in place, because we were given the room to create them to start.

So thank you so much, everyone, and thank you for being here.

MS. WARD-WALLER: Monica, before you go away, I want to ask you a question.

Matt talked about community-based organizations. There's another barrier to, you know, community-based organizations being able to access, having the capacity to use government funds. And I think that's something that SGC has like really been looking for innovative ways to --

MS. PALMEIRA: Yes.

MS. WARD-WALLER: -- you know, have more flexibility there. And so in terms of institutionalizing a -- you know, kind of a pilot practice, I think there's a whole lot to learn from what SGC is doing and working with and directly funding the community-based organizations that already have trust.

MS. PALMEIRA: Yeah. Just a quick note on that. My colleagues at Caltrans and Air Resources Board that are here that were working on these subcontracts with community- based organizations to do outreach as part of technical assistance work, it's not easy work and we're literally -- quite literally navigating that right now.

2.2

But I think we are learning some important lessons that we look forward to sharing with folks moving forward.

COMMISSIONER SCOTT: Okay. Thank you.

Will you please join me in thanking our excellent first panel. Thank you for taking the time and bringing your great insights to us.

We are going to tee up Panel Number 2, which is addressing barriers to clean energy in multifamily building infrastructure.

While they are making their way up there, I'll just remind folks that if you are interested in making a public comment and don't have a chance during our short period, we will have another period at the very end of the meeting.

And you are also more than welcome to submit comments to us in writing, and we will let you know how to do that at the end of the workshop.

So as soon as our folks get up at the table, we

1 | will let Panel Number 2 get going.

2.2

MS. RAITT: This is Heather again. Our second panel is moderated by Bryan Early from the Energy Commission.

And just one more reminder to please go ahead and identify yourself each time you speak because we do have a fair number of folks on WebEx participating remotely.

Thanks.

MR. EARLY: Hi, everyone. My name is Bryan Early with the Energy Commission.

This panel, as was already mentioned, is going to be diving in on the issue of clean energy in multifamily housing.

This is a sector of housing which historically has been tough to tackle in terms of programmatic efforts to achieve energy efficiency and demand response and renewable energy and clean vehicles. And it's a huge sector of the state's housing stock and one that is particularly important to low-income and disadvantaged communities. And it's obviously a sector of our housing stock which is growing by share.

We have also been discussing here at the Energy Commission in our IEPR proceeding this year the need to really do a deep-dive in providing energy efficiency and other clean energy measures in existing buildings, and

particularly in multifamily structures.

2.2

2.3

So this is an issue -- area where it's both an imperative from the climate perspective and an imperative to meet our equity goals for the state.

So by way of -- oh, and of course the genesis of this panel was the recommendation in the SB 350 Barriers

Report to do a deep-dive in providing clean energy in the multifamily sector for all the reasons that I already mentioned.

So by way of structure today, I wanted to, first off, have Eugene Lee who is the lead in putting together this multi-agency report, the Clean Energy in Low-Income Multifamily Buildings Action Plan, give a brief summary to those here of the process and the content and recommendations and the next steps from the report.

And then we wanted to hear from Michael Massie, and he'll be our case study to talk about new construction, which is pertinent.

And then we will open up for a panel discussion with both Eugene and Michael and also Maria Stamas from NRDC, Stephanie Wang from the California Housing Partnership Corporation and then Sarah Lerhaupt from the PUC.

So Eugene, do you want to get us started by giving a brief intro to the CLIMB report?

MR. LEE: Thank you very much, Bryan.

2.2

I thought about how to introduce this topic of yet another action plan, and so I creatively thought that how about explaining what it is in reverse and so if you actually were to read the title, it's actually a plan to act on buildings occupied by low-income multifamilies and provide clean energy opportunities. How's that.

So I think it's really important that we understand and we have this foundation as we use this term of "multifamily."

And I think of it in six buckets, essentially.

That number one, we're thinking of deed restricted

affordable housing, those properties that are occupied by

low-income households.

And secondly, those that are actually rented as market rate developments but they're still inhabited by low- and moderate-income households.

And then the third would be the market rate where the household income is actually to meet those rent levels.

I mentioned six buckets because in the multifamily sphere, there's actually the new construction and then there's the acquisition and rehab. So there's essentially four basic buckets. And this action plan addresses four of those six.

We know that in the multifamily sector those

renters, as stated in our equity indicators report, that at least 40 percent -- at least those in Southern California Edison region, 40 percent of low-income multifamily customers experience an energy burden in the summer.

2.2

We know in the Barriers Study that 40 percent of low income live in multifamily rental housing. And according to the U.S. Census, 57 percent of those multiple family buildings in California were actually built before 1979.

We know by real experience that state agencies are not necessarily all coordinated in their programs. The CLIMB Action Plan, the DNA is born out of the Barriers Study, as Rhetta had explained.

This is Recommendation 1(d), and I'm pleased to say that it was a long journey but well conceived. It was a -- the recommendation, as a reminder, was to develop a comprehensive plan focused on improving clean energy opportunities and increasing energy equity.

I'd like to pause on that word "equity," because I've heard this morning and we use it quite often. But depending on who you ask what equity means, it could mean very different things.

If you're a resident, you're seeking equal treatment under the law, you're seeking for equal opportunities. But if you're an owner, if you're an

investor, equity means the value or the investment.

2.3

It's my opinion that the CLIMB Action Plan actually embodies both of these themes, that they are not distinct, that there is value. There is a call for investment and yet we can also achieve social goals by using this common word "equity."

We heard from Tabetha and Rhetta about the need of collaboration in Panel 1, and I would like to think of collaboration as a line, not a dot. This action plan was created because of the continued sense of collaboration spearheaded by the SB 350 interagency task force.

And the content in the action plan was developed though one-on-one meetings with partner agencies, many of them that are in this room and are listening today. And I just want to give a shout-out and thank all of you and your staff and the time that you have spent to dedicate and strengthen the content of this action plan.

The CLIMB strategies include very -- multiple lead and supporting agencies. And so the responsibility is spread. It is not borne by one state department. And so as collaboration is aligned, continued collaboration is necessary to actually implement it. It does not stop with this final document at all.

And I would be reticent to say that if -- we didn't include local governments and these community-based

organizations as part of that collaboration to ensure its success.

I'm reminded by a quote by Mother Teresa who was overwhelmed in her burden and her calling and she had said "I can do things you cannot. You can do things I cannot. But together we can do great things."

And that is really in the DNA of this document.

It's a powerful statement. And this is how we're going to achieve and actually implement this action plan, through this collaboration.

There are strategies that are dedicated for local implementation that relate to multifamily data sharing, leveraging of local funds and actually understanding what are those local pathways through program administrators to outreach to owners and tenants.

Part of the DNA includes this clean energy. Embodied in this is the energy efficiency and demand response, renewable energy, energy storage and, yes, electric vehicle infrastructure, which I will speak to soon.

The purpose of the CLIMB is to be adept and be forward thinking and improving and recalibrating this program delivery, as we look at multifamily programs identified in the plan and as we go forward in seeking long-term solutions.

A common comment that I receive about the CLIMB

Action Plan is this: "It's so comprehensive. It's so big.

Where do I begin? It's almost that paralysis by analysis because the document is so robust." It's much like a buffet. And "Where do I begin?"

2.2

And so I would recommend that we pivot and think of it more like a bento box. And so creating compartments where -- there are five compartments here, and it speaks of expansion and coordination among existing programs.

And secondly, developing a cohesive understanding of the multifamily market.

Here at the CEC, we're looking at what are those knowledge gaps. And also as we're launching with great excitement AB 802, our benchmarking program, we're collecting data on multifamily buildings in 2019. How are we improving the existing and future program design?

Fourthly, are we identifying the additional resources, and how do the deployment opportunities need to be tweaked, modified, brought together?

And speaking in "and" statements, as we increase strategic outreach, fifthly, in that awareness and that access.

And so I would invite all of us, and as we take this document, as robust as I've described it and this five-point framework, is that it sets up an opportunity to

look at it as a menu and to leverage each person's expertise to what they are strong in and to select a menu that we have identified.

These five strategies are broken down into 49 sub-strategies. So, yes, it is a comprehensive document.

So when we met in May, we conducted a workshop here to invite this conversation about energy equity, and these were a couple of things that came up.

The importance of non-energy benefits, and the comment was made that -- I'm paraphrasing -- that benefits are benefits and that we do not need to necessarily bifurcate energy benefits with non-energy benefits. These are all benefits, and we need to think holistically.

There was continued support for the one-stop-shop concept and a need to extract and look at case studies of multifamily building programs that are succeeding and lift those elements that are working.

So in this final report, let me just say that we continued to collaborate and we received the public comments. So we got added car sharing to the document and EV infrastructure. We incorporated and recognized the non-energy benefits about carbon emission reduction as well as the comfort, health and safety.

We updated the time frames for the respective strategies, working with our other state departments,

recognizing that there's more work to go and implementation discussions to be had. And we have also updated the current activities in the appendix of the plan, to actually showcase those strategies and activities that are relevant to the current CLIMB strategies outlined in it.

I'm pleased to introduce Michael Massie and he's with Jamboree Housing who will example an award-winning multifamily development. It's an affordable development, and I think it really exemplifies how we are now including clean transportation together.

This development was assisted through a state program funded from the GGRF fund, through CARB, administered by the Strategic Growth Council and implemented by my former department, HCD.

And I was part of the original work to design this program. It was a very transformative program that realized that there is a need to integrate and cross lines between the transportation sector and the affordable housing sector.

And the CLIMB strategy is all about connections.

As we increase EV infrastructure -- and "infrastructure" is a good word in that we recognize that infrastructure is really the word that binds us as a society.

We exist in a society where we drink common

water, we enjoy clean energy together. And we live comfortably and we seek that all neighbors live comfortably in the summer and winter.

Michael.

2.2

MR. MASSIE: Thank you, Eugene.

Good morning, Commissioners. As Eugene said, my name is Michael Massie. I'm the Senior President of Finance for Jamboree Housing Corporation.

Jamboree is a 501(c)(3) nonprofit affordable housing developer with properties throughout the state of California. We have about 8500 units throughout the state. There are 17,000 Californians that make their homes in our properties. It's 50 developments in 30 communities throughout the state.

And on each of those, we've found them to be complex. We were thrilled to do this work. It's necessary work, it's vital work. It has to be part of our future.

What we've found is these are enormously complex projects. It's all the complexity of a typical real estate transaction with the added complexity of multiple layers of financing from both the public and private sectors.

So making those work is a difficult dance that is really what we at Jamboree consider our core competency.

Complexity is something I'm going to say a lot over the next several minutes as I walk through this project.

I'm going to throw out another couple phrases that you are going to hear again and again and again. One of those is because of that complexity, in order to work our way through that, we need to partner. We need to identify partners throughout the process and that's how all these developments get done.

Another term I'm going to use, and this is probably just me personally but "silver bullet." I look at housing -- this has been my life's work and this is something I'm extraordinarily passionate about. I'm going let you know there's some bias as we walk through this example. But I see housing as a silver bullet for a large number of issues that we deal with as a society.

And I'm going to spend a good deal of time talking about energy and sustainability as a significant part of that. But also know that housing addresses crime and economic development and education and healthcare and everything else that we do. It's an extraordinarily vital thing. So, again, forgive my bias as we kind of walk through this.

I like to have lots of visuals, particularly on this project. We're talking about a development very, very close to us. In fact, we don't need a whole lot of visual aids. If we had a window that would actually be a pretty good visual aid.

This is almost a literal stone's throw from where we are just across the river in West Sacramento. And with these deals, I like to talk about the origin stories and how they started. And on this development it's particularly pertinent because of that partnership.

2.2

This project is in the redevelopment agency of
West Sacramento. So we are immediately adjacent to Raley's
Field and just off right -- located directly on Tower
Bridge Gateway which is the entrance to West Sacramento.

And the work and forethought that the city of West Sacramento has put into redeveloping that area has been considerable and it's one of the reasons that we wanted to be a part of it.

The city had planned on doing an RFP on this development. They had had some issues with soils and such on some previous developments in the immediate vicinity.

We were proactive about it. We had a relationship with some folks at the city but we were proactive about it. We didn't have any rights to the property. We didn't have any negotiating agreements, but we went in and we did some work.

We did some studies and proved to the city that, hey, we're going to be a good partner on this. It's going to be a complex deal and Jamboree wants to be along with -- as part of this.

The city saw that and opted not to go through the RFP process. We think we probably would have won the RFP process anyway, but they opted not to because they wanted to move as quickly as possible on this really, really important development.

But it turns out that partnership was a key to the success. And as I sort of walk through this case study, this development itself is a perfect case study because it offers everything you want out of a case study.

There's a whole lot of things that we did really well that lead to why it was successful. There's a whole lot of things that we missed. We just didn't have an opportunity to do, and I'm going to talk about those as well. And, quite frankly, there's a number of things we got really lucky on, but we got lucky because of those partnerships.

I believe the very old saw, the more prepare the luckier I get. And that was absolutely the case on this development as we went through it.

So we can see -- again, just a quick overview of kind of where we are. And this is prior to our development and our site is right smack in the middle of that picture, like I said, immediately adjacent to the easily spotted baseball stadium.

But this is at the forefront of all of West

Sacramento's planning and has been a recipient of a lot of their efforts, especially from redevelopment which the -- even without the resources available, they're still trying to move towards developing that and they've been very, very successful at it.

2.2

But they certainly wanted -- they see this as an important vital part of the development of West Sacramento, wanted to include affordable housing as a significant part of that and saw that. And that's one of the reasons, again, why we wanted to part of it.

What we've developed -- if we can go to the next slide -- is the first phase and there is a second phase coming of 77 family affordable housing -- 77 affordable housing units, one, two and three bedrooms.

This is for large families. A hundred percent of the units are set aside for families that are low income, but again because this is on the Tower Bridge Gateway, the city really wanted retail to be a part of that, so we have developed retail on the ground floor. This is a showcase for the city. And, again, it's that relationship with the city all the way through that has gotten us to the success that we need to.

If we can go to the next slide.

I'm a numbers guy, so this is always my way into a deal. But this is essentially a \$30 million development,

29,348,799. This is a very typical standard capital structure for an affordable housing development. We get a significant chunk of our financing from our low-income housing tax credit equity. That's the 15 million 773.

We also have some conventional debt that we're to support by the operations of the property. The city, through the land donation and with a little bit of gap from some redevelopment funds that were left over, were able to put those into the deal so that got us very, very close. And that left us with a gap of about \$3 million.

And as we were going through this development, this is one of the places where we got lucky. And just as we had applied for low-income housing tax credits and were looking at a structure facing this gap -- which normally would have been filled by redevelopment funds but those had disappeared -- the AHSC program came into play and we were able to get into the first round of application.

And our project, because of the planning and because of the requirements from the city and some of our other funding sources, primarily the low-income housing tax credit, we were already prepared to be a very energy efficient building. We were already meeting a lot of the qualifications of AHSC.

But with the additional funding, we were able to get all the way there and take additional sustainable

measures which improved the sustainability of the project itself.

2.2

And I think that's something I really want to touch on is that energy efficiency of building a sustainable product -- multifamily development absorbs a tremendous number of resources, both from a financial standpoint and from a material standpoint. It takes a lot of energy to build one of these deals. It takes a lot of energy to produce the materials to build these deals. It has to last a long time.

And by building something sustainable that does last for a long time. That in and of itself is an energy efficient measure and a sustainable measure.

So we were able to apply for the AHSC program and were awarded \$2.6 million. Jamboree decided to fill in the rest of the gap by deferring about \$600,000 of our developer fee. But that's how the capital structure came together.

So as part of the AHSC award, and again we applied as a partner with the City of West Sacramento, the housing development portion was \$2.6 million, the city was also awarded \$4.1 million in transportation-related infrastructure, which -- again the city, by being prepared, by doing the work in advance, was ready to step in and had plans available to provide that infrastructure, had been

1 looking for funding for it anyway.

2.2

And so it timed out very, very nicely and that's part of the lucky part that we got to.

In terms of the sustainability measures within the building itself, there's a long list that I have and we can talk about all the little small ones if you'd like and we can get into nontoxic insect pest control and have a long conversation about that.

But you might notice on my slide, I very subtly drew your attention to just one of the sustainable measures.

Affordable housing with access to transportation. A transit-oriented development that contains affordable housing is a gigantic sustainable measure. Just by building the building itself, without any of the measures, it's a tremendous step in energy efficiency.

By having 77 families located near jobs, near schools, near grocery stores, near libraries, near healthcare, we are reducing by a significant measure the greenhouse gases that would be produced by those folks having to live in areas where it might be more affordable. It's one of the reasons I'm a big believer in affordable housing. Every affordable housing development that we can build, we are able to achieve goals.

So when you look at that \$29 million capital

stack, the \$2.6 million is not that much of it, but we look at that as our last-mile financing.

On any deal that we do -- we look at that \$30 million on every deal and we know we can get 15 million from tax credits and we know we can get a couple million by the building supporting itself and we can probably get a couple million from the city on every deal.

And there's always that gap, and that's what we spend our time doing. That's our secret sauce. That's the work that we do is finding that gap.

And by AHSC coming in and making that -- bridging that gap and making this deal feasible and realistic, we were able to -- it made the deal happen. The deal literally would not have happened without that.

So we're able to --

2.2

16 COMMISSIONER RECHTSCHAFFEN: I'm sorry to
17 interrupt --

MR. MASSIE: No, no, please. I'm a better conversationalist than I am a speaker.

COMMISSIONER RECHTSCHAFFEN: Is this literally the representation? Because you have to quantify the GHG benefits from the project. Does this literally represent the share as compared to the other sustainability elements or are you just drawing our attention --

MR. MASSIE: No, I was just drawing -- but --

COMMISSIONER RECHTSCHAFFEN: Is it a significant share. Could -- without having to --

2.2

MR. MASSIE: It is. And I apologize. I actually have the application over in my bag over there, but I don't know the numbers off the top of my head. But, yes, it is a significant share of it. Yes.

But there were also other benefits.

So on the next slide, the \$4.1 million that went to the city for their transportation-related infrastructure was also a very vital and important part of what we were able to achieve here as well.

Again, the city had lots of plans on this already, so you can see a large portion of that and their restrictions on where we can spend this money, but the vast majority of it on hard construction costs but also the engineering that goes along with it and some of the wayfindings and signs. And you'll see the results of that in just a second.

But on the next slide, you can see, the city had already planned this as a major transportation corridor, currently for buses but also the streetcar. I apologize, the current status of the streetcar is a little outside of my expertise, so I'm not going to speak to it, but it was certainly part of the planning as we were developing this.

You can see this is prior to our construction.

This is a major thoroughfare, and this is going to be a developed area. There's going to be increased density, there's going to be increased development through here.

It isn't there yet, but the transportation is there and we wanted to make sure to accommodate that and include it, both from the bus standpoint and the streetcar standpoint and from bicyclists and pedestrians as well.

So on the next slide, you get a little bit of idea of what the finished product looks like. We were able to extend some of the bike paths so a lot of infrastructure in terms of creating the stop itself, a wayfinding, the enhanced medians. A tremendous increase in accessibility, both from an ADA standpoint and in pedestrian standpoint, access to the stop with a mid-block crosswalk. Additional signaling and signs.

Just a tremendous amount of work and really made a difference and an impact.

As a bonus -- and this is something, again, where I think we got lucky -- as the city was presenting their plans and saying, okay, we have these things, we're going to implement them, there's going to be some -- we're going to be tearing up some of the streets, we're going to be doing some work out there, it timed out nicely as they identified some sewer work that needed to be done and storm water work that needed to be done throughout the city.

So they were able to create some efficiencies and tap into Community Investment Fund investments in order to get some of that work done at the same time that they're doing it so that we don't make this investment now and then five years later have to tear it up to make that improvement.

2.2

So, again, it's that involvement with the city, that partnership with the city, the foresight of the city and -- for them to take the leveraging opportunity that was presented by this investment and pair it with other investments to make it a successful venture above and beyond just the \$4.1 million.

So we did a lot of things very well. I think the idea of just building affordable housing and partnering with the city a visionary development and leveraging that with other programs.

I think that given just the timing of this development and because we were in a crisis without -- with the elimination of the redevelopment agencies, we were scrambling and looking for anything that we could find. We happened to be a very good position to take advantage of AHSC when it came out and so that worked out well, but we had to move very, very quickly.

So we didn't have an opportunity really to search out other partnerships with utilities to make electric

vehicle accommodations, which is something that I wish we had done. But given the timing and where we had to go and how quickly we had to move, that was one of our issues.

And that's always an issue that we have because these developments are enormously complex and take a long time. Once they start rolling -- and our funding sources come with very severe penalties in terms of not being able to perform. So sometimes we just have to go, and we don't have time to foster those relationships.

But earlier involvement, as we've seen with later AHSC deals, allows us an opportunity to really explore those partnerships and really leverage them as much as possible.

The other ongoing piece is, because affordable housing developments by definition have several component parts to them from a capital structure, there's always multiple layers of financing, making them work together is always a challenge.

And making AHSC work with four percent tax credits and nine percent tax credits and taxes and bonds and other HCD developments and with what we hope is a new flood of money and opportunity coming from the ballot measures that are upcoming, there are going to be challenges with integrating those with other programs as well. That's always a problem.

The constant problem, the top line problem for us is always money and we're -- because these are enormously complex deals and getting more expensive every day, every month. As construction costs increase and land becomes even more scarce and difficult to find, they are just more and more expensive by an order of magnitude. And with diminishing resources, making those work, that's always a constant challenge.

2.2

There's also the idea that some of these programs
-- and you're starting to see this I think a little bit
with AHSC -- is it has been an enormously successful
project -- or program. And like with the low-income
housing tax credit, success attracts a lot of attention and
attracts a lot of people that want to hang additional
requirements on the program as well.

So that's I think a danger on a going-forward basis. It's a little bit of a victim of a successful program.

And lastly we are -- as I don't think I have to tell anybody in this room, anybody in this city, anybody in this state, we are in the midst of a very severe housing crisis. And we are pleased to see the legislature and the voters of California responding to that, and that's great.

However, because what sometimes happen in a crisis is, okay, let's build as much housing as quickly as

we possibly can, some of the other things get left on the side of the road. And I think I -- I have some concerns that as we do that, sustainability might be one of those things that we're going to have to keep an eye on. That as we respond to this crisis, as we build as much housing as we possibly can as quickly as we can, we don't forget that the long-term sustainability measures that are required for a successful housing plan.

So, again, I appreciate all of your time. And as I said, I'm a better conversationalist than I am a speaker. So I look forward to your questions in the Q and A period.

MR. EARLY: Thank you very much, Michael. That's a really exciting project.

So I think now we're going to turn to a panel discussion and encourage everyone here to respond to a series of open-ended questions.

And apologies in advance for -- this is an openended and complicated issue, but I thought we might start off -- so Eugene referenced that this is a market with many, many segments.

And so maybe we could discuss a little bit more in-depth what some of those segments are and then what specific strategies are unique to particular segments and what are some common threads in terms of achieving increased DERs in multifamily buildings.

MS. STAMAS: I can take that one. Thanks, Bryan.

This is Maria Stamas. I'm director of Energy

Affordability with the Natural Resources Defense Council.

2.2

And I also work primarily on an energy efficiency for all coalition effort within California, which is a multi-organizational effort with affordable housing, environmental stakeholders, public health stakeholders, including California Housing Partnership that's here. And we collectively advance healthy and affordable energy solutions for this sector, the low-income multifamily sector.

So we've learned a lot in the last five years that we've been really focused on this. And one of the things that we learned in the very beginning was that while multifamily sector may seem niche, there's many subsectors within it.

Eugene described some of the buckets. You know, there is the affordable housing that Michael's development is part of that has deed restrictions often so that rent is maintained over a set period of time in the long term.

And then there's also this category of housing that's often termed as naturally affordable. But it's really market rate housing that often has a lot of deferred maintenance. And a lot of low-income families may live there, but there are no rent protections on that housing.

And that's actually about 80 percent of the low-income multifamily housing that's out there, and it's often the most neglected housing. But as we look at solutions and the prospects of investing a lot more energy efficiency dollars into that housing, we also have to be mindful about displacement and gentrification that could result from that.

So there's definitely solutions out there, but that's a particular market segment that needs attention but also needs more intersectional policy solutions that go with it.

And then even within those two main categories of low-income housing, there's farmworker housing in the Central Valley that also has certain nuances that need to be taken into account.

So just the importance of looking at tailoring the solutions for the particular market segment and not leaving any of the segments out I think is really important.

Bryan had also asked if I would speak a little bit just to the scale of what we are talking about and give a sense of the proportion among that. But why is multifamily housing important in the first place and low-income multifamily housing.

And, you know, there's a recent report that came

out in California that said that 40 percent of our entire
population right now lives at or near the poverty line.

And nearly half of folks who are at the poverty line live
in multifamily housing. So that's about 2.25 million

5 households.

2.2

That's a lot. That's about 7 million people. So this is not like a small issue. This is actually a lot of us here in California. And if we want to talk about actually addressing both the need for deferred maintenance, public health issues it's going to take a lot of investment. And that's something on the order of about 3,000 to 4,000 per unit minimum to do a comprehensive retrofit that addresses -- you know, deeply saves energy in the course of 50 percent.

And that's also addressing deferred maintenance, public health issues at the same time. If you do a simple back-of-the-envelope calculation, that's 8- to \$9 billion so that's a huge thorny problem.

So when we talk about split incentive is challenging, where are we going to find that 8- to \$9 billion investment? It's going to require widening the scope of our lens so that we are both looking at energy efficiency budgets that utilities have but we're also looking at public health funds.

Affordable housing is often viewed as a

prescription for public health issues that residents are facing. We're looking at we want a flexible grid, but of most of the rental housing doesn't has even have -- has manual thermostats so smart grid thermostats aren't going to really work for this sector.

2.2

We need to do a much larger investment, and there's value there that goes beyond just energy efficiency but gets into demand response and supporting our grid.

So I could go on and on, but I'll stop there, that there's tailored solutions and that this is a big problem that requires an intersectional approach.

MR. EARLY: Well, maybe we could focus a little bit more -- obviously, that's a huge dollar sign need.

Maybe we can talk about what the existing streams of funds are and where the gaps are, and not just in the scale of the amount of money that's needed but the strings that come attached and how we can take some of the strings away.

MS. WANG: Sure. I'm Steph Wang with the California Housing Partnership, and as Maria mentioned, we work together on energy efficiency for all on other coalitions.

As a background, the California Housing

Partnership has been working with nonprofit affordable
housing providers and housing authorities for 30 years,
providing expertise on financing affordable housing,

specific deed restricted. So, you know, really stacking those really complex financial opportunities together and stream.

2.2

And I wanted to make sure before I delved into the details of gaps in financing that I went a little bit bigger picture first. It's helpful that I just came from the California Adaptation Forum. Actually it was really cool because yesterday I was part of their new trend where they now have a track that's equity focused in adaptation.

And so I was on a panel with these really great speakers talking about the intersection of housing equity and climate resilience. And it really got me thinking about how our efforts to address the climate crisis really, really have to go hand in hand with the housing crisis.

In fact, the reason why there was the SB 350
Barriers Report and why there was so much community support
for all of this work has been because energy -- because
it's about energy burdens. And if you come down to what
energy burdens are about for low-income and disadvantaged
communities, a lot of it is really linked to housing
burdens, right?

And that's where my organization is interested in this work, because our focus is on getting access to resources for low-income California renters and supporting the affordable housing to reduce those housing and energy

burdens.

When we think of it in that context, then you start thinking about the solutions a little bit differently.

I liked how Eugene started the conversation with let's read the report description backwards, right?

Thinking about who it's for, what the goals are, that we are ultimately trying to serve the underserved, and what do they care about, right? What do -- our community members really are concerned about their housing costs, their energy costs and how it fits together.

So when we -- and this starts touching into what Michael was concerned about. If we come up with solutions that are mostly about getting energy efficiency and clean energy into buildings, then we don't think about could we be unintentionally reducing access to affordable housing, right, by making it harder to build affordable housing instead of thinking of ways that we can uplift climate healthy housing and support more affordable housing at the same time.

So that was one of the things about the Affordable Housing Sustainable Communities Program that is so important to us. My organization does a lot of partnerships for supporting that program with the Sustainable Communities for All and the -- sorry,

134

```
1
    California Coalition for Energy -- I'm sorry. I'm having
 2
    one of those moments. I'm getting all of my acronyms mixed
 3
    up.
 4
              I'm going to slow down a little. Too much
    coffee.
5
              So -- and I wanted to note that we have an
 6
7
    upcoming report coming out with more data about the
 8
    benefits of the AHSC program, including a preview of some
9
    numbers.
10
              So far the program has invested in 77
    developments across the state, investing more than 707
11
12
    million statewide. And the awarded developments will reduce
13
    more than 1.8 million metric tons of carbon over the course
    of their operating lives, removing approximately 11,631
14
15
    cars from the road.
16
              And, you know, that's just the tip of the
17
              So I will be sharing that with the list as soon
18
    as we have our Round 3 analysis report done.
19
              But also I wanted to get more into more of the
20
    programs that directly touch our agencies.
21
              So we are -- something that we've been thinking
2.2
    about a lot about as a bunch of nonprofit organizations
23
    that I'm working with, we are part of the Solar and
24
    Multifamily Affordable Housing Program team.
```

We're helping -- it is really an amazing

25

opportunity where the CPUC's program is going to be administered and delivered and the outreach done by not just the usual folks but a lot of us who have deep ties to affordable housing, to the disadvantaged communities that we work in. And we're all going to be working together to try to make this program really benefit low-income renters and partnering with coalitions like Energy for All to try to make sure that we get the details right in the program design.

2.2

But while we're super-excited by this opportunity, we also recognize that it's just for existing affordable housing, and so there remain gaps.

One is, as I was starting to talk about, the need to make sure we don't create barriers to access to more affordable housing. We really appreciated the CLIMB Action Plan called out that we need to retain access and continue programs that provide distributed energy resources for new construction as well and not just existing properties.

This is something -- the new solar homes

partnership is sunsetting of course and at the same time,

the Energy Commission of course has approved -- or are

moving forward with the code requirements for all new

housing to have solar.

And while we were really appreciative of the flexibility in the requirements, that we can use different

types of distributed energy resources to meet these requirements, we also recognize that adding new requirements while sunsetting existing incentive programs is going to make this tougher because we really do have to worry about the last mile in getting these housing projects built. So we really wanted to highlight that gap.

Another one is that we need to make sure that community solar can work for new affordable housing.

That's part one of the flexible options for compliance with the new solar code requirements.

And while we think that's terrific on paper, we're really excited about it in theory but we need demonstration projects, we need funding and cooperation with the great staff members here at the Commission we've been working with, to make sure that we can show that it is a usable option.

And then as for electric vehicles infrastructure, I really appreciate all the resources that are coming out to support this very important work. But we want to make sure that demonstration projects don't only focus on the technology and the outreach but also on demonstrating business models that actually work for affordable housing, because that is a really major gap right now.

I get approached regularly by folks in the electric vehicle business and by agency folks saying, "Hey,

do you guys want to do outreach? Do you want to be part of these programs to sign up multifamily affordable housing owners?"

And we say: Well, we actually had a webinar with a focus group of them and the feedback we got was: This is a really interesting concept and there's interest in car sharing with electric vehicles and other things. But in terms of who is going to pay for the electricity, how is that all going to work, it's very complicated and we don't have the resources to figure this out.

So I think there's a real opportunity there.

12 Thank you.

MR. EARLY: Thank you, Stephanie.

Sarah, do you want to give your perspective from staff at PUC in terms of what lessons we've learned from past successes and lessons learned in implementing these programs, sort of wrapping up the things that have been said?

MS. LERHAUPT: Thank you for that question, Bryan.

First, I just want to commend the California

Energy Commission for the CLIMB action report. You made it really possible for all of us at individual agencies to really contribute effectively to that.

I know that it probably wasn't always easy. So

thank you so much for creating this document with areas of collaboration that we are really excited to get our arms around and move forward.

Now, to get to Bryan's question, the CPUC directs the investor-owned utilities to offer income-qualified energy efficiency programs for multifamily buildings.

And thanks in part to input from the public and the utilities, we have made some incremental changes to start addressing some of the challenges in offering low-income multifamily energy efficiency programs.

To date we have extended our single point of contact to low-income programs so multifamily building owners have an easy way to access many different types of programs that the PAs offer from both the energy efficiency side, DR, demand response, and electric vehicles.

We also have expanded affordable financing for multifamily building owners.

Sorry, I'm a little nervous. I'm going to take some water. This is my first time speaking to so many commissioners at once.

Back to the exciting world of finance.

COMMISSIONER RECHTSCHAFFEN: So many mean commissioners at the Energy Commission.

MS. LERHAUPT: Yeah.

2.2

COMMISSIONER RECHTSCHAFFEN: It's very difficult

to speak unlike the PUC who are all so nice.

2.2

MS. LERHAUPT: So we've expanded affordable multifamily finance options, like our on-bill finance program is now available all multifamily building owners.

Also, for our energy savings assistance program, we have directed IOUs for the first time to offer measures for common area so that way equipment in the building, like large central water heaters for the first time, can receive assistance through this direct install program.

We also are beginning to explore co-funding. So the ESA program, Energy Savings Assistance Program, is working with LIWP, the Low-Income Weatherization Program, to combine our efforts so that way we can maximize health and achieve higher energy efficiency for participants.

And last but not least, we are also thinking about how we can design programs that benefit both tenants and owners like our virtual net energy metering which allows removal energy credits to be split between both tenants and owners.

And on the other side of the house for our market rate programs, our regional energy networks have done a good job in working with local governments to help expand participation for multifamily building owners as well as our preference towards hard-to-reach and disadvantaged communities.

And thinking about how we can use this information going forward in making the CLIMB Action Plan a reality, our program administrators have a deep understanding of the multifamily market, and a lot of that information has been shared publicly.

2.2

We have our multifamily sectors and indicator metrics which are coming out soon, our low-income program monthly and annual reports, and our periodic low-income needs assessment, to name a few.

And as stated in the CLIMB Action Report it's going to be really integral to all of our agencies' success to be sharing that information and to becoming increasingly aligned so that way we can help support both our agency's individual goals and we can really leverage all of our program offerings.

So information is critical to understanding the energy efficiency potential in the multifamily sector and for designing custom programs. I know you've already heard that from many people today, but we cannot take action without information. And one of the great roles that we can provide as a government agency is supplying actionable information.

So we are very excited about the CLIMB Action

Report because although, while individually the CPUC cannot overcome all of the challenges inherent in low-income

multifamily building, like financing, metering, ownership structures, we know that working together our paths forward increase.

So I just want to echo what Eugene said before, and we are optimistic that the CLIMB Action Plan has highlighted some areas for partnership and collaboration that are really going to make a better future possible for low-income multifamily building residents in California.

MR. EARLY: Thank you, Sarah.

At this point, I think we can open up for questions from the dais.

COMMISSIONER RECHTSCHAFFEN: Stephanie, did you have any specifics in mind when you said that one thing we should focus on is demonstration projects for specific different business models -- in the EV infrastructure that work for affordable housing? We should be looking at testing different business models.

Do you have any specifics?

MS. WANG: I was thinking more in terms of a lot of times without that business models in mind, some of the Energy Commission or other pilot opportunities may read as technology demonstrations or may read in terms of not giving more points or recognizing the higher value of something that's really focused on new business models, and not just business models for the EV companies or other

charging providers but specifically to unlock the opportunity in low-income multifamily properties.

2.2

COMMISSIONER GUZMAN-ACEVES: I have another one for you, Stephanie.

You mentioned the phasing away from kind of the new developments' dependence on new solar home for building the solar component, financing that. And we are very excited about some of community solar offerings, both the in-community community solar offerings but also the not-directly-in-the-same-community Green Tariff shared renewable for disadvantaged communities.

And I wonder, is there a need for any sort of greater dialogue or technical assistance or -- you know, we obviously continue to improve those programs that are just really being developed and implemented by the utilities. They haven't started the RFP process yet for those projects.

It is a different model than on the actual site. It's a shared model and there's other values for doing it that way, particularly cost effective for the rate payer base as a whole. So I just wonder what is needed to kind of foster success by utilizing those newer options?

MS. WANG: I really appreciate that question. I think that some of what was recommended in the CLIMB Action Plan focuses a lot on interagency coordination.

And one piece that's been really unclear to those of us who have been watching it from a code compliance perspective is whether participation in some of those green tariffs would be considered compliance and what it would take to get participation in terms of -- whether it be the common area only or whether we would have to guarantee that all the tenants would sign up ahead of the new development, right?

And so we don't -- I think we actually -- so, therefore, to get an affordable housing provider to be able to feel comfortable that this is going to work, we're going to need funding and a dedicated demonstration project or use of an existing one. Like the CSD low-income weatherization program has a community solar pilot coming up, and we would also highly support use of that or use of another separate demonstration or both to demonstrate different ways that different types of community solar are unique.

I was planning to follow up with Eugene and other staff about how to do this but would love to keep that dialog going.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Indiscernible.)

CHAIR WEISENMILLER: But without a lead

24 | commissioner on this, right?

2.2

COMMISSIONER SCOTT: So I had a question for you

all.

2.2

I mean, I think both this panel and the last previous panel and also the two that we will have this afternoon, one of the things we've got up here on the screen or that folks can see on the WebEx and around the room are -- we spent time doing a study to really try to understand what the barriers are for low-income communities being involved in energy efficiency, renewable energy, the clean transportation revolution.

And then we came up with these recommendations, right? We have some recommended solutions and we're highlighting some of the agency actions that we've taken since then to make progress and also these case studies, which are showing highlights and demonstrations in the real world.

This is how this actuates itself in the real world. So examples of how we put the solutions and recommendations in place.

And so, Michael, my question is for you. You mentioned how complex all of this is and that the affordable housing project that you highlighted for us, the West Gateway, really hinged on having the AHSC funding come in place.

And I'm wondering if you have ideas about are there ways that we could make some of this more simple and

a little bit less complex, or does it just inherently have this complexity built into it?

2.2

And then I'm wondering if you might have tips or lessons learned -- and you highlighted some of those as you talked -- but for other developers so that we can kind of take this and push it out as solutions that others can grab on to?

MR. MASSIE: Sure, Commissioner. And thanks for the question.

Let me sort of take the last part first if I could but it's going to sound very familiar. And it's a lot of partnerships. And whether we're talking about a new construction tax credit typical affordable housing development or an acquisition rehab or a NOAH, naturally occurring affordable housing, in all of those cases, every case there is an opportunity to reach out and partner and to be as proactive as possible.

And because -- as Eugene mentioned and as is underlined in the report, it takes collaboration, it takes partnership. That's as much an end -- as a developer we try to think that we're masters of the entire process, but we're not. And we need lots of help in order to understand all the technicalities, and because each program is going to have its own peculiarities, it is just a matter of maintaining those partnerships.

And doing it on a one-off basis isn't helpful. It has to be done -- that's why as Jamboree, we like doing five projects in one city as opposed to just one, because then we have a relationship with the utility providers, we have relationships with the cities and the counties and the agencies as well.

But it really takes that ongoing proactive management of the partnership.

2.2

In terms of lessons learned, the other part is -- and what can be done to make it simpler is an awareness of the designers of the program of the other programs that are out there.

My favorite thing in the entire world to talk about is the low-income housing tax credit. And a couple times a month I'll get together with any kind of group and talk about the low-income housing tax credit. It is a really fascinating subject, I assure you.

But anybody that is working in the affordable housing anywhere in the affordable housing world has to have an understanding, at least basic understanding of the low-income housing tax credit and the requirements of that program. It's a driver of 95-plus percent of affordable housing that's developed in this country.

So having an understanding of that and what the pressures are of at least that one program as well as maybe

some -- maybe not all the other ancillary programs.

And, by the way, fingers crossed, there's a lot more coming with the ballot measures in November. But there are going to be ongoing programs.

Like I said, anybody touching the industry having some familiarity with those programs and processes would be helpful.

CHAIR WEISENMILLER: How did the Trump tax reform affect the availability of affordable --

MR. MASSIE: I'm glad you asked that because I actually -- I like the way -- the nomenclature as well. I actually share an alma mater with the president and a profession. I actually am a Wharton educated real estate developer.

But, yeah, there was damage because the low-income housing tax credit is -- without getting into far into it, is based on the tax rate. The value of them is based on the tax rate. There was there was a diminishment in pricing.

We think that now it's not as bad as we thought it was going to be, because the industry now is mature enough that we can kind of absorb it, and there's a flight to quality. And a strong developer in a strong market with strong funding is going to have pretty good pricing, not as good as it would have been two years ago.

COMMISSIONER GUZMAN-ACEVES: This is maybe a follow-up for you, Mike, and also for Maria.

You mentioned, Maria, that I think 80 percent of this affordable housing stock is not deed restricted; is that right?

So I guess my question -- and really based on Katie's comment in the last panel about the need to have policies in place like gentrification, displacement policies and inclusionary policies.

It seems that certainly we want to continue investing in deed restricted affordable housing. But a bigger area we need to concurrently operate under is what are we doing in terms of our overarching local government policies around inclusionary housing, et cetera.

And what is our responsibility as, you know, the guiders of the environmental stewardship around local planning, be it VMT reduction or energy efficiency upgrades, to ensure those policies are in place? And if there are one or two, which should we be very cognizant of perpetuating or requiring?

MS. STAMAS: Thanks for that question. I think one of the -- one thing you can do that's fully in the Energy Commission's control and the Public Utilities

Commission's control is when you're authorizing energy efficiency programs that invest in that market rate housing

that the -- that there's a contract that comes with the application that requires that rents not increase as a result of the funding and then to work to partner with other agencies to ensure that that contract is enforced.

2.2

So there's lots of models that use that, that have varying degrees of enforcement but New York NYSERDA has a program. Massachusetts has a multifamily program that has that contractual protection.

And then the Low-Income Weatherization Program, the multifamily version that's run through CSD's agency, they also have a contract in place that will need additional enforcement if we're actually going to ramp up investment, but that is a place to start.

COMMISSIONER SCOTT: So let me note we have one public comment. We said we'd do a little public comment after each of the panels. So unless we have any other burning questions from the dais.

Okay. I will turn then to the public comment, and that is from Jeanne Clinton.

MS. CLINTON: Hello. I'm Jeanne Clinton representing myself.

I read through the CLIMB plan yesterday and I just wanted to make a few observations about that.

First of all, it's pretty unheard for eight state agencies to collaborate on one plan document, so I think

that's amazing. And I don't know if the Governor's Office had to knock heads to have that happen or the agencies just saw the wisdom in collaboration.

But three observations about it.

One is it comes across as a "Okay. First, we're going to walk before we can jog, and maybe someday we'll get to run" kind of approach.

And I think what it gave up in the process was a vision, a sense of vision or outcome that's desired, what would a good outcome be. And I think that's going to be necessary for eight agencies to continue to walk together and learn to jog together as a team or something like that. So that's just -- vision I think would help for the outcome.

Related to that is eight agencies is a lot to maintain in some sort of collaboration format. And I would -- I think the plan is silent on perhaps the need for consolidation of one or two agencies to be viewed as lead. Some combination of energy and housing knowledge perhaps would be the right way to go.

And I really think this is going to be important as we transition next year to new leadership in the Governor's Office and different formats in the legislature and as commissioners' terms -- people get reappointed.

There's really going to need to be some sense of

what's the long-term leadership arrangement for making progress in this area.

2.2

2.3

So that's perhaps more of a political issue than it is a staff report issue. But I just think that's going to be desperately needed, if you know, half of our population is low income, or nearly, and half of that population is living in multifamily -- we're talking about a quarter of the state's population that needs some attention from a leadership perspective. And I would suggest some consolidation institutionally ought to be on the table at some point.

And in a totally different vein, we've got a long list -- I think Eugene said 47 or 49 action steps. And that's just the beginning of the walking stage.

And one thing that occurred to me as I read through the document is there's very little voice and perspective of owners and managers represented in this action plan.

It's heavily represented by government and NGO and advocates but not the people who are actually owning the property, making the investment decisions or figuring out what funding or financing mechanisms are acceptable or not.

So I just want to encourage in the next 49 steps to really prioritize the communication and dialogue with

1 the owner/manager community in terms of helping to figure 2 out if some of those steps are higher priority than others, or should be moved forward in the time frame. 3 4 I think getting that perspective is really 5 important. Thanks. 6 COMMISSIONER SCOTT: Thank you. 7 That's the only public comment that we had for 8 now, so if you will join me in thanking Panel 2. 9 Thank you so much for your time and expertise. 10 And we are going to break for lunch, and we will start back up promptly at 2:00. So please return just a 11 12 little bit before 2:00. 13 (Whereupon a luncheon recess was taken) 14 MS. RAITT: Hi, everybody. Welcome back to our 15 workshop on SB 350 equity issues. 16 So this panel -- we have two panels this 17 afternoon. And this one is moderated by Tyson Eckerle from 18 the Governor's Office of Business and Economic Development 19 to discuss financing. Thanks. 20 Go ahead. 21 MR. ECKERLE: Thank you very much, and welcome 22 back from lunch, everybody. 23 Just kind of connecting to this morning as we 24 were sitting there, there were a lot of great lessons this 25 morning that we heard, especially from the people who are

active in the community. And it kind of reminded me of a parable that came out of the Peace Corps, which is -- you know, the Peace Corps had gone into Africa and they were asking questions about from the past.

And they talked -- the Africans had talked about how the Europeans had come to this great river valley and looked down and saw a beautiful area where you could do agriculture -- and there's no agriculture to be spoken of. Oh, we're going to import this agriculture. It's going to be amazing and so they went about and did it. And they planted tomatoes and cucumbers, all sorts of stuff.

And the villagers even helped a little bit. And when it came time to harvest, a herd of rhinos three days before came through and trashed the whole thing.

The Europeans asked the villagers, "Hey, do they come every year? And the villagers said, "Of course they come every year." "Well, why didn't you tell us?" "You didn't ask."

And so when you think about it like this is -- a lot of the lessons learned that we're hearing today is kind of about asking those questions, getting into those communities and asking. So that really struck me.

So today for this panel, we're talking about financing and transformation. And it's really kind of at this level. It's not just about money, it's about

investment.

2.3

And investment means more than just money. It means building relationships and trust. It means human resources and insights from the people in the community and its organization, kind of building that organization. I think Matt put that together really well with the Ontario case study.

And so really we have a number of recommendations

I think that will be flashed up on the screen that we'll be talking about and a great panel that has a lot of different insights.

But I think the recipe for success is to build local buy-in and knowledge. There's got to be creative funding and financing, workforce training and buy-in and really trying to create a virtuous cycle out of this.

And so I wanted to connect to this -- there were some great questions that came from the dais and insights.

Really, as the panel, we're thinking this through, you know, through the lens of -- something

Commissioner Scott had brought up, really like how do we connect the concept from this morning, kind of the building the trust and equity into our state processes where I think we have a lot to learn in doing that.

And really -- and then what Commissioner

Rechtschaffen brought up, what structures do we have to

1 have in place to have this long-term capacity, because 2 really this is a long-term play and it takes a lot of 3 effort to go. And so with that, what I want to do, we'll go 4 through the panelists and they'll give a brief 5 introduction, a couple minutes kind of about their role in 6 this thing, and then we can do some questions. And we have 7 a great case study here by Jaime that will kind of wrap it 8 up. 9 So maybe we can go down in order. Larry, if you 10 want to start from the Energy Commission and kind of give your role. 11 12 MR. RILLERA: Thank you, Tyson. My name is Larry 13 I am staff with the California Energy Commission Rillera. 14 in our Fuels and Transportation Division. 15 I lead teams and various project initiatives 16 under our Alternative and Renewable Fuel and Vehicle 17 Technology Program, or ARFVTP. It's a \$100 million 18 program, up to \$100 million annually for various investment 19 areas such as ZEV infrastructure, zero-emission vehicle 20 infrastructure, ZEV technology demonstrations for medium-

The ARFVTP, in addition to aligning and implementing SB 350, also implements the recently announced Governor's Executive Order for ZEV infrastructure, the

and heavy-duty vehicles, advanced technology manufacturing

and workforce training and development.

21

2.2

23

24

25

elements of the ZEV Action Plan, and the California Sustainable Freight Action Plan.

Additionally, there are new partnerships, both on the technology side and the community side and the public side, meaning government at all levels, as well as the finance entities to help move these technologies through the lens of the state priorities such as impacted communities where everyone can accrue the benefits, not only of the technologies but the environmental and economic benefits as well.

So we thank you and are looking forward to the discussion.

MR. MAGAVERN: Hi. I'm Bill Magavern, Policy Director with the Coalition for Clean Air.

And two of our biggest priorities are channeling climate Investments into disadvantaged communities and also cleaning up the transportation sector. So what we're talking about here today really is where those come together.

And in climate investments, it actually was the Coalition for Clean Air about 10 years ago who went to Kevin DeLeon, then in the Assembly, with the idea that some of the revenues coming from California's climate programs should be directed to our most disadvantaged communities. And then Assemblymember DeLeon introduced that as a bill.

Years later when he was in the Senate, it was signed into law.

2.2

And since then -- that was 2012 -- we've been working with our partners in the California Climate Equity Coalition on the implementation of that law, which included supporting Assemblymember Jimmy Gomez's Bill AB 1550 two years ago that strengthened those requirements and also broadened them to some low-income communities that are not classified as disadvantaged.

And we also worked with Senator DeLeon in 2014 on the Charge Ahead California initiative with our partners in the Charge Ahead California campaign and that campaign and that law have twin goals to accelerate the deployment of electrified transportation in California and also to provide access to that clean transportation to those people in disadvantaged communities who have had the least access to it over the years.

And so we have worked with the Air Resources
Board on the equity pilot programs that were established
under Charge Ahead and been involved in the implementation
of those. And when we get into our discussion later, I
will provide some recommendations on this.

MS. SMITH: I'm Bailey Smith, and I'm with the California Air Resources Board. I'm staff and work on the California Climate Investments.

So the California Climate Investments uses the Cap-and-Trade auction proceeds or the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund, the GGRF, to fund clean transportation and clean energy projects as well as projects that support natural and working lands.

We have over \$8 billion that have been appropriated to date. And those programs are reducing greenhouse gases, but they're doing so in a way that really maximizes co-benefits, particularly for vulnerable populations. And those benefits to disadvantaged communities and low-income communities and low-income households is a really fundamental piece of the program and also a statutory requirement.

Projects mentioned today in the case studies are a lot of California Climate Investments from the transportation -- the Transformative Climate Communities Program. We heard from the weatherization program for multifamily. Our projects are reducing energy costs, improving air quality, increasing access to transit.

The program began in 2014 and has evolved a bit over time. And that evolution is really a reflection of our partnerships with environmental justice and community advocates, as well as direction from the legislature.

We recently updated the CARB funding guidelines that applies to all of the programs that are funded through

Cap-and-Trade auction proceeds. And those updates really incorporate some of the feedback we heard about what's important for these investments and that's ensuring community benefits, providing technical assistance and enhancing those employment benefits.

2.2

So over 20 different state agencies implement
California Climate Investments, and each of those agencies
conduct outreach and engage with communities directly on
their respective programs.

Agencies are increasingly providing direct technical assistance for applicants and also supporting broader capacity building within those communities.

Also, agencies are really encouraged to include targeted workforce development strategies as well as supporting job-training programs as part of implementation of those programs.

CCI, the California Climate Investments, also funds standalone programs that are dedicated to workforce development. And that workforce development piece is really addressing a critical need that has been identified by communities across the state to ensure that our workforce can transition to clean transportation and a clean energy economy.

Overall I would say that the Climate Investments employ many of the lessons learned from SB 350 by

addressing community needs, working to reduce those barriers for low-income residents and disadvantaged communities and also by directly funding those critical programs for clean transportation and clean energy solutions.

2.2

So the program has really grown significantly over the past few years and we've seen a lot of progress. We still have a lot of work to do and room to grow to further improve access and outcomes for the program.

MS. WHITE: That's a lot. Hi, I'm Sarah White.

I'm the deputy director for Equity Climate and Jobs at the
California Workforce Development Board.

And, wow, I can say a lot. Let me just say that the reason I'm here today is, we are in charge of implementing or herding cats to implement the various recommendations in the low-income barriers studies from CARB and CEC as far as they intersect with jobs and training.

And we are doing this also as part of -- we were charged also in AB 398 to really come up with a sort of bold jobs and training plan that could match the bold climate goals in the State of California and actually marry those two things.

So instead of doing this ad hoc, that we will actually finally have a single plan that says: Here,

across agencies and across investments, are the standards and the principles by which we will invest in jobs and training, and here are some of the ways that labor markets work around that.

2.2

So as a part of developing that report, we have just finished a couple months of stakeholder consultation meetings with different sectors and different agencies and folks from around the state.

So to talk today just a little bit about what we're finding and what we know and what we've heard.

I think that the first thing I just want to say is that co-benefits don't just happen, right? I think that these panels have all made that clear. I wasn't able to hear it this morning, but I'm sure that you heard many of the same things.

But you have to design them intentionally if you want to get equity.

And so another thing to think about actually is that not -- and I was thinking about this because we have a great example today, a great case study, which I'm really excited about.

But not all GGRF investments, not all CCI investments, right, are going to be jobs drivers. Some of them will be big jobs drivers. Others do good things in and of themselves around equity, but you can't expect every

investment to do a heavy lift on jobs and training.

2.2

So I just want to make sure that one of the things we need to do is look at all the programs, see where the jobs are and then invest accordingly -- in training accordingly. So we can't just automatically assume that we're going to tie jobs and training to all the investments, but see where they make the most sense.

I think that we know that in renewable energy and energy efficiency and transit, there are going to be great jobs for a lot of people, right? And they are going to be in manufacturing, in construction, in operations.

I know Larry might talk a little bit about the Sustainable Freight Action Plan, which if we're going to build a sustainable freight future, then we need an entire workforce that can design build and run it.

And we do know what those jobs and how to invest in them. So our goal is to, first of all, start with the jobs. What are those jobs and can we deliver job quality? And then the next piece is the training piece which we add to that, which is to provide access through training to those good jobs. So two sort of separate activities that need to be linked.

In the 350 recommendations, there are these very generic large-scale recommendations that are up on the screen. But there were a number of very specific

recommendations around that we are sort of shepherding through. And they really call for two things, more and better jobs around transportation and clean energy and more and better access to those jobs for disadvantaged communities.

And so we have a lot of insight and expertise on how to do that. And just the things I will say that are -- first of all, on the job quality, our take on equity is that the fundamental premise that you cannot deliver equity without paying attention to job quality, because connecting disadvantaged communities to dead-end jobs with low pay and no career future is not an equity outcome.

So we look at jobs -- and the way we get to job quality -- and this is really where we find the great and increasing role of climate and energy agencies -- is in fact to attach labor standards and to use of a lot of sort of best value contracting and not things that are owners but things that make sure that where the dollars are invested in communities, they are going to create jobs and we want to make sure that those are good jobs.

So that's one way to do that. And that's one way that we are providing technical assistance to agencies across these efforts.

I think the second piece of that is more and better access to jobs, and this is a supply side strategy.

This is training. We think that -- you know, we have a lot of principles for best practice and training for the clean economy, the first one of which, as I mentioned, is starting with the jobs rather than starting with training.

And I think that our goal on this is for climate and energy agencies to really invest in partnerships that are already on the ground working, not to develop brand-new partnerships, to let folks who are experts in the workforce and jobs do that work, and to really think about the ways that those pipeline programs are connected to real jobs in the community so we are connecting people to careers and not just a short-term job connection.

So there's a lot more to say about this, but I want to just reiterate that we are excited to be a part of this, and that we think in achieving the equity goals of SB 350 we really need to think about investing in disadvantaged communities in ways that create quality jobs and building workforce systems in those same communities that connect folks to quality jobs and doing both of those at the same time. You can't do one without the other. And it's a tricky thing.

So lots of advice on how to do that, but I'll stop with that.

MR. ECKERLE: Thank you all.

And, Sarah, actually I was going to ask for a

little bit of advice on how to do that because I know you have given a lot of thought into it's one thing to say we need to have clean transportation jobs; it's another to actually connect the training to that.

So maybe you could say a little bit about what that actually looks like, how we implement it.

MS. WHITE: Sure.

MR. ECKERLE: In 30 seconds --

MS. WHITE: Thirty seconds. No, that is a great question. And I think one of the ways we do this are through -- we have a number of demonstration projects at the board, the hire of training partnerships are one of them.

I think there's a lot of work and there's a lot of very visible work on pre-apprenticeship programs, connected to apprenticeship programs. Our work on Prop 39 is a great example of that. The work that's being invested through the Transformative Climate Communities. We worked very hard with SGC on those guidelines to make sure that some of this was built into there.

I think one of the simplest and best ways that we've been working with folks is to use community workforce agreements, which is a way that if you're going to invest in building green infrastructure -- which is often what these look like -- there's a way in which you help

166

1 decide -- I'm echoing. 2 Can you hear? Okay. Sorry. Usually I'm 3 bellowing. 4 Well, so then -- I said really smart things and 5 you can just --6 We think that one main tool is a community 7 workforce agreement, which is a way that when you invest money in a community to build any kind of green 8 9 infrastructure. It's a legal format to say these are the 10 kinds of signatory employers we're going to work with, these are the kinds of jobs we're going to create, and 11 12 these are the community programs that we're going to pull 13 folks from to do these jobs. 14 So there are number of just well-known tools that 15 can be easily adapted to a lot of this work that's going on 16 already. 17 And then existing programs on the ground which 18 bring together -- I mean I think the thing is working with 19 on-the-ground workforce programs that do not -- I mean the 20 challenges, we all like to start with a population, right? 21 Like I've got these women. I've got these people of color. 2.2 I've got these veterans. I've got these ex-offenders. And I want to get them into a job, right? Because that's the 23 24 path forward. 25 We say it's just -- wait for second. Let's see

what the jobs are and then we'll build pathways to them. Otherwise, you're just building a pathway and it doesn't connect to anything.

2.2

So first find out what the jobs are and the way you do that is by working through region-based industry training partnerships that are by region and by industry where you get all the employers at the table who say "This is exactly the kind of jobs we're looking for. And these are the programs we're going to pull from."

So you actually line those things up before you start, rather than starting a training program that looks wonderful and exciting and you get to the end of it, and we send people out on their own to try and connect to jobs, which hasn't worked for the past 20 years and I don't expect working here.

So that's why we're excited to see a lot of this work focusing on these new ways of working.

MR. ECKERLE: Thank you. Obviously, there's a lot there to learn from. And it sounds like that single plan will be something that will be really helpful for the rest of us to --

MS. WHITE: All the answers.

MR. ECKERLE: Okay. Good. Maybe for Larry and Bailey and Bill, if you want to jump in, but if you could give an example of a project that works to kind of bring in

that community engagement and if there is something you would have done differently in retrospect.

2.2

MR. RILLERA: All eyes on me. I think the project that pops to mind is one of the investments we did for our zero-emission vehicle technology demonstrations at the Port of San Diego, consistent with something you mentioned, Sarah, at the beginning was design.

Designed into the specific project was to look at the workforce impacts of implementing this new technology there, but more importantly how is it tied to what that looks like in a growth scenario, consistent with their quality plans and things like that.

So that was very -- this is an initial foray in the middle of the process with the Greenlining Institute and other local partners. But it took a long time to come together even after the application was submitted to develop the common vernacular and vocabulary which everybody could use, both the community partners, the technology partners, the port partners, and the folks that were going to be demonstrating and using those technologies.

So design was important, very simple vocabulary that could -- everybody can rally around and then introduce their respective concepts and desires.

Now they are at a place where how do we

communicate that message about growth and these new opportunities, not just for jobs but new technology jobs that they want to participate in, both because they represent opportunities for economic growth for their households but also because they want to accrue the benefits of these technologies going forward, because these are the industries that are growing up around them.

MR. MAGAVERN: I'll say first I think that CARB did a fine job with the Barriers Study. There is very thorough outreach and we support the recommendations.

I think a project that I'm familiar with that has done a really good job of responding to community needs is the Scrappage and Replacement Program in the San Joaquin Valley that is funded by climate investments through CARB to the San Joaquin Air Pollution Control District, implemented there by a nonprofit called Valley Clean Air Now.

And they have been doing community outreach for years and have really embedded in the community, so they get the word out through faith groups and groups of farmworker grandmothers and a lot of informal networks. So more than 20 Saturdays a year they are all up and down the San Joaquin Valley.

And on a Saturday morning -- actually even starting Friday night, hundreds of people will drive their

vehicles and line up so that they can come in and then they can get their emissions tested, they can be identified whether they are eligible for vouchers to have the cars repaired so they'll pass smog check or get additional subsidy for scrapping the vehicle, or in some cases they're eligible -- and this is the Climate Investment part -- for scrapping a vehicle and replacing it with an advanced technology vehicle which is an efficient conventional hybrid or a plug-in hybrid or a full battery electric vehicle.

2.2

And I've been to these events three times. They are very -- there's a lot of contact with the customers.

And so Valley Can has got staff and volunteers, many of whom are fluent in Spanish. They make sure that law enforcement are not bothering anybody who might be undocumented or who might be scared away otherwise.

And so they have really figured out how to respond to the needs of the community and to meet those identified needs.

MS. WHITE: So Climate Investments fund a broad range of programs and each of the agencies have taken a little different approaches.

One of I think the models for community engagement has been the TCC program through the Strategic Growth Council.

And what I think set that apart from -- as a model is they really went above and beyond informing of the community of the projects that are coming down and really gave the community decision-making authority and that brought in community buy-in and really created a successful project that is supported on the ground.

2.2

So that I think was an example of some of the huge success in community engagement, and I hope that we see more projects like that.

MR. ECKERLE: Thank you very much.

Now, I want to turn to our case study. We're very excited to have Jaime Lemus.

Did I say that right, Lemus? Lemus.

Our Community CarShare project in Sacramento.

There's a ton of lessons learned. We got to pick his brain a little bit before, and I'm looking forward to doing it again.

MR. LEMUS: Great. Thank you. Good afternoon, everybody.

It's always a little difficult to compete after lunch, you know, because it depends what everybody ate, you know, maybe getting a little bit sleepy here. So I'll try to keep this exciting and somewhat short.

It's very humbling to be here describing the
Our Community CarShare Program. I take a lot of pride in

our team at the Air District with this program that they developed, as they started talking about this in 2014.

So long time ago -- a few years ago and the developments, the refinement, everything that it took to get to the press event and now today to everything that we've learned about this program. A lot of partners involved, a lot of lessons learned, a lot of challenges, a lot of heated discussion internally and externally to get to where we're at.

A little about the program. Not sure if everybody here is familiar with this, but this is our Sacramento region's car share program.

Let's turn to the next slide, please. Thank you.

I'll talk a little about phase 1, which is what we first deployed and currently now we're in phase 2.

Phase 1, we were awarded \$1.3 million and what we developed out of this car share community program was we -- we developed the project, which contained four disadvantaged community sites.

In each of the sites there was two electric vehicle chargers and two electric vehicles. It's as easy as saying, well, let's put two electric chargers and let's get two electric vehicles, and let's deploy this in these communities. And it's a lot more difficult than that.

Even in choosing the vehicles.

There was a lot of discussion on the vehicles alone because we wanted to make the vehicles to be -- to just kind of blend into the community. We didn't want them to be highlighted. We didn't want them to be extra special. But then we also wanted the vehicles to be useful.

2.2

We know that some of the electric vehicles or the early electric vehicles don't have a lot of trunk space. So we wanted something that folks can carry groceries, that they can put in child seats and can really, quite frankly, try to put as many family members as they can into the vehicle. So we went with the electric Kia Soul. It's pretty affordable and it kind of blends into the communities.

So we have eight dedicated level two chargers in the four communities. There's a community in Lemon Grove area, Alder Grove -- or, I'm sorry, Lemon Hill, which is a mutual house community; Alder Grove; and then two sites downtown, one in the Amtrak station and then the other is in the nearby SHRA site.

All the communities are different. Even though they're disadvantaged, they are all very different.

The Lemon Hill community is very diverse. You have Spanish-speaking communities there. And what I mean by that is, you have people from Mexico, people from El Salvador, Guatemala, Nicaragua, Central and South America.

Then you have your East Asian families. And then you have also Russian. And so very diverse.

In the Alder Grove community, you have a variety of mixed Mexican-American communities, American families, and then sprinkles here of African-American and Asian families as well.

In the downtown community, it was senior citizens, and that was a variety of folks as well too. So each -- the reason I mention that is because each group, each community had its own challenges.

To mention a little bit, in the Lemon Hill community, when we first deployed there, we had flyers, we had PowerPoint presentations and translators which were very -- all multilingual in various languages.

I remember during one of our first meetings there, we had the presentation done in English, followed by my translation in Spanish, followed by Cambodian and Vietnamese. And it was very challenging, but it was very successful.

At that time, we took sign-ups. And we thought great, this is a great program. All the participants really need for this program are a driver's license.

The district took care of the insurances. With our partner Zipcar we took care of pretty much everything. So all you have to do is show up and register with a valid

driver's license.

At the very end of the conference -- or at the very end of the workshop, it was like a mass exodus of people that just walked out, you know, and so our staff kind of quickly ran to the doors and tried to kind of redirect folks and try to figure out why they were leaving.

I thought this was going really good, right? We had a lot of questions from the community. We had some engagement and everybody pretty much said, "Thank you and we'll see you guys later," right?

Well, we did have food there and so we did feed the community and they did eat and everything. We did have raffle prizes, but as government we're used to doing things a certain way, right? I've talked to Bill and I've talked to some of the Clean Cities folks, the ARB folks. We all drink the same Kool-Aid, right?

And we think that everyone else also does too.

And in these communities, sometimes as the experts in this field, we forget some of the very simple things that are very real to the communities. So as we redirected some of the folks, we were able to get a few sign-ups.

Some of the comments that we heard back was,
"Well, you're still the government. So how do I ensure
that you're not going to turn me in to ICE?" Some of the
other comments were like "Hmm, there's still a catch here.

How much does this cost?"

2.2

Some of them said "Well, this is all great but this is app based." So in order to reserve your vehicle you've got to go online on your phone and you've got to reserve it, kind of like we do our Jump Bikes, right?

"I have a cell phone but I just text."

So we had to reach out to the youngsters, to the children of the residents. "Can you help your parents out?" So within a matter of days, we had to quickly restructure the way that we thought we were going to do registration.

We went from thinking that everybody was going to register to showing folks how to sign up for emails, how to sign up on your cell phone, how to work the technology and the applications.

So I think part of the lesson here is we don't always know exactly what the communities are capable of and what they're not.

I'll go in later a little bit more on to some of the learned lessons. With all of those challenges, some of which are very simple to address -- of course, only if you knew them beforehand -- we finally moved forward. And we now have a successful program. It took a little while to get to the program. I will talk a little bit about the time frames.

As mentioned, we started out with conversations in 2014. CARB solicitation was released February 2015. We won the award November of 2015.

And this is something really great and unexpected. We executed the grant with CARB three months after. So with CARB's legal processes and our legal processes, it only took three months to execute. So that was really good, because after that it took us almost a year and a half to get all our contracts and agreements with all of those partners, with the exception of CARB, finalized.

I was mentioning to Bill earlier that the grant funding is great. It comes with restrictions, and obviously we want to get more partners. The more partners we get, then the more we can leverage funding. As we bring more partners in, every partner comes with their restrictions. And now, you're trying to paint or trying to create this project with many, many more restrictions than you originally had.

So City of Sacramento had their restrictions,

SMUD had their restrictions, SHRA had their restrictions,

Mutual Housing had their restrictions, and Zipcar had their restrictions. And it's nothing bad that, you know, each of them had their restrictions. It's just the way that we operate, right?

It's the funding that has certain restrictions.

It's the company policies. And so we have to work with it.

So staff scrambling, you know, how do we make this work and meander this way and deviate this way in order to deploy.

2.2

So if there's anything to learn from that is, we have to have these conversations with all of our partners much sooner. Even if we begin to start thinking about, "You know, I think -- wouldn't it be great if this were to happen," then I think right away we should start talking to our partners. Because that way they can give us perspective as to "Okay, that sounds great, but you also should think about this and this and this" up-front as opposed to when you're in the trying to finalize your contracts with them.

So our program is successful. We're moving on now to phase 2. So we got another million dollars from CARB. Thank you very much.

And now we're trying to refine our process. At the same time we're expanding it. We're expanding it to three different housing locations. We're adding six more vehicles and six more chargers.

So that's great, replicate the process, expand it to different regions, include all the learned lessons in that. But how do we refine it?

Part of what we're doing now is we're including a

ride hail program. We discovered that not everybody has a driver's license in these communities. We also discovered that even if they do have driver's licenses there are certain cultures that some of the members in the family just don't drive.

2.2

And then we have the elderly folk. Some of them just don't want to drive. So how do we take advantage of this program with those participants. So we said, well, let's figure out a ride hail program.

Let's design it so that we can develop champions within their communities to be able to drive them around. That's one part of the ride hail program.

The other part is the bank-less community, right?

The bank-less community are the folks that just can't go and get a credit card or get a bank account, which is a really big problem when you're dealing with application-based -- so app-based programs.

You have to sign up, you enter your credit card in, and then you can reserve your Jump Bike or any other mode of transportation. But if you're a bank-less participant, then how do we find a solution for that.

So what we're doing is we are developing a Visa card type of program or Visa logo'd card that can be interconnected with all of our mobility programs. Well, now we're expanding it to our car share programs, Jump

Bike, RT. We want to expand it to Uber and also Gig -- I'm sorry, Envoy and Gig.

They'll also be able to use Envoy and Lyft as well with it because anything that you can use your credit card with, now you're able to access that form of mobility.

And I see Paul out here in the audience. We have discussions with Envoy and Gig as to how we can also connect this card with them as well.

So that's the new component that's really exciting in phase 2. We haven't launched this yet. There are a lot of challenges to this because there has to be some kind of security when you deal with credit card issues and trying to deploy credit cards into communities where they're bank-less participants. So more to come on that.

Next slide, please.

2.2

So I'm going to touch a little bit about -- on some of the learned lessons, add a little bit more. We've been discussing all morning as to what we've learned from these communities in deploying projects like this in these communities, right? Language barriers, immigration barriers, cultural barriers.

One of the things that we also learned here is we're dealing with technology, two aspects of technology: one, the vehicle; two, the charging infrastructure. Well, the community is unfamiliar with this technology so there's

a lot of education that has to go into the community to let them know that this car is better, right?

2.2

This car is a lot better. You don't have to refill it with gasoline anymore, but you just have to refill it somehow, right? You charge it.

The other part of the challenge was the infrastructure component because we can't just place the vehicles in these communities anymore. We have to place them with charging stations and we can't just place these charging stations wherever we want.

It has to be strategic -- strategically located where it's safe, where it's accessible, and in most cases where it's close to a panel, because the farther away it is from a panel, then the more it costs.

So there's a lot of challenges with the deployment of electric vehicle infrastructure.

Construction time lines and permit time lines also pose another problem with this.

During the times that we started the deployment of this project, there were not many electricians that were raising their hand willing to put all the EVSC out there.

Now, there's a lot more, but at that time it was somewhat still experimental. They had to deal with the city building permits. The housing units had to become comfortable and familiar with the charging pieces of

1 | equipment.

2.2

So there is a lot of education, not just to the participants but to the construction industry, to city employees, and to the housing agencies. So a lot of work to be done there.

The weather also has or is a big factor.

Obviously rains and storms slow down our construction process. So mother nature will not wait. Even though you have a press event ready and lined up, you know, it will push it out. And we've definitely learned our lesson there.

So a lot of things to consider that are out of your hands really.

Managing members and vehicle use. As I mentioned, there's a lot of education that goes into having participants use the technology. You know, you have to sell it. "This is really cool. Look, it's very easy. You hit the park button or you turn the little lever to drive or reverse. And that's really it. You unplug it and you plug it back in."

It's still new technology. It really is. It's very foreign still.

The best way to do it, the best way to educate them really is to get them in there and drive them around, and that's kind of what we did. Look, we have a staff

member that has an electric Kia Soul and he volunteered his vehicle and we took it to the communities and we said, "Get in it. Let's drive around the block."

And as silly as that sounded, they got out of the car and they were like "Hey, it's exactly like a regular car." It is, you know, almost, right?

From that point forward, then they tell their friends and then their friends tell their friends. And then there we go.

The biggest champions though are the kids, the kids that go to college, the kids with their permits.

Those kids can get their parents through the application, through the software and into those cars. They're also the motivation when it comes to a broken down vehicle, when it comes to another family member taking the only car and they got to get to school.

So now mom or grandma or somebody else, who normally doesn't drive or didn't drive this vehicle, has a vehicle sitting there and you have the kids saying, but there's a car there. We can get there still.

So thank you to all those kids because there was a big push in a lot of the younger generation that really made it easier and really sold this program for us.

The outreach and education I mentioned, multilingual -- and I think we have to get better than just

the multilingual documents, you know. Again, we come from a government agency. We're used to putting the documents in different languages.

2.2

But I used to be involved many years ago with Barrio Logan and Wilmington and during those times of advocacy. And what we did there was simultaneous translating, a simultaneous translating, which means that as I'm giving this presentation in English, there are folks wearing headphones and listening to the same exact presentation in Spanish at the same time.

That's much more effective. They are part of the program. They're not secondary or they're not segregated, but it's a part of the program. And I've got to tell you it's really expensive, but I think it's very worth it.

You know, we tried, okay, what if just separate out all the groups. Well, there we go again, right, separating everybody out and the dynamics of that.

I could translate in Spanish and then we can translate in Cambodian and we can translate in Vietnamese and we can translate in Russian. And now we've turned our 45-minute presentation into about two hours.

Nobody wants to sit for two hours to listen to that, especially if you have your young ones in the room.

It doesn't how much pizza and cake you have. It's just not going to work. So we should think about that, multilingual

translating.

We talked about the benefits to the community. Obviously, we're in the business of cleaning our air, but the program doesn't focus on cleaning our air.

The focus is about mobility. The focus is about how do we get these communities to their doctor appointments, to their interviews, to the class and really, more importantly, just how do we provide them the freedom of mobility that everybody else has.

Well, it's a little difficult with an electric vehicle, especially one with program goals where you want to increase ridership, right? Because do you consider success where a family can take the vehicle, one vehicle and go all the way down to Los Angeles and back during a weekend or do you consider success where during that same weekend, 10 families reserve it for an hour? Which is more valuable?

If it's metrics based, then I want all the rides.

If it's freedom of mobility, the Los Angeles trip sounds

better, right? So we have to think about that.

Some of the families came back and said, "Well that's great but I can only reserve this vehicle for three hours." We did a three-hour allotment on purpose because that would guarantee that nobody would run out of a charge. And so to this day, we've only had one vehicle come back on

a flatbed, so that's not too bad.

2.2

Let's see, talking again about the material. How do we put all this information out to all the families?

You can go door to door. You can put all these flyers out in their community centers. You can visit the churches.

You can visit their community centers.

But let's face it. As we get material, we don't even read it. So how do we address that issue, right?

Again, we're government. We're used to putting out flyers that look very government like, and we all know what those look like, right? They're not fun. They don't look like concert flyers or anything like that. They're not engaging.

So we need to think about how we make our publications. We need to think about how much do we bombard them with this type of information.

One of the things that we learned was that in disadvantaged communities, there's two major ways of communication -- well, three: Gossip and what we found out was "El Face," so Facebook, and texting.

So my daughter went to the Language Academy of Sacramento which is in a low-income community, and I always would get texts and my wife would get Facebook notifications. But I never got emails and I never got phone calls.

And so it wasn't until this program that I realized, oh, it's through "El Face" and texting. That's how they communicate. It makes a lot of sense. It didn't when we first deployed.

So part of the reason of sharing all of these learned lessons, you know -- and many of them you've already heard. Many of them are common sense, now that I've mentioned them, "Oh, yeah, that makes a lot of sense." It's so that we can continue to make these programs better so that we could really be successful.

Something else that we heard from the communities is, "You know, you should've talked to us a little bit more and we could've told you that," right? We had earlier this morning, right?

I was mentioning to Tyler earlier, we came in with a great idea saying we're going to raffle -- for every registered participant we're going to give you a raffle ticket and you're going to enter to win an iPad, right?

And who doesn't want to enter raffles to win an iPad.

Well, that was not a driver. Later, we discovered as we talked to some of our community organizations, they said, "Why would you raffle off an iPad?" And we said, "Because it's cool. It's like the latest technology, right?" And they said, "No. You should've thought about crockpots. You should've thought

about toasters, coffee machines and rolls of quarters."

Ah, right? And we were like, oh, that makes a lot of sense. Well, it does after you're told, right? So let's continue to have these workshops so that we can continue to learn.

Can I get the next slide, please.

So as we look into the future, we have four sites launched. We have three more by the end of this year. So far there's been 6,000 trips taken, 92,000 miles driven. And we have 150-plus members, and our membership is increasing.

There's our vehicle right there, the Kia Soul. We did have to brand it though. We talked about making it not so visible, but we did have to brand it because we had to give everybody kudos that participated. So there was our branding there.

We expect to have more membership with the Ride Hail program, which will take care of the bank-less community, which will take care of the participants that don't drive, and as we expand as well.

As we continue to expand and refine these processes, we're also going to continue to create synthesis with the other mobility projects that are already out here in Sacramento.

As mentioned, the Jump Bike, RT, Uber, Lyft,

Envoy, Gig, especially as we figure out the Ride Hail component and the Visa card, because ultimately what we want is to reduce VMT, is to reduce emissions and really to have better mobility and to provide better mobility within the communities.

2.2

As we continue to develop the projects and as we continue to refine them, sometimes the projects get a little more complicated, because as we become more innovative, there's more risk.

So in 2014, we had this discussion about car share. Wouldn't it be great if we could deploy this car share project in these communities? And at that time there were very minimal car sharing companies or car sharing providers. Zipcar was a car sharing provider. Envoy was barely developing. Gig was barely developing. But at least here in Sacramento, it was mostly really Zipcar. So we took a risk.

And as I mentioned in the time frames, part of the reason the time frames went so long is because, as government, we have to take calculated risks. Obviously, we can't deploy a ton of money out there and have projects fail. So we have these calculated risks to try to deploy projects such as this one.

Sometimes taking a risk is worth it. And in this case, we made a lot of mistakes. We had a lot of heated

discussions, and it still surprises me how far we've come along and how much work we still need to do.

2.2

We've had contact from Europe, South America, and different parts of the nation about our car share program.

It's a smaller program. We can't compete with L.A.'s Blue Dot program and we can't compete with some of the other larger programs, but it's a very special program.

We're refining it, we're making it more innovative. And it always surprises me how much attention it gets from all the world.

So how do we then integrate this as we move forward, because we can't continue to take risks. I don't think that CARB, Mr. Corey was going to continue to give us money to take -- to create these projects and to continue to take risks.

So we're looking at how do we create sustainability with smart growth and development. How do we plug this in before developments occur? And then also is there opportunity even for these programs to be integrated within rental agreements not necessarily within disadvantaged communities.

So there's a lot of opportunity for growth.

There's a lot of opportunity for expansion outside of these pilot programs. And the Air District and I are here in whatever way possible in which we can share our learned

1 lessons and give you a hand in any of that. 2 Thank you. 3 MR. ECKERLE: Thank you very much. 4 And Jaime wanted me to make sure that -- you 5 know, that he is always available on Facebook or text. So 6 if you have any follow-up questions. 7 So I wanted to open up to the dais because we're 8 a little short on time. That was a great presentation. 9 MR. RECHTSCHAFFEN: I have two questions. 10 you for that great presentation. One is could you provide a little bit more detail 11 12 about the virtual credit card or whatever that you're using 13 because it's very intriguing. 14 And I guess I have a guestion for Bailey. 15 Are you already starting to incorporate in CARB's 16 funding guidelines the lessons learned from car sharing 17 programs like this in terms of what we're looking for going forward for future projects? 18 19 MR. LEMUS: So I can't share much on the Visa 20 card since it's not -- it's still in development. 21 essence, what it is, it's like a Visa logo'd credit card, 2.2 kind of like what you buy at Raley's or Bel Air, a gift 2.3 card. 24 We think that the Air District may have to be kind of the escrow or the bank. We're looking at providing 25

the Visa cards to different participants in disadvantaged communities with a pre-loaded amount. There will be merchant code restrictions to allow only transportation merchants to be -- to have access to the funds.

2.2

I think that's really mostly what it is. And so we will evaluate the ridership, the use. And as members draw down on their allotment, then we will continue to -- I quess continue to add to the balance.

So we are looking at a couple of pilot programs, one for six months and then another for a year in different communities. And so we haven't yet exactly figured out which communities that will be. We're thinking maybe the Franklin Boulevard area may be one. We are thinking South Sacramento may be one or downtown.

MS. SMITH: Just to say feedback from projects on the ground like this is incredibly valuable for not only CARB's program but for all California Climate Investments programs.

As we learn more and more about, you know, what's working and what's not working, we do try to take those recommendations and turn them into guidance for all the agencies to let them know how to improve access and tackle some of these language barriers and all the things that Jaime described.

MR. LEMUS: I also want to add, you know, we've

been talking with ARB staff about -- you know, there's this discussion about admin funds, right? In every grant you have admin funds, and then sometimes the admin funds don't necessarily cover the program costs, right?

2.2

As we talk about Clean Cars for All, as we talk about programs like this, they're very labor intensive because of the engagement with the community. We are in conversations with the Air Resources Board right now about education and outreach funds outside of the admin funds.

So we are constantly in communication. We are sharing with them. I've had discussions with Anne Marie from ARB as well, with those types of ideas.

South Coast and the Bay Area and San Joaquin will tell you that, you know, the engagement with the community is very labor intensive. And there's a lot that goes with it: the public relations aspect, the translation services, the after-hours, the pizza, the donuts. All of that, right? The raffling.

We have to think outside of just the regular program funds and admin funds in order to make these programs successful.

COMMISSIONER SCOTT: Let me check to see whether or not -- I wasn't handed any blue cards. I know we have a little bit of a comment period also after this panel.

If I don't have any public comment, let's keep

1 | going on the dais.

I have a bunch of questions and it looks like Richard has one as well. But I want to make sure if there are folks who wanted -- in the public who wanted to say something, they have an opportunity to do so.

Go ahead, Richard.

those relate to one another?

MR. COREY: All right. Great presentation, Jaime.

Question for you: What's the interaction of the car share program with the Electrify America/VW

Investments? I think it's -- Sacramento has a green study.

I think it's \$44 million over a period of time. How do

MR. LEMUS: That's a great question. We are in constant communication with all of the Electrify America and Green Region partners.

A lot of it is car sharing: Envoy, Gig,
Microtransit projects as well. So we're always in
communications to make sure that we don't saturate our
communities.

And then also -- the biggest, I think -- the biggest plus is the infrastructure component in developing and deploying infrastructure where everybody can use it.

We're hoping that the car share participants will be able to charge at any of the Electrify America charging sites.

And we're also hoping that the Visa card will also be a seamless integration to any of those programs as well.

2.2

In essence, how we look at it with Electrify

America and Envoy and Gig is a massive wave of mobility

projects here in the Sacramento region so that everyone can
be able to access.

Our car share programs are really located specific to some residential communities, but at the same time outside of those communities, those same members will be able to -- hopefully will be able to use the Envoy and Gig system as well.

COMMISSIONER SCOTT: Yes, I have a question and then I want to turn back to our panelists. I know some folks had a few concluding remarks and may have questions for one another, since we have until about 3:15 here.

The question that I had kind of goes back to the outreach that you did, Jaime, with the members. And you mentioned that many of the folks said, "Oh, I just use my phone for texting, not for -- I don't have apps." And so one question I had was, so it turns out that most people do have phones, they just have to figure out how to get the apps on there?

And then the second question was you mentioned you have about 150 members so far. Is that enough for the number of cars that you have or is the supply -- the demand

outpacing the supply? Or how is that kind of coming along?

MR. LEMUS: So, you're right. We definitely had
to show members how to use apps. Their children were
instrumental in that as well.

2.2

But one of the things that we learned from that is a telephone concierge system. And one of our partners here, Envoy, has definitely learned from that. And so they were able to have a telephone concierge system because some folks just don't want to go online on their phone and reserve a vehicle. They prefer to call.

In addition, I know RT's Smart Ride down on Franklin Boulevard has also integrated the concierge service as well so you can just call in. As you can imagine, some of our grandmothers, they don't want to get online and reserve something on a phone app, so they feel more comfortable just calling and saying, "Hey, I need to be picked up" or "I want to reserve this."

The 150 members does meet Zipcar's utility model as far as full utilization. If we were to increase the vehicles within that neighborhood, we feel comfortably that the membership would increase, because we do have communities that, as we drive by them sometimes or -- even the feedback that we get is, you know, I really wanted to go and reserve this vehicle on this day, but it's just out.

So even the communities are starting to have to

learn now that you've got to reserve the vehicle in advance. You can't just say "I want to get up and go" because that just doesn't quite work.

2.2

So deploying more vehicles in communities I think would definitely benefit.

COMMISSIONER SCOTT: Great. Let me see if any of the other panelists would like to make -- Bill, yes, please. And others if you would like to feel free to make some concluding remarks or ask each other questions. And we'll turn back to the dais as well.

MR. MAGAVERN: Thanks a lot, Janea.

And I did have just a few short recommendations based on the report and our experience.

The report addresses the need for funding for clean transportation and mobility, and most of the funding for these equity programs so far has come from the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund. Yet if you look at that, there is sustained continuous appropriations for transit and high-speed rail, but the other clean transportation programs we have to scrap every year for that funding. So I think that inequity needs to be redressed.

And we also need to look beyond the GGRF to other funding sources. And I will note -- and I can say this since I'm the one person up here who doesn't work for the government -- first, we need to defeat Prop 6, which would

make it virtually impossible to enact some of the recommendations in the report like fee bates on vehicles or raising motor vehicle fees in the future. That would all have to go to the ballot, which would be an extremely expensive proposition.

2.2

So just starting with that and then thinking more broadly about ways that we can sustainably fund these programs.

Secondly, I think we need to have greater integration and coordination of the different programs, Climate Investments and other investments and the one-stop shop.

We're excited that Grid Alternatives has been awarded that from CARB. That's a first step but that only addresses the vehicle programs, and we think we could broaden that and have energy programs, so somebody gets a plug-in vehicle and then they can get solar on their rooftop so that they're plugging into solar energy.

And I also want to second Jaime's really important point that we need to see flexibility from the agencies and the legislature in allowing for education and outreach activities, not to be kept the way that administrative costs are kept, because as we've heard, those are really essential to these disadvantaged community programs.

And then we also need to make sure that we're not doing any harms like displacement. Katie Valenzuela-Garcia talked about that this morning. And keeping in mind safety. There are places where people don't feel safe biking or walking because of traffic or crime.

And when we talk about sharing vehicles, I know there's been some research indicating that in some communities, people are worried that they might be held liable if a previous driver left drugs in the vehicle.

So we need to think -- as Jaime said, it's not the kind of thing that we might naturally be thinking of but in a lot of communities those are concerns.

Thank you.

2.2

MR. LEMUS: Bill, that was -- you touched on something kind of different there on the drug issues, you know.

We actually did have to have a conversation with our PR folks and our director in saying "Oh my gosh, what if this does happen and then it gets on the Sac Bee and our car's there and our logo's there and then next thing you know, everybody's giving us a call."

That's part of the risk. You know, that's part of the risk. It can happen at any time. It could happen in any community, not just disadvantaged communities.

I know that when I first met -- as we were

developing this project and we were talking about the deployment of these projects within disadvantaged communities, a lot of those issues were brought up, crime, just different issues that some folks think are maybe more relevant within these communities.

But really, those are just issues that can happen anywhere at any time, DUIs, anything like that. So we have to get past that.

COMMISSIONER SCOTT: Sarah and then Martha.

MS. WHITE: Just had a quick -- one thing that struck me, Jaime, as you were talking, this idea of the many restrictions that we put on funds. Part of this panel is to talk about funding and how we can do that more and better.

I think one thing that strikes me, bringing this back to the jobs angle, is that we see that a lot of the -- as we've already said, one of the recommendations is for climate and energy agencies to think about investing in standards, labor standards on the projects you're investing.

But insofar as climate energy agencies and programs are investing in workforce training, to really, again, listen to the community about what this looks like because we find often that there is there is a sense in government, right, that we know, that we only want to fund

those green bits of training.

2.2

And we know that most of these jobs may not even have green pieces to them. To sort of manufacture a vehicle or to build clean infrastructure or to operate an electrified bus, there are certainly some new skills. But what we want to look at is funding entire training programs and think about -- when we're thinking about access for disadvantaged communities is things like do people have stipends to afford going to work.

That's the kind of thing we need to invest in, not let's fund this little green bit of this curriculum, right? So I think this is just a much broader understanding of workforce and the kinds of things that we can and should be funding on that side.

COMMISSIONER GUZMAN-ACEVES: Well, I had a related question. One was on the operating and maintenance of the vehicles, just if you are using your own staff. Is there a workforce component that you're looking at there to train up the locals to be able to replace a battery or do any other kind of work to maintain the vehicles?

MR. LEMUS: No, but that's an excellent point.

In these communities with the education of the technology is baby steps, right? We are working with the American River College as they have an automotive program. And they are very progressive and starting to teach their

students on how to do maintenance work on electric vehicles.

2.2

They're also working with Twin Rivers with some of the zero-emission buses that are deployed out there and starting to look at some of the maintenance for the buses and heavy-duty as well. But for these vehicles, Zipcar takes care of all of that.

We wanted to make it as -- easy for the participant. And I think those are good things to start thinking about in the future for workforce development.

COMMISSIONER GUZMAN-ACEVES: Then just one more question --

COMMISSIONER RECHTSCHAFFEN: Can I just ask a quick -- sorry to interrupt you. Does Zipcar get any funding from this as a result?

So, for example, Sarah says you should attach workforce development agreements with labor standards to any funding we're giving. Could we do that for Zipcar, saying you're maintaining these fleet vehicles, but you have to contribute to a community college apprentice program or something like that. Do they get funding on --

MR. LEMUS: Sure. Absolutely. We can definitely develop something like that into our agreements. That would have to be part of the original grant though, or that component would be in there.

just wondered about -- I didn't see, and I'm sure you've talked a lot about -- you just mentioned a new partner that wasn't on your PowerPoint. But what about SACOG and some of these larger transportation planning agencies? It's interesting that you as an Air District are taking the lead on so much of the transit need in the community.

Obviously, you're showing leadership there, but it does kind of raise the question of where SACOG's involvement in RT you mentioned is a partner. But can you talk about that relationship?

MR. LEMUS: So we are very integrated with SACOG. Just to give you one example, we run CMAQ dollars, which are federal highway dollars, through SACOG through the district with our CCAP program, which is a heavy-duty replacement program.

Now, we've changed our guidelines just last month with SACOG and our board to be able to deploy zero-emission vehicles and give a higher dollar incentive for those participants.

So we are very much aligned with SACOG's missions. Our Jump Bike program is also integrated with SACOG as well. Many know that it's a SACOG deployment but don't know that it's the Air District also with them. So, yes, we are very much partnered with SACOG and Regional

Transit as well.

And just to kind of go back a little bit. The reason we're very interested in the reduction of VMT, or vehicle miles traveled, and transit and increased ridership is because our region is very impacted by mobile sources and so therefore will spend the money to reduce those emissions.

COMMISSIONER RECHTSCHAFFEN: I just want to thank you since Commissioner Guzman-Aceves treated me to Jump Bike after lunch. It's my first time and it was a great experience, because I rode to Davis. That's why I was late because I was so excited I could ride so fast.

COMMISSIONER SCOTT: Awesome. Well, if everyone will join me in thanking our terrific panel.

And we will go right into Panel Number 4. Panel Number 4 is entitled "Measuring Progress for Low-Income Californians in Clean Energy and Transportation Access."

So we will just take about 60 seconds here to switch out the speakers and panelists and then we'll get right going.

Okay. It looks like everyone is assembled -22 almost.

All right. It looks like our Panel Number 4 is assembled, so I will turn it over to Commissioner Guzman-Aceves to kick us off.

1 | COMMISSIONER GUZMAN-ACEVES: Thank you.

2.2

All right. Good afternoon, everybody. This topic today, we're talking about something that's come up a lot already which is our tracking of metrics and our data gathering so we can show progress.

So we are going to hear from different agencies, both some of the locals down in Southern California and here in the state.

So I think without further ado so we have enough time for discussion, I'm going to go ahead and turn to the California Energy Commission so that we can hear about their indicators report that has been a part of the 350 work that we've been doing.

We got a little glimpse of that when we were at our Disadvantaged Communities Advisory Group. So thank you, Pamela, for coming out for that. Okay.

MS. DOUGHMAN: Okay, is that right? Can you hear me?

COMMISSIONER GUZMAN-ACEVES: Yes.

MS. DOUGHMAN: So as part of the SB 350 Barriers
Study Part A, there was a recommendation to -- excuse me.
There was a recommendation to develop energy equity
indicators and so we developed draft a framework report and
we consulted with stakeholders and we had opportunities for
public input. And in June we released our energy equity

indicators and there are three ways to view the data. 1 2 Can you turn to the next slide? Thank you. 3 There are three ways to view the data: as a 4 report. Excuse me. 5 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Would you like some water? 6 MS. DOUGHMAN: Maybe I'm a little better now. 7 Thank you. 8 As a PDF and also as a story map and as an 9 interactive mapping application that shows different data 10 layers that people can turn off and on. 11 So the purpose is to highlight opportunities to 12 expand clean energy access, investment and resilience in 13 low-income and disadvantaged communities. And the report 14 also points to key data gaps. 15 So some of the layers include disadvantaged --16 Some of the layers include disadvantaged 17 communities have been discussed earlier today using the CalEnviroScreen 3.0. 18 19 We also have tribal communities shown as a data 20 layer. And we also have areas that have a median income 21 that is 60 percent of statewide median income that's shown 2.2 in dark green. And then we also have areas that are 80 2.3 percent of statewide median income. 24 And the idea was to identify locations that are 25 likely to be eligible for a broad range of programs. And

the 60 percent statewide median income, we compared what that would mean, and so we use that as a key data layer for most of the other indicators.

If you could turn to the next one.

2.2

So the data show opportunities for outreach and investment. There's been some discussion today about public health and the importance of looking for opportunities to address public health at the same time that we're looking at energy efficiency and other clean energy investment opportunities.

So here I just pulled up some of the maps. The one on the left shows areas with high -- where the county has a high number of emergency room visits due to heat for 10,000 people. And then as another data layer we show here also the census tracts that have a statewide -- that have a median household income that is 60 percent of the statewide median.

And then there is another layer we have. This is from Cal-Adapt, this layer. It shows with climate change; additional cooling degree days are expected to increase significantly by mid-century. And that's on the left.

And then on the right we see data from the CPUC that show areas that have a lower level of expenditures for energy efficiency or the number of people participating per zip code where there is an overlap with the housing, 70

percent of the housing being built before 1979.

So the point here is to identify opportunities for further outreach and investment where we can really make a difference in public health and energy efficiency.

Also, there was a mention about energy burden, the cost of electricity bills. And as the temperatures go up, we have a real opportunity, especially in low-income areas, to help keep the electricity bill low through energy efficiency investments.

Next slide, please.

And so this just highlights another example.

This shows -- the pie graph on the left shows counties with the top urgency department visits due to asthma. And so San Bernardino is one of the counties that has -- scores high on this indicator.

And then on the right, looking at San Bernardino County and the data layers related to opportunities to help address this issue. The different layers here show low income with older homes, low efficiency, low solar and low electric vehicle rebate.

And so this is information that community organizers and program administrators can use to help expand outreach and uptake of the opportunities.

And I've been given a cough drop here.

Next, please.

So for more information, I have some links here.

The energy equity indicators, the Low-Income Barriers Study

Part A and also Part B from ARB, as well as the SB 350

Disadvantaged Communities Advisory Group.

Thank you.

2.2

COMMISSIONER GUZMAN-ACEVES: Thank you, Pam.

And I'll just say that we were able to dig in a little tiny bit deeper during our Disadvantaged Communities Advisory Group. I know it's a tool that I really encourage everyone to spend some time with to really help inform all of our investment strategies.

So we're going to move next to our case study and then go to our panel. And we're joined today with Amy Dryden, who is from the Contra Costa County Weatherization and Energy Efficiency Pilot Project.

MS. DRYDEN: Good afternoon, everybody. My name is Amy Dryden. I work for Build It Green.

I'm the Director of Policy and Technical
Innovation there. And kind of the hat that I'm wearing
right now for this project is Build It Green is
administering the single-family low-income weatherization
program in Region 2, which is around the Bay Area and also
in Los Angeles, Santa Barbara and Ventura Counties.

So there's a number of themes that I've heard throughout the day. So thanks for still being here but

you'll hear consistent themes in terms of trust,
partnerships, local channels, alignment or misalignment of
programs, funding constraints or funding opportunities, we
could also say, and more investments that's needed.

So I'm going to talk a little bit about the why because I think it helpful to frame it, not that I don't think you all know this and some of it probably better than me, but I think it's also helpful.

So I'm going to talk about bridging the gap between on-the-ground health professionals and energy efficiency professionals and why that is impactful.

So as California, with the largest, cleanest economy, the most aggressive climate policies, you know, we've got the Global Summit coming up in September, you know, reductions for greenhouse gas emissions, doubling of energy efficiency by 2050. I don't say that. I know you all know it.

But I say if we're that committed to greenhouse gas emissions, then we are also committed to health. It is in intersectoral problem. It's a challenge.

And I was reminded of that as I drove up here today, listening to a report about the fires. So I'm thinking, oh, fire impact, drier, loss of house, loss of security, affordable housing.

But the whole report was about the fact that the

smoke was blocking the sun so crops were not growing. So then farmers were not able to generate the yield that they thought they would be able to generate. It also meant the air quality was really bad, that the workers couldn't work a full day, so they're leaving at 12:00. So now wages are reduced for that population. And with less volume of a crop, then also cost goes up.

2.2

2.3

So all of a sudden in this very short period of time, I just reminded of this intersectoral approach and it is just something to keep in mind.

Also with that I would say, as we think about climate change, it is the most vulnerable communities that are affected the most. While it affects all of us, 38 million population in California, it's those that are most vulnerable with the least resources to respond that get impacted first.

And we can think about those folks from a health perspective, we're looking at asthma. We can think about chronic obstructive pulmonary disease which is COPD, cardiovascular disease, children or elderly who have harder times dealing with higher heating degree days that Pam was just talking about as we look forward, and energy burdened households.

So if anybody -- if these communities or people have those conditions, climate change is just exacerbating

that.

In conjunction with that, a number of our vulnerable populations, as Maria pointed out earlier today, live in rental housing. And if we look at the quality of rental housing, it is often going to have greater deferred maintenance and more substandard conditions, which can be moisture, which can be mold, which can be pest infestation, which also exacerbate health conditions.

So as I mentioned, you know, these resources are the least able to cope with climate change, to afford the more expensive food, to the transportation that Jaime was talking about previously, and to be able to control their environment as far as maintaining a comfortable home.

So some of the strategies that we can put in place for climate change can also present health co-benefits and those opportunities. I think if we think about them in a planned way, we can really maximize both of those, but it takes some thought. It takes a lot of coordination.

So I want to talk about how the energy efficiency improvements and health can work together. And I think the first thing is also just to define health. And the reason why I do that is because coming from the energy efficiency sector, coming from the building sector, it often gets defined in a very, very narrow way and it's often just

about combustion safety.

2.2

But if we think about health it's a state of complete physical, mental and social well-being, not merely the absence of disease or infirmity. And so I think that really is important for us to think about that conceptually and how we have healthier communities.

I will give one just -- also a quick definition of weatherization just so we're all hearing the same thing. Weatherization is often delivering energy efficiency to homes, air sealing, improvements to ventilation potentially, adding insulation or improving space conditioning systems.

So if we think about healthy homes and how to support that, they are dry, clean, safe, well ventilated, pest and contaminant free, well maintained and thermally controlled. And any deficiencies in those can result in health impacts. So indoor moisture or mold can contribute to respiratory disease, in particular asthma.

Pests and cockroaches are connected to communicable diseases and respiratory disease. Improper heating and cooling create temperature extremes that can exacerbate illness or even cause death. And stress from unhealthy housing or even high energy burden can also result in mental health impacts.

So as we think about some of the common energy

efficiency measures like improving envelopes and air sealing, putting in more insulation, improving a space conditioning system or even making it operable can really help mitigate those negative impacts on residents and have these positive benefits on their health.

So I'm going to talk about what we did in kind of the pilot. And I will say there's a number of studies that talked about this correlation of energy efficiency and health, and we do have a lot of anecdotal evidence even from the low-income weatherization program where this one resident in Southern California said, "Well, within six months after receiving services, our son was not taking his medicine as much for his asthma and he's able to go to school more frequently." She felt better.

We don't have a direct tie, but those anecdotal stories are really powerful for us to understand the benefits to real people.

So one of the things that will come up as I talk about challenges is -- so we brought together energy efficiency folks. And if you think about the way energy efficiency folks approach things, is that they're looking at a house. They're looking at things in that house and how to assess it and how to improve it.

And then we're putting them with folks -- public health professionals who have a mind-set of social

services. They have a look of surveying the person, that individual and they're tied to a number of other social services within that group.

2.2

And so very different perspectives, but they can be mutually reinforcing. And so with that, with this idea of leveraging these public health professionals that are on the ground in people's homes, doing home visits, Michael Kent of Contra Costa Health Services was the champion here who said, "I want to figure out how to link these two. How do we link these services and how do we better, you know, provide services to these clients comprehensively?"

So it started about having a discussion with the public health professionals to say "Hey, are you interested in this?" And public health professionals have often connected health and housing. But I think the idea of energy efficiency was a new piece to put in their tool bucket, I guess. They hadn't thought about that as much. Mostly thinking about housing stability or having a house.

So there were 60 public health nurses who were trained. They conduct in-home health visits for low-income residents who have Medi-Cal.

And so they had knowledge of their patients and their conditions, and so they thought these would be a great channel to identify folks that would benefit from weatherization services.

So we trained them and there were several things we had to train them on.

2.2

One is what are these programs. And I forget who mentioned it earlier, but there's a number of programs out there. So what is this program, what's the eligibility, how do I know to understand it enough that I can feel confident in making this referral, because they did not want to be the one who makes a referral that falls through the cracks.

Geographical location. We're dealing with the low-income weatherization program that's only available in the DACs. And then we had LIHEAP, which is Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program, which is DOE funded. That's available in other areas where you have to be a U.S. citizen. In LIHEAP you don't have to be, but you have to be in a DAC. All of these things to negotiate.

And then the opportunity for energy efficiency.

So we tried to simplify it as much as possible and gave them six questions to ask. And if the client said yes to any of those questions, then they would be referred over to weatherization services.

And those were like: Does the client have a health condition that makes him or her vulnerable to heat or cold. Are there any obvious cracks or gaps in windows, house or the -- we said "house," not "envelope," and people

know "house" as a more recognizable term. Is the client uncomfortable like on very hot or very cold days. Do they have challenges paying a bill. Are there broken appliances. And is there a missing carbon monoxide or smoke detector.

And so then if the answer was yes to any of those, then they would work with the client in some way to get them enrolled and complete an application for the program. And we had to be as flexible as possible because this was a hurdle. This required them filling out an application. This required providing documentation of income or categorical eligibility, providing identification.

And so sometimes the nurse could do it.

Sometimes Michael from the -- from Contra Costa Department of Public Health would do it. Sometimes it would come to us.

Like today I have a staff right now who is out at somebody's house -- or they're probably back now -- but working on that.

So we try to be as flexible as possible, mainly to uncover what things are barriers to getting them enrolled, because even though we know this is a benefit for folks, this is not on their top 10 list most of the time.

Most of the time it's: Am I getting to work, am I getting

my kid to school and then to get groceries.

2.2

There's other things. And so being home and completing the application is not necessarily on my top 10.

So this pilot is still ongoing. As I mentioned, I have somebody out today. But we got 31 referrals from 16 nurses. And then right now out of that, we had six that have completed work. In this process, we've asked for surveys pre and post. We only have two surveys back right now. So kind of getting information is still a bit of a challenge.

There's a number of reasons why. You know, we had 31 referrals and, you know, only six of them are getting served right now. Some folks have moved away. Some folks we can't get a hold of. Some folks just haven't had the time to complete the application, like it's, you know, piled up on the counter with some other stuff and, again, it's not rising to the top.

In a large number of them, their landlord would not sign off. And so this was a big barrier because we can install really minimal measures without a landlord signoff, but those are not the measures that are going to have the big impact.

So I want to share a case study with you, and then I'll -- kind of an example -- another example and then I'll talk about some of our lessons learned and challenges

or recommendations, because we're still processing data to help inform other recommendations or programs.

2.2

But we had this one nurse who went out, made this referral to this gentleman. He has respiratory failure, congestive heart failure and renal failure. And this was last summer.

So if you all can reflect a little bit how hot it was last summer, and this is in Contra Costa County so it's a higher cooling degree days there. Maybe not as much as Sacramento, but I'm from Oakland so it's warmer for me.

So this gentleman got enrolled in the program. They went out there and his air conditioning was inoperable, and so that got replaced. Also, windows that could not open that were kind of sealed shut were made operable. So it allowed him to actually condition the home.

So I would say kind of the short of it, we probably prevented a number of emergency room visits throughout that whole summer. You could even say we saved -- his life was saved because of this, because he was able to be in that room. He was on oxygen 24 hours a day, and now he's on it just part-time during the week.

So there's definitely improvements. He was able to start walking, you know, again. Kind of some of these life-changing impacts.

One of the things that was also interesting for us is that deferred maintenance issues existed in that household. And while we could replace the air conditioning unit, we could not deal with the pest infestation.

And so, you know, this is one of our challenges. As I've heard a number of people talk about metrics and constraints on funding sources, one of the things, you know, we want to be able to do is when we get in the house -- outreach engagement is the highest cost. It's the hardest thing. It requires trust and confidence, and when we have that trust and confidence and we're in the door, we want to serve as comprehensibly as possible.

So in that, we need flexibility in funding. We need more coordination between funding sources and professionals who can deliver those services, because he's still -- those are things we can't address even though we had this other large benefit for him.

So as a side note, we've also been working with folks to do asthma in-home visiting programs and working with that. That's kind of a side to this one.

So some of our thoughts on this -- again, we're still in progress, we're still engaging this so we're still learning. There is a lot to learn. And so some of the things I can share with you today is, one, education is key.

Education is key for the client, the resident in that home. What is this benefit, you know, what's the value to you.

It's important for the public health professional making this tie of energy efficiency and health to understand these programs. And I will say and in particular for energy efficiency professional.

As I have talked and trained energy efficiency professionals and talked to them about the benefit of the work they're doing, you can see a switch in that mind-set of getting away from, you know, kind of a widget or kind of equipment, you know, delivery mentality to service.

And I think that's really valuable and just understanding the impact that they have.

I think it's really important to think about the accounting for the level of effort. And what I mean by that is for that client or for that customer, what's that level of effort for them to get involved. They can get asthma services a lot easier than they can get energy efficiency services.

So how do we do that and meet them where they're at. If they have to be home, if they have to take off work. What do they have to do to get enrolled or what kind of documentation to support their application.

If we really value this, then let's, you know,

create metrics or compensation or value for public health professionals and energy efficiency professionals to deliver it and invest in it.

2.2

We don't want unfunded mandates. We want to reduce the number of touches on homes, minimize the impacts on residents and maximize those benefits.

Gaps in funding are a challenge, as I mentioned. So we can increase funding, we can find new sources.

Again, it is an intersectoral issue, so we can leverage funding from multiple sources, and we can go beyond just GGRF, which I've heard from a number of presentations today.

We want to make sure that the funding addresses the need of the home. So if I'm delivering energy efficiency, there is that benefit. But that resident may also really love to have a handrail so they can get up and down their steps, you know, 20 times a day basically, in addition to having a reduced bill.

Pam mentioned, you know, funding and kind of climate change impacts to weather. And so I think if we think about funding tied to greenhouse gas emissions and funding, so that should allow us to increase the types of measures we can install in homes to have both those benefits, not just maybe direct GHGs that are calculated based on saved kilowatt hours or therms but broader so I

can do ventilation, so I could do pest and mold and moisture impact. Or I could also account for forward-looking weather data where I might want to do air conditioning in San Francisco because it's senior housing and it's getting hotter there.

I know I've got like one minute, so I'm going to close out just on a couple of things.

You know, we're working on collecting this data and so there are some things that I would say that are important.

One is metrics to support -- to driving this holistic work and also a collaborative process. I've heard that a lot today. We're better when you have this more integrated process like health and EE professionals.

We're trying to document the conditions of the homes so we know what problems we're trying to solve and what's the magnitude of them. So I think that's also useful.

We want metrics for the co-benefits and also for the population served. Serving these folks takes a lot of effort. It's not just a one-time call to schedule that appointment. It's multiple. And so if we're asking -- if we're targeting medically vulnerable populations as a population we want to make sure is served, then we want to have maybe metrics in there that quantify that and also

account for that level of effort.

2.2

We are trying to scale this and so we're doing that by continuing engagement with public health departments, folks like BARHII, which is Bay Area Regional Health Inequities Initiative. And they have a buildings group, which is awesome, so I go and talk to that buildings group and we talk about connection on what we can do in terms of advocacy and education.

And I think the more we try this, the more we will find out what doesn't work and other challenges to solve, things that may be unique to different communities and also things that can be consistently applied across communities and be more broad that could scale up to things at the state level.

And lastly, I think we just have to keep this balance of doing what is right and trying to serve as much as we can in parallel with trying to gather information and data to demonstrate.

COMMISSIONER GUZMAN-ACEVES: Thank you very much. You just gave a lot of different indicators that can be used to track.

And I think that's really perfect because we're going to hear next from in a way a little bit more traditional energy and transportation indicators and how we're starting to incorporate these health indicators

broader than what the Air Board has done for a long time.

Mental health in particular, one that you mentioned, that

we certainly aren't tracking at the Public Utilities

Commission.

2.2

So I'm going to ask each of our panelists to really focus on what it is that your effort is in terms of measuring and tracking, really get to that so we understand how you're measuring your progress.

So I'm going to start with the Aditya Sharma from the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power.

MR. SHARMA: Hi. Good afternoon.

So the Los Angeles Water and Power Board members and the leadership challenge us and then they also support us making sure that equity becomes part of decision making for pretty much everything from the decisions that we make around investing in infrastructure or the way we go out and service our customers or in our hiring processes, whether it's with gender equity -- so we started collecting data about a year and a half ago. And generally it seemed like we were doing a great job. But one thing that -- well, one thing I wanted to share here is the investment in the electric vehicle infrastructure, charging infrastructure -- electric vehicle charging infrastructure.

So we looked at all the government-owned and municipally-owned charging infrastructure. There are about

less than 500 in the city of L.A. And we put it on the map.

2.2

2.3

So once you put it on the map, you can clearly see places where there aren't any. So one of the explanations that was offered was, "Well, it's where people own electric cars." Okay. Great. How about these other places?

So we are using CalEnviroScreens demographics underneath it. So there are some disadvantaged communities that have no charging infrastructure. So we were asked to do some policy change.

And one of the new things that we're trying to do is, do we concentrate our efforts in places where people already have it or do we go with the idea of if you build, they will come?

So our new effort is to -- our plan was to put about 2,000 chargers by 2021 but now we're trying to put 10,000 charging stations as publicly accessible in government and municipally owned facilities, 10,000 chargers by 2022. And equity is going to be a component in decision making and making sure that the gaps that we saw are going to be addressed.

COMMISSIONER GUZMAN-ACEVES: Thank you, Aditya.

Okay. We're going to move Joel Espinosa (sic) with the Greenlining Institute. Excuse me, Espino.

MR. ESPINO: Hello. Okay. Good afternoon. My name is Joel Espino, Environmental Equity Legal Counsel with Greenlining.

2.2

We are a racial and economic justice nonprofit here based in California, been doing that work for 25 years. And around transportation, we've been pretty much on the cutting edge, so to speak, on equity and clean transportation since 2011.

And we've done that work in coalition with a lot of partners who are here in the room. Coalition for Clean Air is one of them through the Charge Ahead California Campaign and the California Climate Equity Coalition. And we have been involved in many efforts around just the EV equity pilots, the implementation of SB 1275. And we've also helped a little bit with these studies around clean transportation.

In terms of our current efforts there's definitely one thing that I wanted to highlight, a piece of research that we just put out in April that goes to the question directly around equity indicators, particularly around mobility and transportation.

But before I get there, I definitely just wanted to -- it's been a long day, right, but I think it's an important one and I just want to congratulate the Energy Commission and the CPUC and the ARB on putting this

together.

So I've been doing this work since 2014, and this is the first time where it's an entire day focused on the needs of low-income and disadvantaged communities. And I think we've come a long way, and I want to make sure we don't take that for granted because we're doing a lot of important stuff here.

And, you know, I was a philosophy major and a student of social change, so I like to start with big picture and then go a little about how what we are doing fits into that.

There's been a lot of comments throughout the day, and really what we're talking about here is a vision for change, right, that creates a society that's inclusive, just and fair, right, for everyone.

And I'm sure you all have gathered throughout the day, that's not going to happen overnight. In many ways, this is -- like a lot of work around justice, it is going to be a multi-generational effort really.

And so some of the commenters today have alluded that, and also what we're talking about here is like a systems change that we're talking about here, institutional change. And so that's a really complex thing to take on, and likewise as you've heard throughout the day, it's going to be a complex solution to tackle that.

And so I think we just need to be mindful of -these problems may seem big and like out of our hand. But
there are things that we can do now today, best practices,
that we can implement now and sort of lay the structures
and foundation for that change to evolve and kind of ignite
that transformation that we need.

There are things that we can do today and some of those have been talked about and mentioned already. But I just wanted to level set there.

And it was kind of with that thinking that we embarked on this project around mobility equity. So we put out what's called a mobility equity framework, how to prioritize people in transportation.

And we took that -- we didn't take that effort lightly. There was a lot of intention in terms of how we developed that framework.

And one of the ways that we did that was we developed a technical advisory committee and we wanted to make sure that a number of different voices were being represented on that.

We had folks from state government. Randall Winston actually was on that technical advisory committee. We had folks in philanthropy. We had folks from our environmental justice community. We had folks who were transportation justice advocates. And the list goes on and

on. Because for us, it was important that we were building off on existing stuff, right, existing efforts and not replicating efforts so that we kind of built as comprehensive of a framework as possible.

2.2

And, you know, because we are a racial and economic justice nonprofit, it was really important for us that that framework be centered on kind of three key principles: transportation justice obviously, which translates to a lot of the mobility stuff that's happening in access and providing lots of options; that it was centered on environmental justice so that we were promoting sustainable forms of transit, and also, you know, focusing on public transit options, those kinds of things; and economic justice.

And that's one thing that we heard in the panel previously is that there's a lot of investment happening, right?

And we need to leverage that opportunity to really help folks out of poverty and help our small businesses, as well, benefit from some of these opportunities. So those were the main principles that kind of shape our framework.

And so that's definitely one of the best practices that I like to mention here in terms of when you're looking for equity metrics and how to develop those,

obviously those have to be tied to some sort of objective or goal, right, that you're trying to achieve. And if you're asking the Greenlining Institute, those three principles are a good place to start.

And so are framework is built around those. And so I'll kind of walk through a little bit of how that shook out for us in the framework.

So the first goal around increasing access to high-quality mobility, that's our transportation justice goal. And what we found -- we did lots of research. We looked at equity metrics and metrics in general across the country and state to really hone in on like what are those metrics that people are using or agencies and advocates are using.

And so there are five that kind of bubble to the top and there were common across all metrics. So one obviously is affordability. Another one, accessibility; another one, efficiency; reliability; and safety.

So those are the equity indicators that we've come across to really ensure that we're meeting our objective of transportation justice, mobility, equity, whatever term you want to use.

On our goal around sort of reducing pollution and improving public health, it's our environmental justice priority. Obviously, clean air and positive health

benefits are like indicators in and of themselves but also reduction in greenhouse gases and reduction in VMT was another.

2.2

And then lastly, our last principle which is kind of, you know, really a key priority for us at the Greenline Institute was this principle around economic justice.

And so how do we enhance economic opportunity through our mobility investments. The indicators that we came up with there are connectivity to places of employment, education, services and recreation; fair labor practices; transportation-related employment opportunities; and inclusive local business and economic activity.

So this really gets to making sure that as we're taking on these investments, that we are also be mindful of generating an inclusive economic opportunity for everyone.

So, if folks want to share -- or learn more about all of the different details that went into the framework, I would suggest that you go to our websites. You can just Google "mobility equity framework" and that will come up.

And I'm just looking forward to questions and more conversation.

COMMISSIONER GUZMAN-ACEVES: Thank you, Joel.

Okay. And our final panelist is Maggie Witt with the California Air Resources Board. And then we are going to take some questions.

MS. WITT: Thank you so much.

2.2

Hi, everyone. I'm Maggie Witt. I work at the Air Resources Board, and I work in our research division.

And I have kind of a unique role on this panel here today because we're very early on in our process of developing our metrics. And these are metrics to try to assess our progress in helping to overcome the barriers to clean transportation and mobility opportunities for low-income and disadvantaged communities.

So we're at this place right now because we spent quite a bit of time on the outset working on developing our priority recommendations. And this activity, the metrics piece, is actually one of our supporting activities.

So we really wanted to work with the various participants on the task force to have a mechanism in place to first identify what are our priority recommendations and now we're at the place where we're actually implementing a lot of those. We've got our Governor's Office task force in place, and we're able to kind of take a step back and think about what are the metrics we want to use moving forward to try to track our progress and keep track of our implementation efforts as well.

So with that said, today I'm mostly going to be sharing information about our plan process, and so I just want to put that out there so everyone knows how you can

participate moving forward in our development of these metrics, because I think that they will be very important in helping us understand the progress that we're making and any changes that may need to be made along the way and how we proceed in implementing our recommendations.

2.2

So metrics development is something that is really important to our agency as a whole, so I don't want to forget to mention that. In addition to the metrics for our SB 350 progress that we're talking about today, ARB is also working a lot on developing metrics for tracking our progress on SB 375. That will be coming in a report to the legislature this year. Also tracking our progress in the California Climate Investments Program and down the line in the AB 617 program too.

So we realize that trying to develop these metrics is going to require really strong inter- and extraagency coordination and collaboration. And then also we feel strongly that we need to work with the communities, as was done in developing our Barriers Report and really talking to them to understand, from their perspective, what are the barriers to clean transportation and mobility access.

So we want to do the same here with the metrics to make sure that what we're tracking is really the things that matter to the community and also make sure that the

metrics that we choose are things that resonate with them and are understandable and can be easily digested by all involved.

2.2

So far, you know, as I said, we're early on the process. But because of that, we want to really thank the CEC for the work you've done on the energy equity indicators. I think that provides a really strong foundation upon which we can build as we're putting together our metrics.

I think there are examples. I'm sure many of you have seen their report and their website. It's very cool. You should check it out. There are many examples in there of things that I think really tie very closely to the things that we'll be interested in, so I'm sure we will be building off of those. And we have already started the process of working together and developing what we plan to put together.

So I don't have much in the way of lessons learned for, you know, what we -- since we haven't done too much to date on this besides just some conversations and working together. But I can talk a little bit about where we are currently with our efforts.

So what we've done so far is we have been putting together an inventory of the different types of metrics that are used in other programs, and so I'm looking at Phil

(phonetic) right now because it's no coincidence that the work I've done so far is kind of organized around your accessibility-related indicators. And looking also to some of our other state agency partners to see what they have been able to put together to date so that we are not reinventing the wheel, so that we're looking at what's been done before.

So from our perspective, the purpose of developing the metrics is twofold. It's really to measure progress over time and addressing the barriers and increasing access. And it's also in measuring progress and implementing the SB 350 recommendations. So that includes incorporating lessons learned along the way. So we do really appreciate any work that has already gone into this effort.

The first step is currently underway, and so our next step we hope is to be able to go to our stakeholders and partners and share with them what we've found as far as metrics that we think, based on things that have already been put into place that makes sense moving forward.

And we also really want to be very deliberate in putting together a public process in coordination with communities and others to try to help us shape what those metrics will look like.

Okay. So I think that covers most of it. I just

want everyone to know that we are really going to look forward to working with you all on putting together what will be this kind of suite of metrics to help us moving forward.

We are really encouraging all of our partners to reach out to us. We're always open to one-on-one conversations with you to talk about your ideas moving forward. And I'm sure we will be reaching out to you to talk to you more about what will go into our public process, our consultation with stakeholders and reaching out to communities as we develop these down the line.

Thank you.

2.2

COMMISSIONER GUZMAN-ACEVES: And also, this reminds me, I think everyone's mentioned the utilization of the EnviroScreen, so we should give recognition to CEJA for all their foundational work that we're all building upon.

I just want to do a quick shout out to them.

So I want to turn to the dais to see if there are any burning questions.

CHAIR WEISENMILLER: This is Bob. I was just going to make a couple quick observations.

One is that the fourth climate assessment is out. There is a study in the fourth climate assessment -- I think Pam can fill you in -- on sort of cool roofs and the impact there in terms of public health. And that was

discussed back at the national academy event. It's certainly pretty interesting.

2.2

But, again, just building off of your comment was that we were forecasting not only higher temperatures but more extreme temperatures, so that will certainly have big public health impacts.

COMMISSIONER RECHTSCHAFFEN: I had a question for Aditya.

You said that when you did the map of EV charging stations, it starkly indicated where there were and where there weren't. And we benefitted from your presentations over the past couple years in this group and otherwise.

And I'm wondering, are there other instances where spotlighting the disparities in provision of services -- because you also deal with reliability services and clean energy products and so forth -- has resulted in subsequent policy actions or changes by LADWP?

MR. SHARMA: A couple of other glaring things that popped out was -- one is solar. All right. So one was solar, the distribution of where the solar panels were going and very similar result to electric vehicles.

So we're expanding our community solar program to offer solar energy to communities that didn't have access to it before, so that program is underway. It's being developed.

And another one was gender equity in some craft works where traditionally it's mostly men. They're good paying jobs so the question was raised, why don't you have women in these positions.

The first answer that came back was, "Well, women don't generally take these." The next question was, "Well, has it been offered?" And "Well, technically yes."

I think it's more around just saying there is a job for you versus going and talking to people at an early stage and saying that "If you get in this field, these are the advantages that you can take over your career."

I think that's what we're doing now. We're going and talking to high school students. We're going to different women's colleges and conferences and highlighting the benefits of some of these craft jobs. It pays very well and anybody can really apply for it.

COMMISSIONER SCOTT: This is Janea Scott. And I had a couple of thoughts here. One is I really like the energy equity indicators that Pam and her team put together.

If you are a data geek, or even if you're not, it's a really fantastic tool. It's got a lot of different layers in it, and it presents itself in a way I think that's most useful to whoever you are and why you're looking for the data.

So if you're looking for, you know, electric charging, if you're looking for CARE customers, if you're looking for -- there's all kinds of layers that you can pull forward. And if you're looking also for where gaps are, as LADWP has also pointed out, you can kind of see where those are.

So if you're a policymaker and you're thinking about where do I need to target programs or where should I consider targeting programs -- so I just want to put in an extra plug for that for Pam and her team for putting that together. It's a fantastic tool. So if you haven't looked at it, take a look. You could geek out on it for a whole afternoon for sure.

You know, also, Joel, I wanted to follow up with you a little bit on your mobility equity framework. It's something that the Energy Commission also thinks about a lot as we're putting out our dollars through the Alternative and Renewable Fuel and Vehicle Technology Program or through AB 8.

And are there -- so it fits in really nicely with the metrics and the things that we're measuring, but I also think that there are principles in there that the Energy Commission and other agencies should be sure that we're incorporating in solicitations and other things that we -- when we're putting out grant requests for funding and --

are there some that you would highlight for us?

MR. ESPINO: Yeah, absolutely. And really that was the vision behind the framework because in one way it's a measuring device, but it's also a way to ensure outcomes, right? And so for us that's definitely our vision and that's definitely the next phase of our work, is to do more advocacy around and talk to various state agencies about this.

And I think one I'm sure you've heard me say a lot in the past is -- and I'm glad Sarah White was here -- is just to really look at the economic opportunities of all this stuff. I think that that's something that's really hard for agencies.

I know that you all kind of have your own expertise and so when someone says "economic opportunities" and you don't know what to do, it's kind of hard not to -- it's hard to kind of incorporate that and figure out how to do it.

But there are very easy ways to make sure that through your solicitations, through your contracting that your putting in language that ideally is requiring but at least like encouraging contractors and people when they're building out their partnerships, to partner with groups that have, you know, a training base in low-income areas, for example, or that they're actually contracting with

minority- and women-owned businesses, right?

So there are things that we can do there to really maximize the economic equity pieces of this. And so that's why I think our framework was very intentionally -- we put that in there because traditionally when we talk to transportation justice folks and environmental justice folks, the economic piece is not one that naturally comes out. And so we basically -- the whole thing is like we don't want to miss an opportunity here because there's a lot of money being put into these investments.

So I would say, you know, look. One is that we're definitely looking forward to reaching out to you all to figure out if there's ways that we can incorporate some of that into your existing work. But, you know, take a look at some of the economic -- economic equity pieces of that and figure out what are ways that the Energy Commission here and others can incorporate some of that.

COMMISSIONER SCOTT: Other questions from the dais?

Yes, Richard.

MR. COREY: I'm going to follow up on the same question because you all know this, it comes up all the time with respect to these programs, are economic opportunities that are being created.

Clearly, there are substantial opportunities that

are being created by the policies in the state. We have the EV manufacturer here, zero-emission bus manufacturer here, zero-emission trucks and so on, in response to those policies, I would absolutely assert that. But then when you start to drill down and job creation, who's getting the jobs, what are the numbers, it gets challenging.

And we get those questions many times at hearings, and it's an area that I know that all of us want to answer correctly I think and more robustly and an area where I'm personally much -- very interested in independent analysis, better data, along those lines because I actually think we're understating the opportunities that are being created. But I know there's a sensitivity about attribution and how rich that underlying data is.

So thoughts on approaches, what we ought to be -how we ought to be proceeding to pull that kind of
information together or others, academic or others, would
be really helpful on this account.

MR. ESPINO: Yeah, I think that's a great point and I would just harken back to what Sarah White described. We've been engaging with her office, and Greenlining and other folks are really interested around this jobs question, because we know it's also very -- it's a political thing too, right? People want -- legislators in particular want to say "This is the jobs that I created by

supporting this." And it gets really dicey with, you know, guaranteeing "X" amount of numbers out of an investment.

2.2

And so Sarah's approach about we first need to assess what is the opportunity and then kind of build a plan towards that without like putting the cart before the horse, so to speak.

So there's a lot of I think -- I'm very hopeful in terms of the document that she's creating. That will hopefully cut across all the different agencies and really develop concrete like best practices, steps, assessments, different phases that need to happen first.

COMMISSIONER GUZMAN-ACEVES: I just wanted to add to that last point. Something that I'd like to really continue to look at jointly with all the agencies is the local workforce force component because a lot of times we get limited in our particular set of investments on the benefit to the ratepayers that are funding for this. And those same ratepayers have a public health benefit that's a little more tangible to folks. But the local job component is not always as tracked and tangible because it's not always local.

So I think that's an opportunity for us to further quantify the benefit to the ratepayer if we're able to set up those opportunities.

COMMISSIONER SCOTT: So yes, my understanding is

1 that we do not have any blue cards from the room for public
2 comment.

Oh, okay. So, yes, let us then turn to public comment. And I also think we don't have any on the WebEx, is that correct, but just the one in the room?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes.

2.2

COMMISSIONER SCOTT: Okay. Perfect.

Please come up to the mic. Please introduce yourself and make your comment.

MS. LONDON: Hello, my apologies for not filling out a card. My name is Jody London. I'm the sustainability coordinator for Contra Costa County. So thank you Amy for highlighting our partnership.

I just wanted to let you know that we are actually going to have a CivicSpark Fellow joining us shortly in Contra Costa County to really build on the work that we started to do with our health department and are planning department in terms of figuring out where we have more opportunities to use our social service programs to educate clients about the energy programs.

And then specific to that point, a few years ago
I was much more involved with all of these energy
efficiency topics, so I don't know as many of you as I used
to. But I would suggest that it would be really helpful
for you all to think about the metrics that you're using to

evaluate these programs and pick the ones that are easiest, because right now there's some disparities between the metrics that are used in Energy Commission programs versus PUC programs.

2.3

And as you heard several of your panelists describe today, it's very challenging for people who aren't used to these bureaucratic processes to navigate them. So I would just really encourage you to think about that.

Final point, to your point Commissioner Guzman Aceves, we actually in Contra Costa County are in the process of entering into a contract with the Energy Commission for an EV readiness blueprint planning process. And one component of that is going to be a workforce development program that we plan to develop in Eastern Contra Costa County with our workforce development board and the Pittsburg Unified School District, which is located in a disadvantaged community.

So we're excited to come back in the future and tell you more about this work.

COMMISSIONER SCOTT: Thank you.

Any other public comment?

Okay. Seeing none, please join me in thanking our wonderful Panel 4.

Okay. And from here, we are going to move on to some closing remarks from Alana Mathews of the Energy

Commission, Supervisor John Gioia from Air Resources Board member, and Commissioner Cliff Rechtschaffen from the Public Utilities Commission. 3

1

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

They will talk with us about the path forward for addressing energy and transportation equity. And let's give them just a moment to get settled at the table and we'll go from there.

Okay. I will let you all take it away.

MS. MATHEWS: Hi. This is Alana Mathews. prepare just a little slide so I'll wait for that to come up, because trying to wrap up everything that was presented today, I didn't want to be distracted and ramble.

So I guess I'll just start out by saying, you know, a long time ago my mom always said "You don't know where you're going if you don't know where you come from." So I think today is great that we've had an opportunity to look at all of the accomplishments that we have had so far, to highlight the progress, because that will actually help us move better more effectively.

So just a few things that I wanted to point out of where I think we can celebrate where we have come from is that we've improved our understanding of clean transportation and energy barriers.

There's been broader collaboration and partnerships. That was mentioned in -- I think almost every workshop we heard a lot about -- not workshop, every presentation, how they've had community engagement, how they've learned from that. And that led to adjusting policies and programs so that you won't give away iPads if you really should give out a roll of quarters or things like that.

2.2

Also, that we've been able to explore new and innovative and transformative approaches, and that were seeing some real results in progress on the ground.

So I just want to give everybody a hand for the work that we've done, but I do want to point out one main point.

And if we can go to the next slide.

I think this illustrates it. So I'm sure everyone has probably seen this graphic before with the equality, showing everyone has an equal box to stand on. And then we've seen equity where it's adjusted.

But there's a third one that's always missing.

And I don't know if everyone has seen that. Sometimes it says "Liberation," but I'm going to change it and say

"Engagement." And I think that that's really important.

So engaging the community members, the disadvantaged community members in addition to our stakeholders.

And the way that would look, I think, moving

forward is that if we have a solicitation, a program where there is going to be a solicitation, we need to make sure that in the requirements, there's documentation for effective disadvantage engagement.

2.2

Whether that looks like letters of support -- but there needs to be fundamentally embedded in there something that assures the agency that there's a cultural competency as well as the trust. So if they're going to go to doors, people are going to open it up and they have an effective partnership.

With workforce development, I think the comment was made that not every funding award can have a workforce opportunity connected. But I think we could explore.

Maybe it can. Maybe it can be a job shadow program. Maybe we can work with you as a partner with schools.

So that's the last thing I wanted to talk about is just making sure that we are engaging the community effectively so if there are other issues such as gentrification or historical barriers like redlining, racism, we are addressing that, and we're not afraid to have that conversation and look at the ways.

And the last thing that I'll say is that if you notice the person who is the tallest, they've been engaged the longest. They've always been able to see what's going on over the fence.

And so will we adjust our policies, we not only have to bring someone to the game to be able to see it but equity in engagement really means catching them up because they wouldn't know, oh, this is the fifth inning if they haven't been able to see. They don't know the rules of the game.

2.3

So when we do those policies, we need to make sure that equity and engagement takes into account historical barriers as well. Thank you.

MR. GIOIA: Good afternoon. I'm John Gioia, and I serve on both the California Air Resources Board and the Bay Area Air Quality Management District.

But I think most importantly, I've been representing Richmond and live in Richmond. I've represented it for the last 20 years on the Contra Costa Board of Supervisors. So I get to be in the unique position of figuring out how to help implement a stated regional policy at a local level that respects and listens to local communities. And as you know, Richmond is an environmental justice community. We're highly impacted by a refinery, a chemical plant, by port, by rail. And so really all the issues you're talking about are really relevant to communities like Richmond.

And I want to start by expressing great appreciation for all the agencies and all the stakeholders

work in this area. This is vitally important to the success of our climate protection strategies in California.

2.2

And what I'm going to say to highlight is really nothing you haven't heard, but I think it's important to highlight because I've learned a lot in listening over the last 20 years to what people want to see out of these types of policies.

And my favorite quote from a speaker today was one of the speakers on a panel earlier this afternoon said "Co-benefits don't just happen. You have to design them intentionally to have equity."

And I think that's really so true. So we have to think about it. We have to be conscious.

And communities don't want to just be part of public participation. They want to be part of the process. They want to have a meaningful voice that they're shaping the process. So trust and relationships are really important.

And they want to see progress. So a lot of these goals we're talking about which are long-term are great, but they want to see the co-benefits today in the short term. Co-benefits like better health outcomes, healthier communities, healthier individuals, better air quality.

And on the issue of air quality -- and I think you all know this -- that to have air quality improved

equally across the state isn't enough because it maintains the disparity in air quality between highly impacted and less highly impacted communities. Air quality needs to improve quicker in highly impacted communities for people to see that they are being -- that there is a responsiveness to their communities and not maintaining the disparity.

2.2

And that's why investments need to continue to be prioritized into highly impacted communities. The communities that bear the burden need to also get the highest priority and that's why the AB 617 work is so great. And I think we're all looking forward to that.

The other co-benefits. Yes, better economic and employment opportunities, a just transition to the cleaner energy economy, how everything we're doing -- and someone earlier at a panel talked about not just a job but quality well-paying jobs. That's really vital to the just transition, which also means lower income communities need to benefit from the rebates and incentives that are being offered to everybody. And that's why it's great that there's a higher rebate to lower income for the clean vehicles.

There is a great pilot project that the Air
Resources Board has that kicked off in the Bay Area that
will hopefully expand statewide, which is really financing

for lower income residents for cleaner vehicles.

And one thing that was learned -- that's being learned through this process is -- and it really ties to the issue of multifamily housing. This is all connected -- is because many lower income communities don't have robust EV infrastructure networks, many lower income people live in also multifamily housing, that under this pilot program more lower income residents were choosing the plug-in hybrids, not the all electric.

So thinking about that, even as we look at rebates and incentive, understanding that we need to be responsive to the demands of a particular community.

So again, these are highlighting things that you already know, but I'm really optimistic and I appreciate the focus on multifamily housing. That's an issue we're grappling with in communities in the Bay Area that we've seen, especially with regard to EV infrastructure and the affordability.

So thank you for really holding this and continuing this good work.

COMMISSIONER RECHTSCHAFFEN: My assignment here is relatively limited, which is good because Alana I think did a very good job of outlining and summarizing what we've heard today and where we've come from. And Supervisor Gioia provided the vision, as he always does, on these

areas quite eloquently.

We having -- many of us or a number of us worked on the passage of SB 350. It's very gratifying two years later to see so many concrete examples of how it's playing out. Now, we can already look at lessons learned, paths forward, how to do things better, where we're spending our money and so forth. And that's terrific.

What I wanted to mention something we're doing at the PUC that really carries out Supervisor Gioia's vision and what he said so well, which is that we need to make progress in impacted communities more quickly than in the rest of the state.

We have launched and publicized at our last Disadvantaged Communities Advisory Group an environmental and social justice action plan, and we are going to be circulating it and getting further comment from agencies and the public.

And it's a broad strategy. It builds on everything you've heard today and the work of SB 350, but it's -- in some ways it's border, reflecting the broad mandate we have at the Public Utilities Commission, all the areas that we regulate and also the fact that if -- you can't have a strategy in this area unless you talk about environmental justice, social justice and economic justice. And that's a theme we heard very consistently throughout

the panels today.

2.2

At a very high level what our plan contemplates is that we will use all of our planning and regulatory tools to advance social and environmental justice. And that includes targeting clean energy investments and resources in environmental justice communities, particularly where we can improve air quality doing that, focusing on increasing climate resiliency in low-income and disadvantaged communities.

As we know and we heard earlier, these communities will be the most vulnerable from climate change. Enhancing enforcement and consumer protection in environmental justice communities, promoting business and workforce development opportunities.

And we are starting now for the very first time to do some of what you heard from Sarah White, think about incorporating labor standards and workforce development agreements in our programs.

We also -- the policy also calls for us to improve access to high quality water communication and transportation services in environmental justice communities.

And importantly there's a pillar that calls on us to do more internal training and more staff development so that our staff is better sensitized to these issues.

And finally to monitor our environmental and social justice efforts. We're behind -- we don't like to be behind the Energy Commission let alone the LADWP, but we're behind. We don't have any -- we don't have robust set of indicators. We will need to develop those and I think we can learn a great deal from what's been done to date.

2.2

So that's what we're doing. I think Commissioner Scott in her closing is going to talk about some of what we'd like to do collectively going forward, including with next Administration.

But this policy that is going to be vetted over the next few months through workshops and otherwise gives you some idea of our commitment in these areas.

COMMISSIONER SCOTT: Thank you very much for the thoughtful wrap-up of a really informative and great day.

I appreciate you taking -- all of you -- time to make a few remarks for us.

Let me turn to the dais up here and see if anyone else would like to make some closing remarks.

CHAIR WEISENMILLER: I was going to just make a brief comment. I want to thank everyone today for their participation, for the record.

Redlining came up a number of times and I was just going to suggest everyone think for a second. Peter

Hanson who was Governor Brown's banking commissioner back in the '70s who eliminated that -- we lost him to AIDS in the '80s.

2.2

MR. EARLY: Thanks again. Bryan Early, Advisor to Commissioner McAllister.

And on behalf of Commissioner McAllister, I just wanted to thank Commissioner Scott for leading on this and your staff and everyone at Air Board and PUC and everyone involved in putting together this workshop and participants for traveling here to discuss this very important topic and really look forward to meeting again in the months and years to come and sharing results. So thank you.

 $\label{eq:commissioner} \mbox{COMMISSIONER HOCHSCHILD:} \mbox{ I really think} \\ \mbox{everything has been said.}$ 

COMMISSIONER SCOTT: All right. I do have a couple of thoughts, which hopefully have not already been said.

But let's see, I just -- you know, I really do want to say thank you again to everyone. I think the idea for today was to provide you all with a status update on the progress that we are all making together on implementing the recommendations that were identified in the barriers reports, you know, barriers report Part A that the Energy Commission put out on the barriers for low-income communities being involved in energy efficiency and

renewable energy. And also Barriers Study Part B that the Air Resources Board put out, same topics but related to clean transportation.

2.2

And I wanted to make sure that you all had a chance to either pick up or take a look in the docket for the drafts that we put together. That's kind of the report out on the implementation progress. So those were sitting on the front table as you came in today, and they are also up on our docket.

This is kind of our succinct summary of everything that you heard today. What we really wanted a chance to do today was focus in on a few of the recommendations, talk to you a little bit about what the agencies have accomplished, and then give some case examples, right?

There are things that are taking place in the real world right now to address those barriers. And so we wanted to have more of a dialogue as we talked with all of you about that. So thank you for bringing a great dialogue.

But if you're looking for just a succinct summary that follows -- not barrier 1 but Recommendation 2 or Recommendation 3, that's what we have also put together for folks to be able to follow.

I did want to say that the lead agencies on this,

which is the Energy Commission, the Public Utilities

Commission and the Air Resources Board -- I have spoken

with Commissioner Rechtschaffen and also with Executive

Director Richard Corey who is not here but I talked to him

before he left.

2.2

You know, we very much continue to make sure that our agencies work together on this, work well together on this. We look forward to working with the new Administration to build on the many successes that you heard about today, so the three of us make that commitment to all of you to get that done.

As I mentioned, you can find that succinct summary at the front table.

And I just want to do a couple thank-you's. I want to thank our panelists and our engaged participants in the room and on the WebEx today. It just made for I think a really fantastic dialogue.

And I also want to thank Rhetta DeMesa from the Energy Commission, Tabetha Willmon from the Air Resources
Board and Alice Glasner from the Public Utilities
Commission, as well as the IEPR team for putting together this really great, thoughtful conversation that we all had today. So thank you so much for that.

And we all look forward to continuing to work together in partnership to implement these really important

1 recommendations and keep putting solutions in place. 2 Let me just check. We did say that we would take 3 public comment at the end of the workshop, so I don't think 4 we have any blue cards in the room. 5 Do we have anyone on the WebEx who wanted to say 6 anything? 7 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: 8 COMMISSIONER SCOTT: Okay. So with that --9 MS. MATHEWS: I don't have a public comment 10 but --11 COMMISSIONER SCOTT: Yes, go ahead. 12 MS. MATHEWS: -- I did want to invite you to 13 mention that the Disadvantaged Communities Advisory Group 14 is accepting applicants. 15 COMMISSIONER SCOTT: Thank you very much. 16 will you remind people how they can find that information? 17 MS. MATHEWS: You can go to either the Energy 18 Commission's website -- we have a Disadvantaged Advisory 19 Group webpage and so does the CPUC, and all of the 20 information is available there. And applications are being 21 accepted through September 21. Yes. 2.2 Or you could see me afterwards. 23 COMMISSIONER SCOTT: So I just want to call your 24 attention -- it's up on the WebEx. This tells you when the 25 comments are due.

We love to hear from you, so please, if you didn't make a public comment today but would love to give us information, we'd love to hear from you.

This shows you how to do it. The written comments are due next Wednesday, September 12th. And the slide that you see on the screen here, which will also

I don't know about you all, but I think it's been a great workshop when my brain is chock-full of provocative

likely be in the docket, explains to you how to get those

information and we also end a little bit early.

So thank you for being here today. We're

13 adjourned.

14 (The workshop was adjourned at 4:37 p.m.)

2.2

## REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

I do hereby certify that the testimony in the foregoing hearing was taken at the time and

place therein stated; that the testimony of said witnesses were reported by me, a certified electronic court reporter and a disinterested person, and was under my supervision thereafter transcribed into typewriting.

And I further certify that I am not of counsel or attorney for either or any of the parties to said hearing nor in any way interested in the outcome of the cause named in said caption.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 8th day of October, 2018.

Juliana Link CER-830

## TRANSCRIBER'S CERTIFICATE

I do hereby certify that the testimony in the foregoing hearing was taken at the time and place therein stated; that the testimony of said witnesses were transcribed by me, a certified transcriber.

And I further certify that I am not of counsel or attorney for either or any of the parties to said hearing nor in any way interested in the outcome of the cause named in said caption.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 8th day of October, 2018.

Barbara Little Certified Transcriber AAERT No. CET\*\*D-520