



December 11, 2013 Meeting Minutes DRAFT

Council Members Present: Chair Ken Alex, Director, Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR); Vice-Chair Bob Fisher, Public Member; Deputy Assistant Secretary - Bonds and Grants Julie Alvis, California Natural Resources Agency (CRNA); Secretary Matt Rodriguez, California Environmental Protection Agency (Cal/EPA); Associate Secretary for External Affairs Jim Suennen, California Health and Human Services Agency (CHHS); Undersecretary Brian Annis, California State Transportation Agency (CalSTA); Secretary Anna Caballero, California Business, Consumer Services, and Housing Agency (BSCH).

1:05 p.m.

Agenda Item #1: Call to Order

Chair Alex called the meeting to order. Agenda Item #9 is moved to the next meeting since Louise Bedsworth is in Washington, D.C.

1:06 p.m.

Agenda Item #2: ACTION: Approval of the November 5 Meeting Minutes

Council Member Rodriguez motioned to approve the minutes. Council Member Caballero seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

1:07 p.m.

Agenda Item #3: DISCUSSION: Executive Report

Mike McCoy, SGC Executive Director: The SGC will be hiring a Regional Advanced Mitigation Coordinator, which is a new position. We have hoped to do this for quite a while. We will work with both the environmental and regulatory divisions of the state and federal government, and local, regional, state and federal infrastructure producers, and try to find ways to create more meaningful biological offsets, while at the same time, speeding up growth and project delivery to enhance economic development. Certainly High Speed Rail (HSR) will be one of its focal points, but work will also include activities on the renewable energy portfolio, CalTrans lines,

water projects and others, and the ability to work with regional and local governments to bundle these things and get more bang for our mitigation buck is in the future.

Chair Alex: I should note that this is a difficult job to do—certainly we have good candidates—but it is a tough job to change the orientation of project from a project-by-project mitigation mode and looking at it on a regional level, is not an easy thing to do.

McCoy: That is certainly true. The science has been with us on this for a little while. We are sure how these big scale mitigation processes can work, but the policy end is very challenging. We do have wonderful candidates, and we have high hopes.

The barriers to infill—we selected the contractor and have nothing to report yet, except that we have picked the right contractor and we are getting terrific cooperation from our member agencies.

Infrastructure planning will be Agenda Item #10. Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) Self-Assessment will be Agenda Item #8.

On the UrbanFootprint front, the Governor's Office of Planning and Research has allowed us to work with the University of California, Davis, to design curriculum and begin testing curriculum with county Geographic Information System (GIS) staff and MPOs that aren't currently using the model. The next challenge is to take people who have not had any exposure to the model and develop curriculum with them to begin disseminating broadly. This is progressing as we begin identifying and selecting trainees. This will take place through winter and early spring. We will update again in early March 2014.

The 2013 request for proposals for Round Three of the Sustainable Communities Planning Grants and Incentives Program was posted on Friday December 6th. The closing date is February 28, 2014. We look forward to working with you and your staff to selecting the best applicants.

Outreach will be the Agenda Item #5. Geospatial data coordination and data contracts is Agenda Item #7.

In Health in all Policies (HiAP), we included brief description of current activities from HiAP in your binder. This program continues to be a leading example of what can be done nationally. We will regularly include their reports in our proceedings. Do you have any questions, please don't hesitate to ask.

Finally, for this High-Speed Rail station area planning, a number of local regional governments and number of nonprofits have asked the High Speed Rail Authority to support community-based, locally-led, participatory planning in the areas beyond the immediate vicinity of the stations, High-Speed Rail has worked well with local jurisdictions on High-Speed Rail station area planning. They have asked to expand the program to beyond immediate vicinity of the

station and look at how we can optimize benefits of High-Speed Rail to beyond the station-stop cities.

1:13 p.m.

Agenda Item #4: DISCUSSION: Council Communications and Updates

Chair Alex: Any updates from Council Members?

Undersecretary Annis: I have a few updates: highway, rail and active transportation. For highway rail, CalTrans put out an update to the Main Street California Guide, which specific to state highways that are also local main streets. The intent of the guide is to help communities fully access state facilities for more local and community purposes and to play a role in the design of these facilities. Please take a look at your convenience. This presents opportunities for infill development discussions.

You may have read court decisions related to High-Speed Rail. I wanted to mention those. Some articles are confusing. There are two rulings by Judge Kinney. In one ruling he was looking at 2011 Funding Plan for HSR that articulated the plan to the Legislature, which was made to appropriations in 2012. The judge suggested there were are a few things to fix, and the High Speed Rail Authority (HSRA) believes it is fixable. HSRA will resubmit the plan. The second ruling has to do with bond validation. The court is looking for changes in how the bond committee puts together their certification to going forward with bond sales. The Authority will be fixing this; this is fixable.

The last one was the Federal Surface Transportation Board (FSTB) that requests the regulatory agency to do conditional approval of the current five-mile segment of the HSR track that is currently under a construction contract that is south of Fresno, which is south of the existing environmental approval of the area from Fresno to Merced. In that case The FSTB prefers the state come in after final environmental document is certified from Fresno to Bakersfield and that is anticipated in spring 2014. So that was a process step that the FSTB wanted us to go through in lieu of an advanced or conditional certification.

Regarding active transportation, I wanted to make sure everyone is aware the California Transportation Commission (CTC) put out draft guidelines on the program. These are the guidelines for the program that the legislature approved in the summer per SB 99. These preliminary draft regulations and are following a good model from the California Air Resources Board (CARB) with Cap and Trade Auction Proceeds to have plenty of public outreach. They have done five public workshops and have had additional public discussion. The program cuts across SGC agencies, with a provision to use of California Conservation Corps at the Resources Agency, and has historically worked well with the Department of Public Health on some of the non-infrastructure, educational parts of active transportation. I'm happy to report that process is going forward with lots of public outreach.

Chair Alex: Thank you. Any other Council updates?

Vice-Chair Fisher: Nancy McKeever will be leaving the SGC on Tuesday, December 17. Nancy has been with SGC for two years. Thank you for your hard work. You have been enormously helpful. Nancy has led the data project, and working with me on infill work. We will miss you. Thank you for everything you have done.

There is the MPO Self-Assessment which will be covered in Agenda Item #8.

The infill financing project is underway with consultants. Nancy and I just met with Linn Warren from Department of Housing and Community Development who will be leading that project. We will hopefully have good results. We will have a good understanding of what's available on the financing side with recommendations on what we need to do to further infill. Financing has been identified as a key barrier to infill development. Look for a final report some time in March or April of 2014.

Chair Alex: Yesterday the Natural Resources Agency issued a draft report called Safeguarding California. It is an update to 2009 adaptation plan on infrastructure and adaptation to climate change. This is a very extensive update and close to 300 pages. This is a hugely important issue for California, and if you are interested, I strongly urge you to take a look. We are going to take comments and have workshops. The final report will be completed during first or second quarter of 2014.

Council Member Rodriguez, CalEPA: Hearing Brian, I was reminded of the lawsuit with ARB over the Cap and Trade program, which concluded with the Superior Court since our last meeting. The court found that ARB had not exceeded its authority. The Cap and Trade fund have been upheld. We will be looking for a plan consistent with our Investment Plan that was adopted last year for expending those funds. Additionally, there was another auction held without any problems in November by ARB. The Province of Quebec held an auction early this month without any problem. It looks like the Quebec and California programs will be linked with California next year, which means Quebec allowances will be accepted in California and vice versa. A date for a joint auction has not been set yet, but we should be prepared to do so sometime next year. There is significant progress on the Cap and Trade front.

A small group of us—a delegation of three from California—were invited to attend the Conference of the Parties (COP) in Warsaw, Poland, on climate change last month. We were invited to speak on 12 or 13 different panels because there is a great deal of interest on what California is doing on climate matters internationally. There are not a lot of binding agreements but there is work being done at the sub-national level. It was interesting to exchange information and learn about programs globally, and this was a prelude to the conference next year in Lima, Peru. We will see where we stand next year.

Chair Alex: The next item is Agenda Item #5.

1:24 p.m.

Agenda Item #5: DISCUSSION: 2010 Planning and Monitoring Allocation: Update on Existing Outreach Initiatives and Emerging Priorities

Liz Grassi, SGC: I will be summarizing outreach projects and their outcomes, and talk about the concepts staff will bring to key staff to bring into consideration for future funding for outreach efforts. To view the presentation made to the Council, please click [here](#).

Regarding the local coordination project, which began March 2010, is 95% complete. The regional project indicators, which was for \$200,000, is complete. We are working with ARB on the Funding Wizard grant tool. \$125,000 was allocated and this tool is 65% complete.

There was a pot of \$600,000 for Council priorities. Since then, the three projects that were approved by the SGC are: The 2012-2014 Strategic Plan, Sustainable Communities Strategies MPO Self-Assessment, and the Infill Finance Analysis. There is \$220,000 to date that have been approved for projects.

An additional \$400,000 in March 2010 was allocated for state grant administration coordination project, and the state agency learning network project. Since then these projects have been taken off the table, so that funding is still available.

The local government outreach agreement was done with UC Davis and the Institution for Local Government (ILG). It included support for ILGs Sustainable Communities Learning Network website, the California Resources for Sustainability (CARES) project tool, which looked at best planning and sustainability best practices of cities and counties. There was also a survey and assessment of sustainability practices in local jurisdictions, and there were grantee case stories of how they used their grant funding.

The Funding Wizard is in its second phase. We have worked with ARB. ARB maintained the back-end of the tool and increased topics and categories. We have improved how we are collecting data about grants, especially on federal grants. We pay for web hosting. This is ending in June 2014, and we are continuing to pay for this platform until 2015.

The regional indicators project provided the recommended indicators and methodologies for the development of the 2013 California Regional Progress Report. They also worked with MPOs on how they were applying indicators for their Sustainable Communities Strategies.

Ms. Grassi then went over future outreach projects for consideration, which include Sustainable Communities Planning Grantees Education and Collaboration Program, Promote Local/Regional Collaboration to Implement Sustainable Communities Strategies, Technical Assistance to Rural

Governments, Funding Wizard Phase III – Promoting State Grants and Incentives, and UrbanFootprint Training and Education. She also discussed helping grantees find other sources of funding to move forward and get their projects funded.

Vice-Chair Fisher: How do we assess whether these are useful?

Grassi: We spent \$1.5 million to date on all of these projects. For all of these projects we try to add internal measures. For examples for the Sustainable Communities Learning Network, we looked at how many of our grantees used the network and attended webinars. We conducted a grantee survey and learned about how they were using the funds we have given them and what their needs are. We have also conducted a survey for the Funding Wizard—most of the projects include a review of the process. We are including a review and analysis.

Vice-Chair Fisher: It would be helpful for SGC to know what we are measuring future grants. This would help us have a check and balance to get success, and learn to do something differently if needed. The more metrics we can use, we should strive to measure possible metrics as a discipline.

Council Member Caballero: It would be helpful to have a chart to show the value of the work, objectives, and what we have achieved in a concrete fashion.

Allison Joe, SGC Deputy Director: The presentation of the outreach was a high-level report. We can follow up with you with more information.

1:35 p.m.

Agenda Item #6: ACTION: Reprogramming 2010 Planning and Monitoring Allocation

Joe: We are asking you to approve the consolidation of the two categories: Data and Information, and Outreach, into one program. Looking at previous Council action in March 2010, there was approval of \$4.4 million in two categories. The first looks at the Data and Information contracts, \$2.3 million in Data and Information, and \$1.9 million in Outreach. To view the presentation made to the Council, please click [here](#).

Chair Alex: The math does not add up to \$4.4 million.

(Note: The unaccounted for \$200,000 was identified as SGC Data Project Management. For more information, please review [the amended staff report](#).)

Joe: The Data and Information Program we funded four projects, which included cost savings, particularly for the parcel data project, with a balance of \$350,000.

In the Outreach program, we have funded three of these projects in its entirety: Sustainable Communities Learning Network, Regional Progress Indicators, Funding Wizard Phase II, and a portion of the Council priorities. The remaining balance is \$765,000. There is \$1,115,000 in remaining funds.

The recommended action is to: Approve reprogramming the unencumbered \$1.15 million appropriated for Planning and Monitoring of the Proposition 84 grant programs to a single program category supporting projects focused on and integrating Data, Information, and Outreach.

This provides flexibility and support for some of our local grantees. We hope to acknowledge when some of the projects do not move forward.

Chair Alex: To clarify, on Agenda Item #6, you have identified \$1.5 million of unused funds, and you want to integrate “Data and Information” and “Outreach,” and the next item you will have proposals on how to spend some of that money?

Joe: Yes, this is more administrative.

Chair Alex: We will take up the first issue of consolidating the funds. Any questions, comments, discussion?

Deputy Assistant Secretary Alvis: For the language, “\$1.15 million appropriated...” it should say allocated, because this would be pending appropriation through the budget in order to enter into contracts. Just to clarify.

Joe: We will make that change.

Chair Alex: Is there a motion?

Council Member Caballero motioned to approve Agenda Item #6 (with “appropriated” removed, and replaced with “allocated”), and Vice-Chair Fisher seconded the motion. The motion was passed unanimously.

Chair Alex: You have consolidated your funds.

1:42 p.m.

Agenda Item #7: ACTION: Priority Data and Information Projects

Nancy McKeever, SGC Senior Program Manager: For Agenda Item #7, we are requesting the staff to encumber Proposition 84 Planning and Monitoring funds for the following priority Data and Information Projects: 1) Fine-Scale Vegetation Mapping: \$150,000; 2) Public Health, Urban

Design and Transportation Data and Analysis: \$125,000; 3) GIS Data and Tools Collaborative: \$50,000 (not to exceed \$25,000 per year for two years). The total is \$325,000, and it is within the total of SGC's authority for planning and monitoring. We will be joined by speakers from each project.

The first project is the Fine-Scale Vegetation Mapping project. We are joined by Dr. Todd Keeler-Wolf, Senior Vegetation Ecologist from the California Department of Fish and Wildlife. He directs the Vegetation Classification and Mapping Program. Dr. Keeler-Wolf got both degrees from UC Santa Cruz. To view the presentation made to Council, please click [here](#).

Dr. Todd Keeler-Wolf, California Department of Fish and Wildlife: We classify vegetation areas. Then we take aerial photographs to classify the vegetation area. We superimpose our vegetation information on the fine-scale map. Within each different colored polygons is the name of the vegetation, icons for structural attributes such as color and height. This work supersedes previous work. A detailed and accurate vegetation map allows planners to avoid or reduce unnecessary habitat destruction and costly litigation when siting developments or large infrastructure projects. There are many uses of the detailed vegetation maps, such as regional conservation planning and land management, monitoring or predicting landscape level changes, etc.

We are speaking about the gap in the Tehachapi corridor, which is biologically important, important wind energy area, and transportation corridor for migratory birds.

Dr. Keeler-Wolf explained how the Tehachapi area is within the Desert Renewable Energy Conservation Plan (DRECP). Wind energy development is significant in the eastern portion of the corridor as part of the DRECP. There are a lot of impacts from the potential High-Speed Rail corridor. We are looking for funding from the World Wildlife Conservation Corps. We are looking for funding from the DRECP. This is a jointly funded documentation, with half from the SGC.

This is the Tehachapi loop. This is an important corridor. Since it is most likely the High-Speed Rail corridor, it will impact vegetation in that area.

Vegetation data is useful for assessing local and regional impacts to vegetation communities. Much of this is compliance information: Native Plants Protection Act, California Native Species Act, and CEQA guidelines.

This methodology and contractor has been used to produce the Northeastern Sacramento Valley map. The accuracy is well above 85 %. These are reliable maps. We hope to work with the same contractors.

Chair Alex: Seems like you have briefed the Governor last year. What percentage of the state have you mapped?

Dr. Keeler-Wolf: We have mapped about 48% of the state that does not have high urbanization or agriculture focus, something like 40 million acres. We are getting there—it has taken us 15 years to get there.

Vice-Chair Fisher: Do you figure this on a cost per acre?

Dr. Keeler-Wolf: It's about \$1.50 per acre. We think we could do map 200,000 acres for \$150,000. We are requesting that amount from SGC. We probably need an additional \$150,000 in kind and other funding

Vice-Chair Fisher: What are the other sources of funding?

Dr. Keeler-Wolf: Primarily it's in the department. We received \$4 million grant from the Wildlife Conservation Board, which we are just about through. They have granted us another at least \$1.5 million for this work and adjacent projects in the southern foothills. We have gotten some money from other state agencies to a smaller degree like state parks to do some of their mapping and collaborative work with federal agencies to do their mapping, like the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) and Forest Service, and National Parks Service.

Council Member Caballero: What is the sequence of tasks you undertake when you map?

Dr. Keeler-Wolf: We collect samples and conduct a GIS analysis. That builds a plot database and we establish samples of 1,000 square meters. Then we analyze this data. We build an identification key.

McKeever: We propose the SGC to approve \$120,000 of Planning and Monitoring funds for the Technical Advisory Committee on Public Health, Urban Design, and Transportation. To view the presentation made to Council, please click [here](#).

Joe: We have been discussing the role of public health at the regional level and several stakeholders. MPOs have been using scenario planning tools to develop land use alternatives, such as Fresno. There is increased interest from regional and local governments, public health officials, and stakeholders in correlation of urban form and public health. There is a need for common understanding of how these are integrated: scenario planning tools, application of data and methodologies, and the context of analysis, and how they relate to public health.

SGC staff proposes a coordination of those efforts to leverage cross-sectoral expertise and data. We hope to leverage two existing data sets from the California Health Interview Survey (CHIS), and the California Household Travel Survey (CHTS).

In addition, we have been discussing the refinement of methodology—develop common understanding of strengths and limitations of data and methodologies in the context of

scenario planning tools. Specific to public health, we are looking at some methodological challenges. We need consensus on approach to activity-based indicators, and direct application of methodology to a variety of scenario planning tools.

We propose to convene a Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) to establish data standards, review existing tools and methodologies, and develop suggested algorithms for associating public health variables with land use scenarios. We plan to convene the TAC with support from OPR and California Department of Public Health. We recommend testing TAC recommendations in a representative scenario planning model and bring results back to TAC for review. We hope to do is apply these recommendations for UrbanFootprint and use that as a test case. This would authorize staff to convene this group, to cull the data, do some analysis and discussion and allow for some iterative work to apply those applications.

Chair Alex: What is the outcome from using that model in conjunction with this public health piece?

Joe: It depends. For the physical activity component, you can look at a land use scenario, and say it's a more compact environment, you can look at the public health impacts, such as the reductions in obesity.

Chair Alex: So if you have a scenario that has higher densities and more access to public transportation, the public health module, you would expect to show, where you have more ability to walk, bike and take transit, that it has an impact on public health.

Joe: And we have the data to leverage that.

Chair Alex: So you have access to data to make the tool more sophisticated?

Joe: Yes.

Council Member Caballero: While I want to support getting data that tells us how to build our communities so people are healthier, the whole health issue is complicated. People can live in active community but still consume McDonald's every day, and they are still going to be fat and in bad health. I'm worried about placing too much emphasis on the built environment as the only thing, or one of the major things, we have to do get people to be healthier. In reality we have adopted unhealthy lifestyles. I support getting some of this information, but I am concerned about developing it into a model. Where we add it to CEQA and we hold up our developments based on a belief that if we build it this way, we will get the outcome of healthy children and healthy families. I hope that makes sense, and there are so many components of this. We need to build our environment to be more people-friendly and if we build up and not out, we need to think about how to make people feel safe walking and being active in it.

Joe: I agree, this is one important component of the puzzle. What we might want to consider perhaps in future efforts, how this information is applied, and what it means, and understand the limitation of analyses, and what we are not considering.

Council Member Caballero: Particularly since we looking at already built environment, maybe there are ways we could redo the environment, such as safe routes to school, and have resources for it.

Chair Alex: A couple of observations: This is what HiAP (Health in All Policies Task Force) is designed to do, to integrate health policies. Safe routes to school and complete streets can be part of scenario planning as we rebuild existing environments. This is just one piece. Thank you.

Joe: In the staff report, this is a review of the tools and methodology.

McKeever: The third project that we are asking the Council to consider is the GIS Data and Tools Collaborative: \$50,000 (not to exceed \$25,000 per year for two years). The past collaboration has worked well. This would be an interagency agreement with the UC Davis Information Center for the Environment (ICE).

McCoy: Since 2000 or 2001 the state has had one body or another that has advised on data and geographic systems and investments. These institutions have come and gone. We do not have one right now and since about 2010. Why we need organized input and we make a lot of decisions on this and we make a lot of investments. There are many competing methodologies available for scientific community and we would like to pick the right ones for state investment. Scott Gregory, myself, and a few others, have done unscientific sampling of friends. This is not a systematic or effective way to continue. Some of the expenses of maintaining are beyond our resources and need. We have come to the conclusion with people that have participated and the prior collaboratives and who have participated in UCD-led program with parcel data on our behalf, what might be the middle path that would get us the advice we need from top-tier professionals in the state, get it to us quickly and in a consistent fashion? What we decided is not only have our needs changed, times have changed. We are living in electronic communication era and we believe we can use listserv technology and select top-tier professionals representing local, regional, state, federal governments and nonprofit organizations that participate in GIS systems and assemble them on a volunteer basis. This is a community that has proven it will stand up and do this, we just need to provide leadership toward convening. That is what we are asking for today.

McKeever: Is Scott Gregory here?

McCoy: Scott is not here. But we have the support of Department of Technology and Scott Gregory.

McKeever: From California Health and Human Services Agency, Jim Suennen.

Assistant Secretary Suennen: Secretary Dooley apologizes for not being here due to a conflict in schedule. For Public Health Module, HHS has been working collaboratively with SGC staff and recognizes there is very strong importance to moving UrbanFootprint forward. The public health module is a very good piece of that. The review by our Department of Public Health (CDPH) revealed some shortcomings in a couple of components: The obesity piece could be shored up, the pedestrian injury piece has flaws and needs to be based more on exact science. As a result, we feel this is a strong opportunity to not reinvent the wheel and use this as a short-term, focused effort to bring together public health officers and public health stakeholder leaders to ensure that the science is there, and that it reflects the needs of Californians, but that it has the data integrity for our county health officers to work with that, and as a result, allows them to work more effectively with the MPOs. Secretary Dooley asked “Why not allow it to go forward?” And there were enough key examples to allow this collaborative work, the technical advisory committee, to go forward.

Chair Alex: Thank you very much.

McKeever: That concludes our presentation and action items are ready for discussion.

Chair Alex: Is there public comment on this item?

Public Comment on Agenda Item #7

Chair Alex: The first person is Will Barrett, followed by Gordon Garry.

Will Barrett, American Lung Association: We believe planning decisions are public health decisions. I am representing 26 organizations which support this recommendation. We have been working over the last few years to illustrate health benefits to the state, local, and regional officials. We find that the message resonates, and even more so with local data. The health module is the type of tool we need to tell the story and help folks understand the impacts of land use and planning decisions. This tool helps people become better informed about their health outcomes. We urge the SGC to dedicate funding to the UrbanFootprint tool for this module to help inform the next round of SCS planning. We look forward to working with you, the SGC staff, and stakeholders during this technical review process, to ensure that we have the highest quality data to build healthier communities in California

Chair Alex: Thank you. Gordon Garry, followed by Chanell Fletcher.

Gordon Garry, Sacramento Area Council of Governments: We urge your support for the public health module. This project will make a significant improvement in the analysis of the interaction between land use, transportation and public health and as you have heard, we will be able to add that analysis to the suite of other areas on transportation, land use, energy, climate change, that are a part of scenario planning tools, not just UrbanFootprint. This project

is in collaboration between sectors, health and transportation, the NGO community, and state agencies. Taking advantage of all the knowledge from these sectors will make for a better product as well. Thank you.

Chair AlexL Chanell Fletcher followed by Liz O'Donoghue.

Chanell Fletcher, Climate Plan: We support the public health module. In the future, we hope SGC will expand the UrbanFootprint capabilities to support all the state's planning priorities. A robust UrbanFootprint will lead to strong and more comprehensive Regional Transportation Plans (RTPs) and Sustainable Communities Strategies (SCSs). We look forward to working together to ensure that UrbanFootprint is one tool furthers the goals of SB 375 and sustainable communities.

Liz O' Donoghue, The Nature Conservancy: I am here to support two items on the agenda. First, the vegetation mapping tool. The Tehachapi region has significant importance for connectivity. It is ground zero for the migration of plants and animals, and is also important as we face climate change. Focusing on this region is very smart. The level of data that exists is very coarse.

Agencies and developers can use this data to reduce their risk and expedite their projects. On a lot of infrastructure projects, developers lack this data, and don't find the data until toward the end of project. It's more expensive to not have the information up front.

I support the Public Health Module. As California grows, it should address the needs of public health. It is important to make sure that the sketch modeling tools reflects the state's planning priorities including conservation and social equity.

Sandra Spelliscy, Resources Legacy Fund: I am supportive of the second project on Agenda Item #7. Our organization works with philanthropic community to develop projects that implement SB 375. We worked with MPOs and community organizations and invested resources to develop better technology and co-benefits of reducing greenhouse gas emission for sustainable development. If this project is approved it is a huge step forward for public health, and for community groups to understand the modeling and convey to their decision-makers what they want to see in projects.

Jeanie Ward-Waller, Safe Routes to School National Partnership: I support the Public Health Module. We find the data is lacking on how kids are travelling with Safe Routes to Schools.

Chair Alex: I will make a comment. I want to mention the poor stepchild of this trio—the GIS data tools collaborative. As we look at the data in government—Geoportal-based data, many questions come up—how is data viable? Having some modest funding for a couple of years will help us figure these tough questions.

There are many modules related to health scenario planning. The conservation module and a few others need additional data. It is fair to say that the public health module could have a significant impact on how scenario plan works.

Vice-Chair Fisher: The (SGC) Council is placing more and more importance on UrbanFootprint. We need a semi-annual report on who is modifying and managing system. The more we put into this, the more reliant the state and MPOs become reliant on this system. Not sure how best to do that—I will defer to you Ken.

Chair Alex: This is an important matter. It has implications for High-Speed Rail, other transit, how we grow as a state in urban and rural areas. We need to make UrbanFootprint more user-friendly and accessible. We need at least a semi-annual update and an ongoing item to keep the SGC up to speed on the UrbanFootprint.

We can entertain a motion on items individually or all three.

Council Member Caballero motioned to accept staff recommendations for all three action items. Vice-Chair Fisher seconded the motion. The council approved the vote unanimously.

2:38 p.m.

Agenda Item #8: DISCUSSION: Metropolitan Planning Organization Sustainable Communities Strategy Self-Assessment Update

Nancy McKeever (SGC), Larry Mintier, Mintier Harnish (consultant firm on project) and Ted Holzem, Mintier Harnish, presented a self-assessment update on the MPO SCS. Ted Holzem discussed the progress of RTP and SCS to data and went over meeting schedules with core MPOs from Southern California, Central California, and Northern California. They are summarizing the notes and reviewing the feedback with the participants. They are working to input the feedback into the report and will share the recommendations from the report at the March SGC meeting. Mr. Holzem briefly discussed the SB 375 research efforts among local and state government agencies. Topical issues that were addressed include GHG reduction targets, models, data, and performance measures, Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) determination and methodology, environmental review, local government collaboration, public engagement and education, and resources for effective SB 375 implementation.

Council Member Caballero: Are there any documents being prepared for the SB 375 research efforts?

Holzem: Our efforts are shown in the green bar on the slide #5 (To view the presentation, click [here.](#)) We are producing a report.

Council Member Caballero: The state is great at coming up with reports, but it is not clear who uses the reports. It might be a good idea to bring this back. Since this is research efforts of SB 375, we need to determine how the research efforts direct the activities that will be involved in silos.

Joe: The details of various research efforts reflect the different components. We will continue to make an effort to track and work with other agencies on the needs of that.

Vice-Chair Fisher: Would it not be wonderful if the law could be amended to solve all these simultaneously?

Joe: This goes back to the coordination of our implementation efforts.

Council Member Rodriguez: Each of these reports has a different focus, and each agency has a different relationship with different goals to achieve. It would be a good idea to have all reports brought together and perhaps provide us some guidance. We need to see if the conclusions are consistent. We need to analyze if they relate to one another.

McKeever: One of the reasons for compiling the chart was to help the people in the workshop understand that there were different roots and different research projects.

Chair Alex: Thank you for compiling the reports.

Council Member Rodriguez: I remember working with Larry in 1981 at OPR. My takeaway: You can work at OPR and have a good future. This is a positive message.

Chair Alex: I'm not sure there is a future when I hear that. Agenda Item #9 is deferred.

Public Comment on Agenda Item #8

Bill Higgins, California Association of Councils of Government: I want to thank Larry Mintier and staff. Some of the MPO staff were hesitant at the beginning. It helped that there were couches out there. It was an interesting exercise. It was credited to your staff to identify the other reports and do a self-evaluation.

2:53 p.m.

Agenda Item #9: DISCUSSION: SGC Review of Five-Year Infrastructure Plan Process

Grassi gave a quick overview of the five-year infrastructure plan and the 2010 results of the infrastructure reports from various departments.

Vice-Chair Fisher: So the total is \$52 billion comes from CalTrans and High-Speed Rail.

Grassi: They currently have the bonds.

Vice-Chair Fisher: Schools are not included in there? Do you know how much schools spend?

Grassi: No. We will find out.

Vice-Chair Fisher: It would be helpful to understand what other large capital outlays are included in this.

Grassi: Okay. So our process was to review the process with the Department of Finance, and discuss with SGC agencies' departments about methods used to analyze consistency and examples of submission. Kate White will speak to this.

Deputy Secretary Kate White, CalSTA: From an external perspective, if the five-year infrastructure plan is public, coordinated, integrated, and measured against the state's planning goals, it has the potential to be a very positive tool to elevate and promote the public benefit of the departments' work.

From an internal perspective, there is an advantage to having a simplified process of reporting on consistency. This is valuable for agencies to consider having a comprehensive and analytical document.

Chair Alex: This is a tough process. Do you see ways to integrate this into the process with Department of Finance? Do you think needs to be big changes?

White: The state's planning goals are not well known. This is an important way to ensure that department's plans are consistent with that. There are some internal advantages to helping. If we have a clearer process, it will help streamline our work.

Alvis: SGC charge is to review and comment on plan. It sounds like plan moved beyond that. It looks like we are looking at multiple processes of the plan. I think I would be interested in knowing that Department of Finance is fully on board with any review of the current process that happens. Also, any discussion about infrastructure and investment should connect with the Department of General Services – Real Estate branch. It would be helpful to assemble a group of impacted departments to address what we are trying to remedy and what is the current process.

McCoy: The Department of Finance did ask us to review the five-year infrastructure plan in February 2013. Other than the review, we were terse. There is no documentation in the plan to come to a conclusion about whether any of the effort has been made. We were convinced that good review was being done. It was not being well publicized.

Grassi: SGC could be helpful in streamlining looking at what agencies are providing and how those are being communicated. Is there a way to take the information the departments are providing for us, and continue to convene with department staff in a way that is helpful?

Council Member Rodriquez: What is the end product?

McCoy: It depends what the SGC wants the review to look like. Assembling the review in a public way will communicate the planning priorities of different departments.

Council Member Rodriquez: Are we submitting a comment letter on the plan?

McCoy: We don't know.

Council Member Rodriquez: We need to know our objective, and what we are trying to produce at the end of the process. When are we supposed to get our comment in?

Grassi: There is not enough data.

Council Member Rodriquez: We need to know our ultimate obligation, and when we need to produce the document. It would help us to know what questions are being asked. This could be a useful process to identify if state agencies are having appropriate input into the state's infrastructure process. It raises the question whether the SGC is the appropriate avenue.

McCoy: We will definitely pursue that.

Undersecretary Annis: Are these only state projects?

Grassi: It is money that is paid for by state funds.

Undersecretary Annis: I'm not sure if we fund a housing project that is not on the list? A lot of the projects are state facilities to house state workers.

Grassi: We might have transportation and water and buildings.

Undersecretary Annis: In statute, if there are over 200 workers, it has to be in an infill-type transit. DGS is heavily involved in ensuring the requirements are being met.

Grassi: In local planning there are many considerations. We are thinking about communicating how we choose infill sites, determine siting projects. Is this document a clear vehicle for understanding state spending on infrastructure?

Chair Alex: With the Safeguarding California report, net building requirements, etc., there are many layers. It is not obvious to how it is being done and how it is being communicated. It

makes sense to figure this out. I would request figuring this out in structured way to figure out where we can have the most impact in the process.

Council Member Caballero: I don't want to use this meeting to go through each project to identify how each decision was made. We need a clear understanding of our purpose. Perhaps there is a way to do this through communications.

Grassi: That's because it's at the discretion of the legislature. At a minimum, we need to discuss the factors.

Council Member Rodriguez: We need to know our options for fulfilling this requirement.

Public Comment

Robert Oqilue, Change Lab Solution: I meant to comment on the Public Health and Urban Design of Agenda Item #7. As SGC determines how to review its five-year infrastructure plan, some of the earlier projects could be useful to gather for helping to analyze the data. I urge drawing connection between the data projects that were just approved with the five-year infrastructure plan.

Chair Alex: You should consider that a priority for us as well.

Michael Warburton, Public Trust Alliance: Mr. Warburton discusses being conscious of climate change impacts and seeking alternatives to fossil fuels. He states that his organization holds resources in public trust. State trustees are prohibited from transferring to private use. California and Quebec shouldn't feel so smug about it. Infrastructure financing processes look more like a mecca. He states that the Public Trust Alliance calls attention to the public trust doctrine for natural resources. He is working with PUC right now to get companies to be smarter about water systems.

Chair Alex: A few of us have litigated some public trust matters in the past. Let me ask you to wrap up and give a chance to other public comments.

Michael Warburton, Public Trust Alliance: Public trust is important.

Chair Alex: Liz O' Donoghue is next.

Liz O' Donoghue, The Nature Conservancy: The five-year infrastructure plan looks incomplete. It does not include education among other things. As a stakeholder I think it is not helpful. For the SGC to exist, SGC should help guide concept of sustainability throughout the state's expenditure that impacts infrastructure. There is not a lot of transparency. I hope SGC will do more than just comment, but also to be engaged in development of the project and plan.

Jeanie Ward-Waller, Safe Routes To School National Partnership: School facilities and federally funded transportation projects are not included in the five-year infrastructure plan.

Chair Alex: The SGC cannot change that. For example, school infrastructure has a different budgeting process, which is the same for courts and other things, which is why it is the case.

Ward-Waller: I understand, but the SGC is tasked with looking at these indicators and issues. Also, I want to support looking at the Environmental Goals and Policy Report.

Chair Alex: Thank you. I want to reiterate our thanks to Nancy McKeever for her years of work with SGC, and wish her happy retirement.

We wish everyone happy holidays and see you in new year.

3:36pm

Agenda Item #12: Meeting Adjourned

Chair Alex adjourned the meeting.