

CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION  
EQUITY ADVISORY ROUNDTABLE  
MEETING #6 April 29, 2022, 1PM -4PM  
MEETING MINUTES

---

**Tab 1: Roll Call**

Connie Stewart  
Ivette Torres - *Absent*  
Jacob Babauta- *Absent*  
Jasmine Leek  
Jerard Wright  
Keith Bergthold- *Absent*  
Kiana Valentine  
Lena Morán Acereto- *Absent*  
Leslie Sanders  
Nailah Pope-Harden  
Randy Torres-Van Vleck  
Rio Oxas – *Absent*  
Rodney Fong- *Absent*  
Ruby Acevedo- *Absent*  
Russell Rawlings- *Absent*  
Stephanie Ramirez  
Tamika Butler

---

**Tab 2: Welcome and Reflections from Previous Meetings**

C. Sequoia Erasmus, California Transportation Commission Assistant Deputy Director of Equity and Engagement, and Amar Cid, California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) Race and Equity Program Manager, began the meeting with a moment of gratitude.

C. Sequoia Erasmus (Commission Staff): Led the meeting with a welcome and heartfelt “Thank You” to Roundtable members for making time to attend the day’s meeting to help close out this iteration of the Equity Advisory Roundtable, in addition to the work undertaken to make the Equity Advisory Roundtable a more equitable space since the kick-off in February 2021. C. Sequoia acknowledged that the Roundtable’s input helped shape the Statewide Listening

Sessions, SB 1 funding guidelines update process, and that work will always remain to better incorporate equity throughout the planning activities undertaken by all three agencies.

C. Sequoia Erasmus extended a “Thank You” to all the staff and leadership at the California Transportation Commission, Caltrans, and California State Transportation Agency, the language translators, Commissioners, and members of the public for Roundtable engagement.

Amar Cid (Caltrans Staff): Gave a Caltrans “Thank You” on behalf of Jeanie Ward-Waller, and conveyed Jeanie’s gratitude for the partnership that the Commission has had with Caltrans and the California State Transportation Agency. Ms. Cid thanked the Commission for making the Roundtable space accessible, from which conversations within Caltrans have been generated about how to do equity work across the agency, not only within the Office of Race and Equity. Amar also extended a “Thank You” to Commission staff and the Commissioners for the continued engagement around equity. Amar also shared how equity at Caltrans is not a top-down approach but rather an “all-hands-on-deck” situation, which will be reflected in the upcoming update on the Statewide Listening Sessions (Meeting Agenda, Tab 4).

---

**Tab 3: Meeting Minutes from February 3, 2022**

Rebecca Light (Commission Staff): Presented the meeting summary minutes from the February 3, 2022, Roundtable meeting. These minutes were shared with Roundtable members and posted online April 19, 2022.

No suggested edits or comments were received.

Final meeting minutes will be posted on the Commission’s website at the following [link](#).

---

**Tab 4: Update and Discussion on Statewide Equity Listening Sessions**

Amar Cid, California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) Race and Equity Program Manager, and Carolyn Abrams, Caltrans Priority Populations Program Manager, provided updates and shared high-level takeaways from the ongoing Statewide Equity Listening Sessions.

Amar Cid: Amar described the start of the Listening Sessions as a tri-agency collaboration to engage executive leadership with communities outside of existing communication channels and build upon the equity efforts that were already underway. The first iteration of the Listening Sessions is comprised of six meetings in different geographical locations throughout the state. The following is a list of those locations.

- Kern County (Arvin/Lamont) – March 24, 2022
- Lake County (Lakeport/Kelseyville/Clearlake) – April 19, 2022
- East Bay (Richmond) - TBD
- Imperial Valley (Calexico/El Centro) - TBD
- Inland Empire (San Bernardino) - TBD

- Los Angeles Portside (Wilmington) - TBD

Carolyn Abrams (Caltrans staff): The remaining four sessions are being scheduled with the help of local community-based organizations (CBO) that have partnered with Caltrans. Carolyn acknowledged that the only remaining location without an identified CBO partner is the Inland Empire. Contact with prior CBOs in the area were exhausted due to CBO scheduling or capacity issues. So, identifying contacts with other CBO groups that would be willing to partner with Caltrans on the Listening Sessions would be appreciated.

To impart the importance of these Listening Sessions, Carolyn described the efforts undertaken to engage in these important conversations. Carolyn shared that scheduling of the Listening Sessions revolved around the preferred schedule and meeting times of the CBO partner, which takes precedence over executive leadership and staff schedules. This also means that, in some instances, the Listening Sessions are not held during traditional working hours in favor of evening meetings or may take place during the traditional lunch hour. Additionally, the sessions are tailored to the needs of participants by ensuring American Sign Language and Spanish interpreters are available at the meetings. This aims to increase the accessibility of the sessions to the public. As needed, such as the Kern County session that took place in March, the meeting can be facilitated in Spanish rather than English to better reflect the community participants. In this case translation was provided for the agency staff and leadership in English.

Carolyn continued to describe the trust building efforts being undertaken regarding partnerships with CBOs. Carolyn acknowledged that the CBO partners are expending their own social capital in recommending these sessions and bringing in members of the public to participate, and so the agencies are sensitive to that fact. To alleviate any potential difficulties, Carolyn stressed that the agencies are being thoughtful regarding any inquiries or expectations they communicate with the CBO and community members, as well as ensuring any promises made by the agencies are promises that will be kept. Furthermore, Carolyn reported that the pandemic was incredibly difficult for many CBOs, and to ensure CBOs are fairly compensated for their time and efforts the hourly rate granted to contractors is applied to CBOs for this effort. These efforts tie into the overarching goals of the agencies engaged in the Listening Sessions to be transparent in operation and commitments.

Carolyn then described the first two Listening Sessions. The first Listening Session was in Kern County, and held in partnership with the Center on Race, Poverty, and the Environment. There were over 30 residents and local leaders on the session, with the session simultaneously given in Spanish and ASL. A few high-level themes from the meeting include:

- Dangerous conditions for disabled residents
- Limited or no maintenance for pedestrian accessibility
- Major concerns with rail crossings and freight movement
- Excessive noise pollution and congestion issues
- Rural, small, low-income communities are not prioritized

The second session was in Lake County and held in partnership with Lake County Chamber of Commerce and the Lake County Economic Development Corporation. Approximately 20 residents and local transportation professionals joined the session, all of which were residents of Lake County. Some of their high-level concerns included:

- Representation and inclusion of Tribal members in planning process
- Frequency and availability of bus and transit systems need to be increased to be viable transportation options for residents
- Unsafe conditions created by limited, narrow corridors
- Access to area Reservations
- Chronically ill and aging population living in poverty have unique needs

Amar Cid (Caltrans staff): Added that after each session that took place, and anticipated for each remaining session, was a question of, “What are the next steps?”. Staff are looking at future opportunities for continued engagement or site visits so executive leadership can get a deeper understanding of those unique issues faced by those communities. All the agencies are making a commitment to begin work on the next steps to determine the best avenue for continued engagement after the initial six Listening Sessions, and the current consultant contract expires.

Randy Torres Van-Vleck (Roundtable member): Are there additional locations planned after the initial six?

Carolyn Abrams (Caltrans staff): The six sessions cannot possibly cover the entire state, but they are providing us an initial starting point to begin, particularly for priority populations. This first step is the gathering of community feedback. Afterwards, work will begin to figure out how to go back to those communities to report on that feedback, provide an update of where the agencies are in the process of incorporating equity into agency initiatives and agency work. Beyond that, site visits for the six locations, community tours, smaller meetings with communities and their community organizers, and additional Listening Sessions may be scheduled. These initial six sessions are our jumping off point, from which we will, with the communities, determine what the next, best course of action is.

Amar Cid (Caltrans staff): The consultant contract, which is helping us schedule and shape these initial sessions ends this summer. District 4 Wood Street community has requested a listening session. There is a lot of interest from our partners, especially in the rural areas, who want an opportunity to connect with staff, and we are hopeful that these opportunities will be led by the district staff who operate in their region or area.

Randy Torres-Van Vleck (Roundtable member): Who is the consultant team?

Amar Cid (Caltrans staff): ICF is the consultant team.

Leslie Sanders (Roundtable members): There are many tribes in Humboldt County. Was the Lake County session only for those county residents, or were all northern tribes invited to this session?

Carolyn Abrams (Caltrans staff): Short answer- Yes, it was only for residents or Tribes within Lake County. We've come back to this question multiple times, which is "How do we create an inclusive space in which we inevitably exclude interested participants, but still ensure these are meaningful conversations so that there is some level of geographic or population focus." Ultimately, we decided to only hold sessions for these six areas, specifically for participants located in the regions. However, if there are folks who want to participate in the session and feel strongly about joining, despite not being from the identified location, we are open to extending the virtual space to them if they contact us to request a spot. In this instance, to answer your question, yes. Outreach and engagement for this session was exclusive to Lake County. Follow up conversations will not limit us to only these six areas, and so opportunities in the future will allow us to cover additional geographies and participants.

Amar Cid (Caltrans staff): We had questions and comments about inclusion of tribes in the area, which were shared at the Caltrans District 1 Tribal Summit.

Leslie Sanders (Roundtable member): The Native American Advisory Committee (NAAC) would be a wonderful place for you to engage tribes located up and down California. I attended the NAAC meeting and did not hear anything about the Lake County session. With the number of tribes in that region, from Klamath to Shasta to Humboldt, in addition to Lake County, the experiences are so totally different. Only inviting tribes from the specific area does not capture the breadth of Tribal experience for rural, northern California tribes.

Amar Cid (Caltrans): Thank you for your comment. We did make multiple announcements at the NAAC and had help from folks at Caltrans District 1 sharing information with interested stakeholders. There was a discussion early in the process about potential "outreach fatigue" experienced by Tribal groups since the Governor was also holding different listening efforts. We do try to strike a balance between not overburdening any one community with multiple sessions and partnering with different agencies so that we aren't holding multiple sessions with the same groups of people. There is still much more work to do to ensure we reach the people we need to. Over the next few months, we're going to figure out a better way to engage those tribes and folks we will not hear from in these initial Listening Sessions. Thank you, Leslie, for your comments.

Jasmine Leek (Roundtable member): Jasmine thanked Carolyn for mentioning the ways staff is looking to partner with CBOs and recommended engaging with regional transportation planning agencies (RTPA) as another potential avenue to get in contact with CBOs. Jasmine also thanked Amar for the comment about multiple state agencies approaching communities, because it is important to recognize the difficulty that comes with meeting fatigue. Jasmine recommended a different meeting model to reduce this fatigue, which entails gathering multiple state agencies into a single space on the same day. This allows the community to

engage with all those agencies on multiple topics and doesn't require multiple days of commitment. Lastly, Jasmine thanked Sequoia for traveling down to Stockton to engage on a project being undertaken by the Third City Coalition and remarked how the presence of a single staff person can have a positive impact by meeting with multiple people from different agencies.

Carolyn Abrams (Caltrans staff): Thanked Jasmine for her comment and shared that the suggested option of reaching out to the RTPAs for help connecting with CBOs is an option that has been explored. Carolyn noted that in utilizing these agency connections, there is a balance to be maintained between inviting planning-focused professionals or elected officials which can overwhelm the number of invited members of the public, which may limit how freely those from the public choose to share their opinions.

Jasmine Leek (Roundtable member): To clarify, I don't mean recruit participants from those agencies, but rather utilize their knowledge of their local CBOs to make connections and recruit from the CBO's contact list, or perhaps the RTPA could share a list of CBOs who regularly attend the meetings, make public comments, or perhaps sit on various community boards or committees. That connection to the CBO, through the RTPA, can help you find members of the public to participate.

Carolyn Abrams (Caltrans staff): Thanked Jasmine for the clarification.

Connie Stewart (Roundtable member): In rural areas, we see the state partnering with organizations that don't have an equity lens in their community, such as the economic development agency that was the partner for the Lake County session. Connie urged for connections and partnerships to be made with rural CBOs, rather than economic development agencies, simply because equity-based CBOs have an equity lens in their work and connections.

Connie also responded to Amar's earlier comment regarding the overtaxing of communities with multiple meetings. Connie shared that, as a person working in a CBO, CBOs are eager to engage in these conversations pertaining to equity. Connie recommended that they approach those CBOs or community groups because those CBOs or community partners can make their own decision if they can attend or not.

Carolyn Abrams (Caltrans staff): Thanked Connie for the comment.

Amar Cid (Caltrans staff): Thanked Connie for her feedback and reiterated that these Listening Sessions are not a "one and done" effort and reassured the group that Caltrans will be working with the district staff to build upon these Listening Sessions. Amar shared that they have been documenting the process of reaching out to potential partners, how those relationships take form, both effective and ineffective strategies for opening dialogue, and expectation setting internally and externally.

Jerard Wright (Roundtable member): Are the processes of outreach and marketing also being documented?

Carolyn Abrams (Caltrans staff): For the first session, we opted to not have a registration process because it was a regular standing meeting. That decision was made to reduce confusion from participants and to alleviate any extra burden of having to register for a community meeting someone would, in any other circumstance, simply show up and attend. For the second and future sessions, we have an Eventbrite page and marketing flyer, both in English and Spanish, as well as any other potential languages the CBO identifies as being needed for the meeting's effectiveness. A lot of the outreach was done via e-mail, with a follow up phone call, but your comment does highlight the point that it's maybe easier to send a text or a link for ease of registration.

Jerard Wright (Roundtable Member): Commended staff on the outreach process.

Tanisha Taylor (Commission staff): Acknowledged the power and strength of the Roundtable's recommendations and assured the Roundtable members that their feedback, and the feedback gathered in the Listening Sessions, are being integrated into the processes of the Commission's activities in real time. When the agencies go back to the communities to report on progress, there will be concrete changes presented to those communities and not simply an acknowledgement of their feedback. Tanisha thanked the Roundtable for their work over the six Equity Advisory Roundtable sessions, because the members have made the approach to the Listening Sessions and updates to the funding guidelines stronger and better than if the agencies devised these activities in a bubble without their input.

Carolyn Abrams (Caltrans staff): Indicated that contact with the Roundtable members will not terminate at the end of the day's Roundtable meeting, and that updates will be sent to the Roundtable members despite the Equity Advisory Roundtable's conclusion.

Amar Cid (Caltrans staff): Echoed Carolyn's comment that Roundtable members are encouraged to continue to reach out to staff with their feedback, even if they are not sitting on the Equity Advisory Committee when it is formed this coming summer.

C. Sequoia Erasmus (Commission staff): Now I want to open the discussion to solicit comments from Commissioners and members of the public.

Commissioner Rocco Davis (Commissioner): Want to support and echo Sequoia and Tanisha's comments. It is critical we pay attention to what we are hearing, because we were given two ears and one mouth for a reason. These Listening Sessions are invaluable.

C. Sequoia Erasmus (Commission staff): We'll also be discussing the Listening Sessions at the upcoming May Commission Meeting, which will allow for more conversation for Commissioners to engage.

Spanish Line: No comments received.

Justin Hall (CTC staff): We received one public comment from Steve Hunter, who asked, “Were there any community concerns regarding safe, protected bicycle infrastructure? Was there anything you heard to indicate this was on the community radar?”

Carolyn Abrams (Caltrans staff): That specific topic didn’t come up. That isn’t to say it’s not an important topic, or even that the community isn’t concerned about that, but it wasn’t specifically mentioned at the session.

Amar Cid (Caltrans staff): The sessions were an open forum so participants could bring up any topic, and we did hear about concerns for pedestrian accessibility and safety.

Justin Hall: No other public comments were received.

---

### **Tab 5: Update on SB1 Transportation Funding Programs Guidelines Development**

Matthew Yosgott, Deputy Director of Senate Bill (SB) 1 Programming and C. Sequoia Erasmus provided Roundtable members and the public an update on the SB 1 funding programs guidelines development process. This update highlighted language recommended by Roundtable members and feedback provided within public workshops that staff will incorporate into the guidelines update for Commission consideration. This discussion also highlighted next steps in the guideline development process.

Draft SB 1 transportation funding program guidelines will be discussed at the June 2022 Commission meeting. Staff will request Commission approval of the final guidelines at the Commission’s August 2022 meeting.

C. Sequoia Erasmus: Read the Commission’s [Racial Equity Statement](#).

Matthew Yosgott (Commission staff): In this third cycle of the SB 1 Competitive Funding Programs, Commission staff decided to make updates to promote more equitable outcomes through the project selection process. Three Roundtable members have volunteered to have a more hands-on involvement with the guideline language update.

Matthew gave a brief overview of the guidelines’ development timelines. The development of equity considerations kicked off with a workshop on December 16, 2021. On April 11, 2022, Commission staff held a second virtual workshop where Commission staff shared the draft language with attendees to receive feedback. Commission staff will request the Commission approve the draft guidelines at the August 2022 Commission meeting. A call for projects will be initiated after Commission approval.

The key takeaways from both the December and April workshops were:

- Overall, workshop participants preferred incorporating equity throughout the guidelines including changes to the evaluation criteria to influence project selection



- Encourage early community participation in the planning process
- Add community support as a criterion
- Keep the approach simple
- Include regional definitions of Disadvantaged Communities within indicators
- There was consensus at the April workshop that draft language was acceptable

C. Sequoia Erasmus (Commission staff) : Workshop participants recommended questions to help identify impacts to disadvantaged, vulnerable, or marginalized communities, such as “How does a project affect adjacent neighborhoods?”, “How does the project benefit disadvantaged communities?”, and “What transportation barriers or burdens does this project relieve or remove?”. Participants also suggested applicants identify how the project furthers fair housing initiatives.

Participants also identified challenges with incorporating equity in project development and funding applications, such as: funding constraints which hamper ability to properly address equity concerns, localizing equity indicators within a region, lack of historical data for small or rural communities, inability to fund CBO participation, difficulty in obtaining political support or lack of support from affluent communities, inability for suburbs or rural locations to compete with urban areas, and duplication of efforts across multiple agencies in the same geographic area.

Matthew Yosgott (Commission staff): To help applicants document how the project incorporates transportation equity, applicants can respond to key guideline questions within the equity supplement. The questions cover a wide range of equity considerations, such as how the outreach was performed to disadvantaged or marginalized communities, how feedback from those groups were incorporated into the project, what actions were taken to protect vulnerable communities from negative project impacts, and how the project sponsor assesses the potential disparate impacts to disadvantaged or marginalized groups.

Project benefits identified were: Increase access to social, educational, and economic opportunities; Improve access and safety of active transportation; Prioritize high-need areas; Reduce travel times, congestion, pollution; Prioritize contracting with historically marginalized populations; Improved accessibility to amenities such as shopping centers, health centers, schools, social services, transit centers, and employment sites; Ensure neighborhood stability through short and long-term anti-displacement strategies.

C. Sequoia Erasmus (Commission staff): Thanks to our partners at the inter-agency Anti-Displacement work group for helping us develop a resources page that applicants can utilize when looking for strategies to best avoid displacing residents as a result of projects.

Are there any aspects to the proposed language in this update that could be improved or that you suggest changing?

Nailah Pope-Harden (Roundtable member): I was curious how the Caltrans Equity Index Tool will link to the SB 1 guidelines once it is created?

Matthew Yosgott (Commission staff): We are closely tracking the development of the Tool, but the timing to fold it into the third cycle didn't align. We are adopting the guidelines in August, and the Equity Tool isn't slated for release until Fall 2022. We will be closely considering either direct incorporation or a consideration of the Tool for cycle four of the guidelines update.

Nailah Pope-Harden (Roundtable member): I think this is wildly encouraging to hear that you've taken our feedback into consideration, and even though the timing doesn't work for this cycle you will be actively looking to incorporate it into the next cycle.

C. Sequoia Erasmus (Commission staff): We imagine the Equity Index would be utilized in a similar way that CalEnviroScreen is used.

Commissioner Joe Lyou (Commissioner): How will the decision-making process work for the Commission staff who are determining project eligibility and recommending the project's merit, since the new criteria is not assigned a number score and is more qualitative than quantitative?

Matthew Yosgott (Commission staff): When we evaluate the projects at the staff level, we'll be leaning on experts and the Commission's planning team to assist in evaluating the new criteria, so we understand the difference between a great response and a poor response. A deficiency in that evaluation area would impact how the project competes against other submitted projects that are evaluated to be more robust.

Commissioner Joe Lyou (Commissioner): I understand that evaluations are a balancing act, but to be as transparent as possible, make this clear to everyone beforehand, then de-brief those who didn't get recommended due to a substandard response within the criteria as well as de-brief those who did do well and will be recommended. Doing these de-briefs really helps with program transparency so people understand how the criteria influences the projects that are recommended for funding.

Matthew Yosgott (Commission staff): We are nearing the conclusion of our SB 1 Office Hours activity. We provided feedback to prospective applicants on their processes for incorporating equity into their project and asked questions and recommended different approaches to address the new criteria more fully.

C. Sequoia Erasmus (Commission staff): Are there any public comments?

Justin Hall (Commission staff): We have a couple written comments and one hand raised at this time. I'll begin by reading the written comments. The first comes from Rosie Ramos, who asked, "Are the metrics used to measure meaningful engagement?"

Matthew Yosgott (Commission staff): Yes.

Justin Hall (Commission staff): This question is from Steve Hunter, who asked, “Other countries outside the U.S have already paved the way for creating a role model for what equitable infrastructure looks like in places like, the Netherlands and Spain. Is there any chance to incorporate those models for project applicants to compare against?”

Matthew Yosgott (Commission staff): That is very valid feedback. This is not my area of expertise, but we leaned heavily on Sequoia for informing this part of the process. I don’t know if Sequoia looked at examples from overseas, but I do know we were looking at examples from other states within the U.S.

C. Sequoia Erasmus (Commission staff): I see the value in incorporating as much as we can. I utilized several in-depth research studies that looked at how funding programs, like the SB 1 programs, in other states incorporated equity, as well as taking inspiration from other regions’ programs or projects.

Justin Hall (Commission staff): One attendee has their hand raised at this time, Patricia Chen.

Patricia Chen (County Wide Planning at Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (LA Metro)): We’d like to thank the Commission for their incorporation of equity and the Equity Advisory Roundtable for their work on this topic. We have a few high-level comments on the supplement and scoring criteria that I will share here. We will follow these comments with a written comment letter and offer more specifics, so our comments are fully understood.

The first comment, “The equity supplement offers some good context for why equity is important to consider in transportation planning and funding. We recommend the Commission add the Commission’s Racial Equity Statement, in full, within the supplement, to help educate and set the stage for total equity emphasis.”

The second comment, “Given the context of the equity statement, it is important to center disadvantaged communities and specifically people who have been targeted for mistreatment due to their race or ethnicity. One example where state policy has done this well is the inclusion of federally recognized tribal lands as disadvantaged communities. Unfortunately, there are many lands within the state that have not been federally recognized, and traditionally, ties to the land have not been respected. We suggest looking at ways to center and uplift their needs, such as by indicating race or ethnicity data and federally recognized tribal status as indicators for disadvantaged status. We are not clear how regional definitions support statewide community needs and project benefits.

The third comment, “Metro would like to suggest added attention like needs of language translation, differing ability and resource levels, and technology access disparities.”

This is the final comment, “SB1 Guidelines scoring criteria draw attention to important issues of positive and negative impacts of projects. We suggest that staff ensure the questions make a

full connection between the benefits and impacts and those who will benefit or be impacted to ensure the focus on restoring equity.”

No other public comments were received.

---

**Tab 6: Discussion: Equity Advisory Committee Structure**

C. Sequoia Erasmus (Commission staff): Introduced colleagues Avital Barnea, Deputy Secretary for Transportation Planning at the California State Transportation Agency (CalSTA), and Amar Cid, Race and Equity Program Manager, for the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) Office on Race and Equity. The presentation highlighted the proposed interagency Equity Advisory Committee structure, informed by recommendations from prior Roundtable meeting discussions, as well as outreach conducted with other State agencies and regional air quality districts.

Feedback received during this discussion will be incorporated into the final recommendation for the Equity Advisory Committee (Committee) structure proposal.

Avital Barnea (Deputy Secretary for Transportation Planning, CalSTA): The purpose of this Committee is to elevate marginalized voices to advise transportation agencies on how to achieve meaningful transportation equity and environmental justice outcomes, especially as related to transportation planning and programming. This purpose was developed through the Climate Action Plan for Transportation Infrastructure, as well as feedback from Roundtable members and the Statewide Community Listening Sessions.

A few highlights that we heard in prior meetings concerning the Committee’s development include: the need for transparency and accountability; the need to respect member expertise and time commitments; the need for adequate compensation for advisory committee members; the need to outline the level of influence in policy and program development; the need for honest dialogue regarding the time commitment and level of involvement needed to serve on the Committee; and how important it is for staff to close the information loop by integrating recommendations in real time and not at the end of a certain time period.

The draft organizational principles, developed jointly by our three agencies, include:

1. One equity advisory committee to make recommendations to the three agencies’ executive leadership.
2. Focus on tools and guidelines for transportation planning and funding programs.
3. Open, public meetings.
4. Inclusion of an annual report that will highlight the recommendations, accomplishments, and priority focus areas.

5. Compensate members for costs incurred, such as travel/per diem allowances. We are still exploring compensation for time and expertise.

Amar Cid (Race and Equity Program Manager, Caltrans): Draft EAC Membership proposal is for the Committee to have up to 15 members with 2-year, staggered terms, whose focus will be on marginalized voices within California. There will be an open call for nominations that will allow for a wider applicant pool. Parameters for eligibility will be that the applicant is a resident of California with equity-centered personal or professional experience actively engaged in transportation equity, climate or housing justice, policy, programming, advocacy, or related fields. Applicants will be reviewed and selected by members of the three agencies (Commission, Caltrans, and CalSTA). The following list outlines the expected time commitment for members and involvement of the three agencies:

- Committee Member Meeting
  - 4 times per year
  - Supported by staff from CalSTA, Caltrans, and the Commission
  - Committee + Commissioners + Caltrans + CalSTA Executives Joint Meeting
  - 2 times per year corresponding with Commission Meetings
- Agenda Setting + Planning with staff
  - Committee Chair + Vice Chair + CalSTA/CTC/Caltrans Staff
  - 1 time per month
- Subject Matter Expert Opportunities
  - All members expected to join SME groups
  - 2 max per group, no quorum
  - Ongoing, monthly
- Optional “Lunch + Learn” Opportunities

C. Sequoia Erasmus (Commission staff): The draft scope of the Committee is anticipated to review, advise, recommend, and develop transportation related plans, programs, and policies that include:

- State transportation planning guidelines
- State transportation funding program guidelines
- Development, updates, and revisions of State transportation plans
- Quantitative and qualitative metrics for evaluating equity benefits and outcomes
- How to best integrate meaningful community engagement practices into all aspects of transportation work
- Recommendations for improving equity outcomes in transportation planning and programming
- Provide recommendations on Caltrans project nominations, where applicable, to maximize equity outcomes to state and federal programs

Between summer 2022 and the end of the calendar year, the three agencies will release a call for the Committee membership nominations and finalize the membership. The Committee will begin to meet, and progress will be documented for an annual report.

Connie Stewart (Roundtable member): Expressed excitement for this committee structure and for the future of the committee.

Leslie Sanders (Roundtable member): Echoed Connie's comment that this advisory committee has been a great opportunity and the feedback that the three agencies have taken into consideration. Leslie also urged the agencies to ensure tribes have a seat at the table.

Jerard Wright (Roundtable member): Expressed gratitude for the opportunity to be on the Equity Advisory Roundtable and looks forward to the future of the Committee.

Nailah Pope-Harden (Roundtable members): Thanked the agencies for coming together, working hard to bring this Committee proposal, and for the space that was created for Roundtable members to be honest and welcomed for their feedback. The agencies show how they value the Roundtable members by working hard to incorporate all the feedback into the proposed Committee structure.

Randy Torres-Van Vleck (Roundtable member): Thanked staff for the draft EAC proposal and the demonstration of time and consideration staff took to hear and incorporate Roundtable recommendations.

Jerard Wright (Roundtable member): Expressed thankfulness for the ability to be on the Roundtable, and to staff and Commissioners Inman and Norton for bringing the Roundtable opportunity to his attention.

C. Sequoia Erasmus (Commission staff): Opened the comments to Commissioners and members of the public.

Joe Lyou (Commissioner): Thanked staff for their hard work to create this Committee structure. Advised the agencies to invite executive level people to be engaged in the entire process, not only at the two Commission meetings per year, to demonstrate the level of commitment the Commission has to equity. Recommended three priorities for the EAC. The first is for the creation of a public participation guidebook with best practices, explanations for how transportation decision are made, where public participation opportunities are, and how and where people can have the largest impact within that decision making process. The second specific task for the EAC to focus efforts would be the Equity Index Tool being developed by Caltrans. Third and finally, considering Caltrans' and the U.S Department of Transportation's development and publication of their respective Race and Equity Action Plans, the EAC should review and make recommendations in terms of how to put together a consensus document on an action plan.

Amar Cid: Agrees with Commissioner Lyou's recommendations.

No public comments were received.

---

**Tab 7: Public Comments**

None.

---

**Tab 8: Meeting Recap and Next Steps**

C. Sequoia Erasmus:

Key Takeaways and Action Items

- We look forward to keeping Roundtable members apprised of the listening sessions, summary report, and future engagement opportunities. The feedback Roundtable members shared today will shape the remaining four listening sessions and beyond.
- The draft SB 1 program guidelines will be presented at the June Commission Meeting with new equity considerations and language. We are so grateful to the Roundtable for helping shape these proposed additions.
- Lastly, we are planning to call for nominations for Equity Advisory Committee members this summer. We look forward to continuing this important work at CTC, Caltrans, and CalSTA in partnership with equity leaders across the State.

Next Steps:

- CTC staff will create the meeting minutes, and the recordings, materials, and minutes will be posted to the Commission's website.
- CTC will reach out to the Roundtable members about continued involvement opportunities.