

affordable to low-income families and 7,000 being affordable to moderate income families. After over a year of deliberations, the final result was a 10-point compact, most of which requires state legislative changes in order to be enacted.

Federal and State Equity Laws and Regulations

Despite more than a half century of efforts to address discrimination and inequality through federal policy, inequity in our nation persists. Though great strides have been made towards overcoming oppression and injustice, creating fairness within the procedures of our institutions or systems, demands addressing the root causes of inequality.

Key policies aimed at promoting equity in transportation funding, access, and impact include:

Civil Rights Act (1964)

The Civil Rights Act outlaws discrimination based on race, color, religion, sex, or national origin. It prohibits unequal application of voter registration requirements, and segregation in schools, employment, and public accommodations, including courthouses, parks, restaurants, theaters, sports arenas and hotels. The act forbids the use of federal funds for any discriminatory program, authorized federal assistance with school desegregation, and prohibited the unequal application of voting requirements.

Title VI of the Civil Rights Act is a Federal statute and provides that no person shall, on the grounds of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance. This is a crucial consideration in regional transportation funding decisions.

Americans with Disabilities Act (1990)

The Americans with Disabilities Act is the first law in the United States prohibiting discrimination against people with disabilities by regulating five broad areas: Employment, Services provided by State

and Local Government, Public Accommodations & Privately Operated Services, Telecommunications, and Transportation.

Federal Executive Order (EO) 12898 (1994)

EO12898 was issued by Bill Clinton in 1994 to identify and address the disproportionately high and adverse health and environmental effects of government programs on minority and low-income populations. The order directs federal agencies to develop a strategy for implementing environmental justice. The order also seeks to provide minority and low-income communities with expanded access to public information and opportunities for public participation. A memorandum accompanying EO 12898 identified Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 as one of several Federal laws that must be applied “as an important part of . . . efforts to prevent minority communities and low-income communities from being subject to disproportionately high and adverse environmental effects.”

USDOT Order 5610.2 - Instituting an Environmental Justice Strategy (1997)

Following EO12898, USDOT Order 5610.2 established the Department of Transportation’s environmental justice strategy. It defines procedures for analysis of environmental justice issues and inclusive public engagement with minority and low-income communities in the transportation planning process.

USDOT Circular FTA C 4703.1 - Environmental Justice Policy Guidance for FTA Recipients (2012)

Circular FTA C4703.1 is a guidance document for recipients of federal transit funding. It provides strategies and methods to effectively engage environmental justice populations in the public transportation decision-making process, to determine whether environmental justice populations would be subjected to disproportionate impacts as a result of a transportation plan or project, and to avoid, minimize, or mitigate these effects.

FHWA Order 6640.23 - policies to comply with (EO) 12898 and USDOT Order 5610.2.I (2012)

FHWA Order 6640.23 further clarifies the Federal Highway Administration’s environmental justice

analysis requirements in the preparation of NEPA documents. The policy seeks to minimize impacts on environmental justice populations by identifying and evaluating impacts, avoiding, minimizing and mitigating disproportionate adverse impacts, considering lower impact alternatives, and informing and involving the public in project planning. and Local Government, Public Accommodations & Privately Operated Services, Telecommunications, and Transportation.

In California, regulations guiding the state towards a sustainable future have expanded dramatically in the past decade, and efforts to address climate have become linked with environmental justice goals.

AB32 – Global Warming Solutions Act (2006)

AB32 established historic state regulations aimed at reducing greenhouse gas emissions through a “cap and trade” approach. The act aims to reduce greenhouse gas emissions to 1990 levels by 2020, and to a level 80% below that by 2050. To achieve this the act gave the California Air Resources Board the authority to limit the amount of allowable carbon emissions, and auction emission allowances. Revenues from allowance auctions are deposited into the state Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund (GGRF) which is used to support programs and projects which reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

SB 375 – Sustainable Communities and Climate Protection Act (2008)

SB 375 requires metropolitan planning organizations to develop a “Sustainable Communities Strategy” that integrates transportation, land-use and housing policies to reduce automotive greenhouse gas emissions to levels determined by the California Air Resources Board. The last two Regional Transportation Plans (RTP), Transportation 2035 and Plan Bay Area 2040 comply with SB 375.

AB 1358 – The Complete Streets Act (2008)

Assembly Bill 1358 requires all cities and counties to consider all users of roads when they update their general transportation plans. Caltrans concurrently

updated their own policies (see Deputy Directive 64) to apply the same “complete streets” philosophy to state-owned roads. Complete streets incorporate wide sidewalks, street furniture and trees, bicycle lanes, crosswalks, and bus turnouts to make it easy, safe, and enjoyable for all modes of transportation including motorists, pedestrians, bicyclists, children, persons with disabilities, seniors, movers of commercial goods, and public transit riders.

SB 535 - CalEnviroScreen 3.0 (2012)

SB 535 established environmental justice goals and requirements for cap and trade funds to address concerns that actions taken to achieve the goals laid out by AB 32, must not disproportionately affect low-income and disadvantaged communities. It states that 25 percent of the available funds are required to be used for projects that will benefit disadvantaged areas, and that at least 10 percent must be allocated to projects actually located in disadvantaged communities.

To achieve this, the bill directed CalEPA to identify disadvantaged communities based on geographic, socioeconomic, public health, and environmental hazard criteria. These communities may include, but are not limited to:

- Areas disproportionately affected by environmental pollution and other hazards that can lead to negative public health effects, exposure, or environmental degradation.
- Areas with concentrations of people that are of low-income, high unemployment, low levels of home ownership, high rent burden, sensitive populations, or low levels of educational attainment.

The result, known as CalEnviroScreen, assigns a score to each census tract which represents a combined measure of pollution and the potential vulnerability of a population to the effects of pollution. CalEnviroScreen 3.0 does not include indicators of race/ethnicity or age, however these characteristics remain important to examine in the context of pollution burdens and vulnerabilities.

AB 1550 (2016)

Increases the percent of funds for projects located in disadvantaged communities from 10 to 25 percent. This supplants the requirement in SB 535 that 25 percent of the funds must benefit disadvantaged communities. AB 1550 also created new investment requirements for low-income communities and households requiring that:

- At least 5 percent of the moneys allocated from the GGRF must fund projects located within and benefiting individuals living in low-income communities or fund projects benefitting low-income households statewide; and
- At least 5 percent of the moneys allocated from the GGRF must fund projects located within and benefiting individuals living in low-income communities, or benefiting low income households, that are within ½ mile of a disadvantaged community. CalEnviroScreen 3.0 does not include indicators of race/ethnicity or age, however these characteristics remain important to examine in the context of pollution burdens and vulnerabilities.

**STA Land Use Chapter Pubic Comments Received
(4/8/2020 – 5/10/2020)
Updated 6/26/2020**

Comment Made By	Date Received	Method of Transmission	Comment Received	Action Taken
Elizabeth Patterson (STA Board Member)	4/8/2020	Verbal (at the STA Board Meeting on 4/8/2020)	Requested that staff add to the goals and identify reducing vehicle miles traveled to comply with the CEQA requirement and state requirement under SB 375	Language regarding SB 743 (Pg. 42) was added.
Bill Emlen	4/8/2020	Via E-Mail	Commented that the PCAs on the map shown on Pg. 36 did not reflect the current PCAs following ABAG's recent update of Regional PCA designations.	A note was added to the map to redirect readers to the maps on Pgs. 12 and 32 for maps of the recent PCA designations for Solano County.
Mathew Walsh	4/8/2020	Via E-Mail	Commented that the RHNA language indicated is a 7-year cycle, which is inaccurate.	Comment noted. Edit was incorporated.
Joseph Green-Heffern	5/5/2020	Via E-Mail and Letter	1) No mention of SB 743 within the document.	1) Section regarding SB 743 was added to Pg. 42.
			2) STA should note the "status and future availability of forthcoming SB 743 guidance and policy documents from STA...and Cities within the County".	2) Comment noted. STA is working with the cities to keep them informed on state and regional requirements regarding SB 743 and to support them in the process.
			3) No mention of VMT in the Land Use Chapter.	3) VMT is mentioned on Pg. 18 and Pg. 30 (SB 375). More on STA and VMT can be found in the Arterials, Highways, and Freeways Element of the CTP. (Pg.17, 51, 75, 76)

			4) No mention of Urban Growth Boundaries (UGBs).	4) Language to include UGBs was added on Pg. 23.
Bob Berman (Solano County Orderly Growth Committee)	5/10/2020	E-Mail	1) Importance of the Orderly Growth Initiative on Solano County land use patterns should be further discussed.	1) The OGIs is mentioned more in depth in the Introduction Chapter on PG. 23.
			2) The Land Use Chapter should reference and show the existing UGBs on an exhibit and state when they will come up for renewal.	3) Language to include UGBs was added on Pg. 23.
			4) Tri-City and County Cooperative Plan for Agriculture and Open Space Preservation and other similar plans should be discussed in the Land Use Chapter.	2) Language added to Pg. 30.
			5) Discussion on MTC's Designated Geographies is written in the wrong tense.	3) Comment noted. Edit was incorporated.
			6) RHNA Graphics placements are not optimized.	4) This was recognized by staff and the changes are reflected in the current version.
			7) Discrepancy between 2014-2022 RHNA vs 2015-2023 RHNA usage.	5) Comment noted. Edit was incorporated.
			8) Comments that the text does not mention the issues between RHNA goals for low-income housing and request it be discussed.	6) Comment noted. The plan acknowledges that Solano cities are struggling with producing affordable housing as a result of a lack of local, state, and federal funding sources to subsidize lower income housing units, etc. (Pg. 40)