

California Transportation Commission
Regional Transportation Plan Guidelines
SB 375 Work Group Meeting
November 3, 2009

Goal for the Work Group:

To provide guidance to update the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Guidelines in a manner that will increase the successful implementation of the requirements of Senate Bill 375 (SB 375).

Welcome and Introductions:

Bimla Rhinehart, Executive Director, California Transportation Commission (Commission)

- The purpose of the meeting is to offer an opportunity for the subcommittees to report to the full workgroup on progress to date.
- Recapped the RTP Guidelines update process and progress to date.
- Stated that the schedule for the RTP Guidelines includes presenting a draft to the Commission for review and comment at the Commission's December Meeting. Hearings on the revised RTP Guidelines will be held at the February and April 2010 Commission Meetings.
- Comments on the current draft RTP Guidelines are due to Susan Bransen, Associate Deputy Director, California Transportation Commission, by Tuesday, November 10, 2009.

Martin Tuttle, Deputy Director, Planning & Modal Programs, Department of Transportation

- Four state agencies have a role in the implementation of SB 375 and an understanding of their perspective is critical to the work of the SB 375 Work Group.
- Attended the Government Institute on Sustainable Communities. The discussion focused on "silo busting", integrated planning efforts, and linking transportation, land use and air quality.
- The Department of Transportation is looking forward to more joint activities with Housing and Community Development.
- California is in the position to lead other states in addressing greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions.
- Proposition 84 provides some funding for modeling and data collection. Recognition that better data is needed for planning.
- The RTP process includes an aggressive timeline, but the subcommittees have made great progress. There has been broad participation, much more than in the past.

Kurt Karparis, California Air Resources Board (CARB)

- CARB is working with the RTAC. The RTAC laid out a solid framework to implement SB 375 and target setting process.
- A significant product of the RTAC is the foundation of how to set targets as well as identify critical issues to be addressed in the next few years.
- The RTAC report is a critical piece of the SB 375 implementation process.
- The RTP Guidelines are another significant piece of the SB 375 implementation process. The RTP Guidelines will provide critical direction to the MPOs on such issues as what is a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) or what is the relationship between a SCS and an Alternative Planning Strategy (APS).
- Will need future RTP Guidelines updates as we get smarter about implementing SB 375.

Linda Wheaton, Department of Housing & Community Development

- There are many active efforts around the country to integrate transportation and land use planning.
- The integration of transportation and land use planning is a huge challenge for California.
- Proposition 1C includes a focus on transit oriented developments, multi-family housing. Focus on projects, such as compact development, high density housing, and affordable housing, that help implement SB 375.
- The upside of difficult economic conditions and a challenging bond market is that planners have time to plan. Local agencies are updating the housing element of their plans, changing development standards to make mixed use development feasible and viable.
- To implement SB 375 successfully, need a development permitting process that includes front end mitigation.

Overview of RTP Guidelines Subcommittee, Workgroups & Key Proposed Revisions to Guidance (Non Modeling Topics)

Rusty Selix, Executive Director, California Association of Councils of Government (RTP Guidelines Subcommittee Facilitator)

- Subcommittee formed to develop the necessary statutory language of SB 375 relative to RTPs.
- Subcommittee is composed of representatives from MPOs, RTPAs, state and federal agencies, legislative staff, environmental interest groups, local agencies, building and industry associations, American Planning Association, universities, non profit organizations, and private industry.
- Subcommittee has met four times since the July 1 kick off meeting.
- Key areas of discussion included elements of sustainable communities strategy, sequencing the RTP process with the CEQA, RHNA, ARB, and federal conformity processes, methods to address internal consistency in planning, housing provisions of SB 375, public participation, and clarification of exempt projects as defined in SB 375.

- Given the complexity of the implementation of SB 375, the subcommittee broke into five smaller workgroups: Housing & Land Use, RTP Sequencing & Adoption Workgroup, Transportation, Public Participation, RTAC Coordination.

Overview of Modeling Subcommittee

Ron West, Cambridge Systematics (Modeling Subcommittee Facilitator)

- See attached PowerPoint presentation.
- Subcommittee meetings held monthly.
- Working to develop an addendum to the RTP Guidelines for Modeling.
- The RTP Guidelines and the Modeling Addendum will be a living document. Need to change over time. May take some time for all agencies to meet all requirements of SB 375.
- The Strategic Growth Council reserved \$10 million for model improvements and data collection.

Presentation of Proposed Revisions to the RTP Guidelines

Garth Hopkins, Chief, Office of Regional Interagency Planning, Division of Transportation Planning, Department of Transportation

- See attached PowerPoint presentation.

Comments Regarding the RTP Guidelines Working Draft

Bill Davis, Southern California Contractors Association

- There are a lot of moving parts in the implementation of SB 375.
- The proposed Federal Surface Transportation Bill has massive changes. Many proposed changes will supersede this RTP Guidelines update and the Commission will have to update the RTP Guidelines again.
- The stakes for California are high. Need to balance environmental issues and economic issues.

David Schonbrunn, Transdef

- Concerned with the timeline for adoption. The schedule is too aggressive. Response from Garth Hopkins noted that several MPOs are currently working on their RTPs and need the updated RTP Guidelines.
- Concerned that the phrase “need to reduce per capita VMT” removed from the draft Guidelines. Believe that the Guidelines need to address the need to reduce VMT through compact land use. The MPOs just want to continue doing the same things that they have always done.
- Chapter 4 should be solely RTP content not process. Suggest two new chapters: 1) RTP Consultation and Coordination and 2) RTP Environmental Considerations.
- Need a redline copy of changes made since the last draft.

- Not acceptable that in such a large state that this meeting is not being webcast or that there is not teleconference access. It is the responsibility of the Commission to make these meetings accessible.
- Concerned about handling of exempted projects.

Phil Dow, Mendocino Council of Governments

- One of the key issues that has not been addressed is how the rural regional transportation planning agencies need to address GHG. Is there a rural workgroup addressing this issue. Garth Hopkins and Bimla Rhinehart responded that there was not a rural workgroup, but that Mr. Dow's suggestion had merit and they would take it under advisement.
- The biggest problem is the fear of the unknown. The RTPs need to document everything including supporting transit and supporting the development of bicycle and pedestrian development.
- Want to establish a baseline in the RTP.

DeAnn Baker, California State Association of Counties (CSAC)

- Thanked the Commission and Caltrans for their hard work and public outreach in developing the draft RTP Guidelines.
- Questioned the need to address the topic of SB 375 for the rurals. A key bargaining point during the development of SB 375 was that it would apply only to the 18 MPOs. It is not cost effective to apply SB 375 to the rural RTPAs. Garth Hopkins responded that although the rural RTPAs are not statutorily required to comply with SB 375, they do need to comply with AB 32 and that some rural agencies have received letters from the Attorney General's office indicating that they were not complying with AB 32 GHG reduction provisions.

Neil Peacock, Amador County Transportation Commission

- Need to provide technical assistance to the small RTPAs.

Richard Mark Antonio

- Is the goal that once the SCS is in place, can determine whether local land use is consistent with the SCS? Garth Hopkins responded that the RTPSa/MPOs will need to work very closely with the cities and other local agencies.

Carina O'Connell, EPA

- What was the focus of the Modeling Chapter? The projected use? Ron West responded that the Modeling Chapter was drafted in response to SB 375 but is not limited to SB 375.

Patricia Chen, LA Metro

- Draft Guidelines are close. Would like to continue working with the Commission and the Department.
- Want the phrase "programmed for construction" deleted.
- The Guidelines should provide clarity without unnecessary limitations.

Jose Nuncio, San Diego Association of Governments (Sandag)

- Section 2.7, page 35. RTP development and approval. Need to outline potential implications.
- Section 4.4. Concerned with the use of “shall” versus “should”. “Cities and counties should” not “Cities and counties shall”. Only use “shall” when statutorily mandated.
- Section 4.26. Delete the phrase “programmed through construction”. Not in the statute. Reference ordinance in the ballot.

Sharon Sprowls, Housing California

- Concerned about the timeline for the adoption of the RTP Guidelines. The revision is a complicated endeavor.
- Comments not incorporated because the Housing and Land Use Subcommittee is not meeting until next week. Need adequate time to review and comment.
- Need early meeting notification given the holidays.
- Want coordination with land use and housing. Need to consider affordability, social equity, gentrification, and jobs.

Shirley Medina, Riverside County Transportation Commission

- Agrees with the comments made by LA Metro (Patricia Chen) and Sandag (Jose Nuncio) regarding exempt projects and the phrase “programmed through construction”. The statute clearly states that “projects programmed” are exempt, not “projects programmed through construction”. Measures are 20-30 years long and the FSTIP is only through 2009.

Naresh Amatya, Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG)

- Agrees with the comments made by LA Metro (Patricia Chen) and Sandag (Jose Nuncio) regarding exempt projects and the phrase “programmed through construction”. The statute clearly states that “projects programmed” are exempt, not “projects programmed through construction”.
- Clarify what internal consistency means. Who makes the determination? Through what means? At the SCS level?

Wendy Alfsen, California Walks

- Section 4.26 Exemptions. Understand the investment in programming a project. No one wants to redo planning, but every project should be analyzed to see how it impacts GHG. Unless the impacts are analyzed and addressed, there is no way that the state can meet the AB 32 reductions or comply with SB 375.
- Have not addressed induced demand.
- A multimodal transportation system should be the outcome of transportation planning.
- Need connection to transit. Options not available. Twenty-five percent of all trips are one mile or less.

Connell Cunning, US EPA

- Concerned with the SCS being supported and a Clean Water Act or Endangered Species Act challenge. Concerned that EPA could be a stumbling block for the implementation of the SCS. Specifically “resources/farmland” best practices – Guidelines include a good start but need to be clear on what is the best available.
- Support Green Printing best practices on page 107.
- Sustainability is a real eco-system focus beyond GHG reductions.

Adam Hansen, Tehama County Transportation Commission

- RTP Section 3.1(c). Concerned that regions that are nonattainment due to transport, especially rural counties, will be put into 3.1© and be required to do all the associated models. Rural counties do not get PL funds or Prop 84 funds and do not have the means to do the models.

Mitch Weiss, California Transportation Commission

- Two ways to look at how long the exemptions for projects should last. One way, is the project funded. What does funded specifically mean? Another way is to consider a Measure a programming document. However, projects in a Measure may not be built for five years or longer. In my opinion, difficult to consider a project exempted that will not be built for 10-20 years.