

California Transportation Commission
Regional Transportation Plan Guidelines
2010 Update Joint Modeling & RTP Guidelines Subcommittee Meeting

Teleconference Meeting Notes – Summary

Thursday, October 8, 2009 1:30 PM to 4:30 PM
1120 N Street, Sacramento CA

Facilitators: Rusty Selix, California Association of Councils of Government (CalCOG),
Garth Hopkins, Caltrans and Ron West, Cambridge Systematics

List of Attendees by Organization: *(Note: not all attendees may be listed)*

In Person:

Tanisha Taylor - SJCOG
Naresh Amatya - SCAG
Jonathan Nadler - SCAG
Susan Wilson - Caltrans
Bob Johnston – UC Davis
Chad Baker - Caltrans
Doug McIvor - Caltrans
Justin Paddock - ARB
Dennis Wade - ARB
Rusty Selix - CalCOG
Jila Priebe - Caltrans
Coco Briseno - Caltrans
Mark Stivers – Senate Housing and Transportation Committee
Garth Hopkins - Caltrans
Terry Parker - Caltrans
Teresa Favila CTC
Frank Limacher - HCD
David Robinson Fehr and Peers
Aniss Bahreinian – CA Energy Commission
Anya Lawler – Assembly Committee on Housing and Transportation
Martin Engleman - Contra Costa County Transportation Authority
Joan Sollenberger, Caltrans
Garth Hopkins, Caltrans
La Nae VanValen, Caltrans
Laura Pennebaker, Caltrans
Susan Bransen, CTC

On the phone:

Bruce Abanathie – Kings CAG
Brian Lasagna - BCAG
Jennifer Cohen – Planning Associates

Kiana Buss - CSAC
Kathy Chung – Fresno COG
Kristine Cai – Fresno COG
Gary Green
Mark Hays
Carey Knecht – Greenbelt Alliance
Allan Lind - AEP
Paul McDougal - HCD
Karina O'Connor – USEPA Region 9
Angela Rushen - SCAG
Christy Riviera ABAG
Tom Rosewall – CA Energy Initiatives
Ty Schuiling - SANBAG
Cynthia Smith
Mike Powers SBCAG
SANDAG
Beth Walukas – Alameda County CMA
Ron West – Cambridge Systematics
Marta Frausto - Caltrans
Steve Devencenzi - SLOCOG
Liz Brisson - MTC
Bill Higgins – League of CA Cities
Gordon Gary - SACOG

Overview/Meeting Purpose/Background:

Garth Hopkins provided an overview of the October 1, 2009 re-write of the draft RTP guidelines. The purpose of the meeting is to get a general idea of comments as written comments are due by COB Thursday 10/15/09. Coco Briseno and Ron West will field comments on the modeling chapter (Chapter 3).

Susan Bransen provided a timeline update. The original timeline was set to provide a draft to the Commission for their consideration at the December 2009 CTC meeting. Susan requested that comments be provided by October 15, 2009 as the next working draft will be distributed on October 26, 2009 for consideration by all interested stakeholders with a full workgroup meeting to be held November 3, 2009. This draft (with comments incorporated) will go to the CTC meeting as a preliminary draft/progress report in December.

Bill Higgins, League of CA Cities, questioned the schedule given that the RTAC recommendations will not become final until they are presented to the California Air Resources Board (ARB) on November 19, 2009.

Justin Paddock, ARB, stated that the RTAC report is an informational item on the 11/19/09 ARB board agenda. There is no required ARB action on the report. ARB will

use the report throughout the next year to inform the development of methodology and target setting. The ARB Board will never take action on the RTAC report.

Susan Bransen explained that an RTAC coordination workgroup will be formed. This workgroup will utilize the RTAC recommendations to form necessary language to be incorporated into the guidelines.

Bob Johnston, UC Davis, said that the RTAC report has a lot of good ideas that went through a comprehensive stakeholder input process. This information should be incorporated into the RTP Guidelines document.

Gordon Garry, SACOG, hopes that the RTAC workgroup can a) take the best parts of the RTAC report and put them where applicable into the RTP guidelines, and b) take recommendations which fall outside of the immediate scope of the guidelines and incorporate them as a secondary level (footnote type).

Key Comments to the October 1, 2009 Working Draft:

Chapter 1

Page 18

- Concern about not needing to model exempt projects – suggestion was to make sure that exempt projects are further defined and addressed.
- Projects that are exempt are also very likely projects that are part of the prior RTP; they are not part of the EIR evaluation.
- The whole idea of exemption is to allow negative GHG impact projects to be grandfathered in. Most highway expansion projects would fall into this. However, not ALL exempt projects will have a negative impact and MPOs should have the flexibility to reap benefits from positive GHG impact exempt projects. This may require different models for the same plan, modeling to meet conformity, GHG, etc.
- Section 2.3, Federal Requirements, should include a cross reference (p.34) to the financial constraint requirement (Section 4.5).
- Suggested including the statement that: “major transportation projects must be modeled”.
- For paragraph 2) remove compact, insert strategies that will reduce regional GHG emissions.

Page 25

- Suggested for (5) defining and addressing resource areas better.

Chapter 2

Page 33

- Land use assumptions section does not address demographic and employment factors.
- There needs to be a more balanced assumption section that addresses more of the range of issues facing an MPO.

Page 32

- Section 2.2 (Land Use, Scenario, Regional Blueprint Planning & Coordination) is going to take some additional work and Caltrans is working to make changes as needed.
- Confusion exists in this section about following strategies/goals.
- Section 2.2 - need to clarify the blueprint/SCS relationship.
- We can assume that the blueprint process will follow the SCS – the blueprint is a background document that informs the SCS.
- Need to explain the blueprint program and separate blueprint, SCS, SGC and explain how they all work together.

Page 35

- Add a cross reference to Section 4.5 – Financial Section.

Chapter 3

- Next modeling meeting October 21, 2009. At this meeting will need to address outstanding issues and comments. There is some overlap between the policy and modeling sections of the RTP guidelines.
- Department of Finance population question needs resolution. Need to clarify how population projection in the growth forecast differs from that associated with the RHNA targets and allocation process.
- If we can make the RTP Guidelines a truly interactive document with hyperlink references (hotlink references) both within and to sources outside the document that would be helpful.

Chapter 4

Page 60

- Suggested re-wording first paragraph to “and as MPOs and RTPAs *work towards SB 375 compliance* within their regions,”
- Paragraph 1. Restate as follows: Develop investments and programs that support SCS and APS implementation.
- Move Paragraph 3. “Taking into account such factors... to the Modeling Chapter 3.

Page 62

- Remove the links to best practices
- clarify SB 375 and non-375 best practices

Page 67

- Ensure that the internally consistent references are consistent within the entire RTP Guidelines document.

Page 75

- Concern was raised with respect to the requirement for a public participation plan and both the draft and adopted RTP to be posted on the World Wide Web, to the maximum extent practicable and for the life of the RTP along with hard copies retained in local libraries, etc.
- Documents are required to be retained consistent with public records requirements.

Page 80

- Section 4.15 - The term “Interagency Consultation” in this section should be renamed “Interagency Coordination” to avoid confusion with the federal conformity process.

Page 83

- Remove HCD from the resource agency list.

Page 91

- Section 4.26 – this section should be written consistent with the statute.
- Programming for funding on or before December 31, 2011 is the key requirement.
- Need to define – what a project is exempt from?
- Need to involve Air Resources Board in developing guidance to implement this section of SB 375.
- Perhaps exempt means “exempt” from the internal consistency requirement, i.e. sales tax approved measure that is inconsistent with the land use pattern contained within the SCS.
- Need to further define exemption, need introductory paragraphs.
- The RTPA or MPO does not have the authority to drop a project from the RTP.
- RTP Guidelines language needs to provide flexibility.
- Workgroup was requested to please send comments that define exempt.

Page 93

- Performance measures section to be reviewed by the RTAC coordination workgroup.

Page 99

- Pricing strategies – recognize in the guidelines that some strategies will require legislation and some will not.
- Cross reference the transportation strategies that may reduce GHG within the context of the SCS.
- SACOG has additional citations to add at the bottom relative to road pricing publications.
- Suggested placing pricing strategies in the Transportation Needs section of the SCS chapter.

Page 100

- Transportation Planning and Investment Strategies – this entire section needs to be re-written.

Page 106

- Green printing language should be incorporated in this section. The Nature Conservancy will suggest language for inclusion.

Page 112

- Suggestion was to move text at 4.40 – Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Targets to Section 2.2 of the Guidelines.

Page 113

- Delete the sentence “The RTAC released their Recommendation Report entitled: Recommendations of the Regional Targets Advisory Committee (RTAC)...”

Page 114

SCS Contents:

- Should suggest that a map be prepared of current and future land uses.
- Explain that the development pattern be submitted in a narrative form.
- Clarify blueprint and performance measures with respect to paragraph 3 – the regional transportation system.
- Internally consistent language needs to be cross referenced with earlier internally consistent language
- Transportation projects should support the development pattern in the SCS.
- ABAG will put together language of their interpretation of the internally consistent requirement and send to Caltrans.
- Would like to see more guidance on what should be in an SCS.

MPOs in Multi County Regions:

- Add the Tahoe Region, etc., and explain the 14 sub regional agencies.
- MPO Multi County Regions – should specify that AMBAG and SANDAG are other multi-county regions.

Page 115

- Delete the term “balanced” wherever used.
- The League of California Cities and the California State Association of Counties will provide comments to the “Role of Cities and Counties in the Development of the SCS” section.
- Explain the role of existing general plans in this section.
- Numerous concerns were raised with respect to the “Identifying Land Uses in the SCS” section and it was agreed to re-write this section completely.
- References from the RTAC report should be considered.
- Explain what “other modes of transportation” include.
- Make sure that rural agencies that cannot incorporate other modes of transportation are considered in this section.
- Take out role of cities and counties; add a section that addresses the local plans.

Page 116

- Many concerns were raised by the subcommittee members that the “Housing Issues in the SCS” section should be clearly marked as “under construction” as consensus on language was not reached.

Page 117

- Delete the term “balance”.

Page 118

- The “Social Equity/Environmental Justice Issues” section should be referred to the RTAC Coordination Workgroup for their consideration and comment.
- The “SCS Public Participation and Input/Consultation with Local Elected Officials” section should be removed from this chapter and incorporated within the other sections of the guidelines as appropriate.

Page 119

- Move the “Air Resources Board Review of the SCS” section to the Public Participation Section of the Guidelines.
- ARB review of the SCS should include reference to Section 2.7 and flowchart.

Page 120

- Paragraph 4 - re: AB 32 and SB 375 suggested to be moved to another section.
- Climate Change Adaptation needs to have a better connection to the RTP.
- Strategic Growth Council (SGC) – there should be a reference to blueprint based approach, policy statement published by the SGC.

Page 121

- The Nature Conservancy to provide additional links to best practice publications.

Other General Comments:

- Identifying land uses in the SCS Section should be revisited to incorporate RTAC recommendations. This section will be re-written in light of RTAC report and comments received today.
- Social Equity/Environmental Justice Issues section should be addressed by the RTAC workgroup.
- SCAG will submit language addressing parking, pricing, and other non-land use strategies in the SCS chapter.
- Clarification is needed as to whether the Air Resources Board will provide sufficient advanced guidance as to whether or not the SCS will be accepted.
- Suggestion was made to clarify that these RTP Guidelines apply to the first RTPs completed after release of the 2010 GHG Targets.
- MPOs want guidance on the process associated with the APS.
- Further elaborate on Appendix H – the contents and process associated with the APS.

- Need to clarify when the APS rather than the SCS should be used – i.e. unreasonable land use assumptions.
- The Guidelines may need updating again when the MAP-21 (new federal re-authorization) comes out. A concern was raised that federal legislation may require certain MPOs to amend their RTP

Status of Workgroups:

- RTAC Coordination Workgroup has not met yet but will in the very near future now that the RTAC report is released.
- Public Participation Workgroup has met and developed language. This workgroup will not need to meet again.
- Land Use and Housing Workgroup – met yesterday, will meet again October 30th 10am – noon to further work on RHNA-SCS integration.
- RTP Sequencing Workgroup has met and will need to meet one more time to ensure the process is currently described.
- Transportation Workgroup – met once and will utilize the transportation strategies established in the 2008 Addendum to the RTP Guidelines. This will be used as a foundation for developing transportation strategies and best practices. It is expected that this information will be included in an appendix to the guidelines.

Next Steps

Subcommittee Members will provide written comments to Caltrans by close of business October 15, 2009 to the October 1, 2009 Draft. Caltrans will incorporate these comments and distribute the new working draft on October 26, 2009. A full workgroup meeting will be scheduled for Tuesday, November 3, 2009 to receive input from all stakeholders. A working draft will also be presented to the Commission at the December 2009 Commission meeting for their input prior to finalizing draft guidance to be presented at hearings and adoption.