

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

Teleconference Meeting Notes – Summary

Thursday, December 3, 2009 2:00 PM to 5:00 PM
CTC Conference Room, 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:

Rusty Selix - CalCOG
Ron West - Cambridge Systematics
Garth Hopkins - Caltrans
La Nae VanValen - Caltrans
Laura Pennebaker - Caltrans
Susan Bransen - CTC
Sarah Chesebro - Caltrans
Doug MacIvor - Caltrans
Coco Briseno - Caltrans
DeAnn Baker - CSAC
Bob Johnston - UC Davis

On the phone:

Bruce Abanathie – Kings CAG
Brian Lasagna - BCAG
Bill Davis – Caltrans District 3
Suneil Thomas – TNC
Troy Hightower – Kern COG
Elisa Arias – SANDAG
Geneveve Moreno – SANDAG
Jila Priebe – Caltrans
Liz Brisson – MTC
Shirley Medina – RCTC
Aubrey Spilde – SBCAG
William Yim – SBCAG
Patricia Chen – LA Metro
Linda Wheaton – HCD
Ty Schuiling – SANBAG
Mark Stivers – Senate Transportation and Housing
Jonathan Nadler – SCAG
Mary Pitto – RCRC

Wendy Alfsen – CA Walks
Anya Lawler – Assembly Housing and Community Development
Beth Walukas – Alameda County CMA
Amanda Eaken – NRDC
David Schonbrunn – Transdef
Pete Montgomery – CBIA
Doug Ito – ARB
Dennis Wade – ARB
Bill Davis – Southern CA Contractors Association
Bob Johnston – UC Davis
Sharon Sprowls – Housing CA
Autumn Bernstein – Climate Plan
Steve Devencenzi – SLOCOG
Chris Morfas – SMAQMD
Terry Parker - Caltrans

Overview/Meeting Purpose/Background:

Rusty Selix welcomed all meeting attendees and went through introductions of those individuals in person and on the phone.

Garth Hopkins provided an overview of the November 23, 2009 Draft RTP Guidelines. This draft was reformatted based on comments received and features a reorganized table of contents. New additions to the November 23rd draft are noted in blue font, language that has not changed since the October 26th draft is noted in red font. The purpose of the meeting is to provide an update of workgroup progress to date and to get a general idea of comments. Written comments are due by close of business on Friday 12/11/09. Coco Briseno and Ron West will field comments on the modeling chapter (Chapter 3).

Susan Bransen provided a timeline update. At the Wednesday December 9th CTC meeting, the RTP Guidelines Update will be presented as an informational item for the Commission. Commissioners have been provided a copy of the November 23rd Draft Guidelines. This will serve as an opportunity to brief the Commission on SB 375 required changes to the RTP process, as well as, provide a progress report on the Guidelines update and solicit any input or concerns from the commissioners. The Commission meeting will be held at the Sacramento Convention Center in Room 204. The RTP Guidelines update agenda item is scheduled for approximately 3pm and there is opportunity for public comment. Written comments are due on the November 23rd Draft RTP Guidelines by close of business on Friday December 11th 2009. Susan urged all subcommittee members to work collaboratively prior to submitting comments. The next Draft RTP Guidelines with comments incorporated, will be released January 4th 2010. Comments on the January 4th Draft will be accepted through January 14th and the Final Draft RTP Guidelines will be considered for adoption by the Commission at the February 24th and 25th meeting in Sacramento and the April 7th and 8th meeting in Irvine.

Ron West, Cambridge Systematics, provided an update on the RTP Guidelines Modeling Subcommittee activities. The Modeling Subcommittee met on December 1st and continues to make progress on the Modeling Chapter. Recent comments have focused on the issue of latent/induced demand. Staff is working to coordinate comments that apply to both the modeling chapter as well as other sections of the Guidelines. Modeling Subcommittee efforts will continue with the majority of correspondence taking place via email. The subcommittee will meet again in early January if needed.

Garth Hopkins gave an update on the progress of the 7 workgroups that were formed to provide technical input and guidance to the RTP Guidelines Update Subcommittee:

1. Public Participation – this workgroup has concluded its efforts, they provided input and guidance on the language contained within Section 4.2 regarding public participation.
2. Transportation - this workgroup has concluded its efforts, they provided input and guidance for Sections 6.23 and 6.25 regarding addressing transportation needs in the SCS and land use/transportation strategies to address regional GHG emissions.
3. Sequencing – this workgroup has concluded its efforts, they provided input and guidance for the flowchart in Section 2.7 regarding the RTP development process.
4. RTAC Coordination – this workgroup is finishing its efforts, they have incorporated information from the RTAC report regarding social equity, co-benefits and performance measures into the RTP Guidelines, this language will be finalized in the January 4th draft and the workgroup does not anticipate meeting again.
5. Project Exemption – this workgroup met on December 2nd to discuss language for Section 6.15 of the Guidelines. Numerous comments were received and discussed, draft language was developed that will be incorporated into the January 4th RTP Guidelines draft.
6. Rural Counties – this workgroup met on November 19th to discuss language for Section 6.27 – Non-MPO Rural RTPA Addressing GHG Emissions. Draft language is in the process of being developed and will be incorporated into the January 4th draft.
7. Land Use and Housing – the efforts of this workgroup are ongoing. The workgroup met on November 10th to discuss outstanding land use and housing issues in the November 23rd draft. The workgroup will meet again on December 16th to further discuss outstanding issues and solidify housing and land use assumption language for Section 6.23 of the Guidelines.

Garth Hopkins then opened the discussion for major issues and concerns:

- DeAnn Baker – CSAC, expressed concern over the timeline. Given resource constraints, Counties haven't been able to adequately review the draft Guidelines

and there are areas of concern. There is also minimal mention of the local system in the draft Guidelines. CSAC and other local government agencies would like to see local streets and roads mentioned in the modal discussion. Counties are currently working on revisions and proposed language. There are also inconsistencies in where statute is applied in the Guidelines as well as critical issues that need to be resolved between HCD and local government regarding housing. CSAC, the League, and APA are currently working on providing comments.

- Rusty Selix acknowledged CSAC's concerns, but reminded everyone that the Guidelines are still not finalized, and all interested stakeholders should continue to work with the other appropriate stakeholders as there is still time to submit written comments to meet the next comment deadline on Friday, December 11th.
- David Schonbrunn – TRANSDEF, would like to see all language proposals incorporated into the body of the Guidelines to facilitate group decision on proposed language.
- Steve Devencenzi – SLOCOG, requested an explanation of the County grouping in the Modeling Chapter.

Key Comments to the November 23, 2009 Working Draft:

Chapter 1

No comments received.

Chapter 2

Section 2.2 Page 26

- Amanda Eaken, NRDC, expressed concern with the characterization of the Blueprint as a broader document than the SCS. She will provide written comments.

Section 2.6 Page 3

- DeAnn Baker, CSAC, raised the question of why the items in Section 2.6 were elevated to inclusion in the body of the RTP Guidelines.
- Susan Bransen, CTC, responded that the consideration of Complete Streets in the planning process is critical to avoid potential re-design later in the programming process. CTC would like the Guidelines to reflect that Complete Streets should be considered in the early stages of planning as a best practice to avoid re-work at the final design stage which potentially adds to the cost of a project. Corridor System Management Plans (CSMP) were included in Section 2.6 because the preparation of a CSMP is a requirement for projects receiving Corridor Mobility Improvement Account (CMIA) funding.
- Chris Morfas, SMAQMD, expressed support for the inclusion of Complete Streets policies in the Guidelines and thanked the Commission for their inclusion of Complete Streets policies within the body of the Guidelines.
- Bill Davis, Caltrans, mentioned AB 1358 legislation as it relates to California General Plan Guidelines and Complete Streets in the planning process.

Chapter 3

No comments received.

Chapter 4

Section 4.1 p. 65

- Autumn Bernstein, Climate Plan, suggested that Section 4.1 should contain language/recommendation that MPO's consult with one another during development of the SCS.

Section 4.5 p. 73

- Mark Stivers, Senate Transportation and Housing, suggested that Section 4.5 contain a recommendation for MPO consultation with school districts regarding school siting during development of the SCS.

Chapter 5

No comments received.

Chapter 6

Section 6.8 p. 105

- CSAC, League, and APA will submit Local Streets and Roads language for the Modal Discussion section.

Section 6.15 p. 111

- David Schonbrunn, TRANSDEF, would like to see the internal consistency provision of Mark Stivers language incorporated into this section.

Section 6.23 p. 121

- De Ann Baker, CSAC, expressed concerned about Section 65583.2(c)(3)(B) as it references a high density of units per acre for rural areas, while Section 65583.2(c)(3)(2)(A) should be used as the citation instead as it includes a lower density level for units per acre for rural areas.

Section 6.23 p. 122

- DeAnn Baker, CSAC, requested that cities and counties be included in the consultation process for addressing resource areas and farmland in the SCS.
- Steve Devencenzi, SLOCOG, expressed concern with the directive to "identify regional priority areas for conservation and mitigation efforts" as this can lead to land speculation on surrounding properties that may be counter to the intent of the SCS and SB 375.

Section 6.23 p. 124 – 129

- Susan Bransen, CTC, requested subcommittee members to review the two language proposals in Section 6.23 regarding RHNA/SCS Coordination and Land Use Assumptions.
- DeAnn Baker, CSAC, indicated that CSAC, the League, and APA are working with HCD staff on blending the two language proposals submitted.

Next Steps

The November 23rd working draft will be presented to the Commission as an informational item at the December 9, 2009 Commission meeting for their input and comments. Subcommittee Members are requested to provide written comments on the November 23, 2009 Draft to Caltrans by close of business Friday, December 11, 2009. Caltrans will incorporate these comments and distribute the new working draft on January 4, 2010. The next joint subcommittee meeting is scheduled for Monday January 11, 2010 from 2pm to 5pm.