California Transportation Commission

Regional Transportation Plan Guidelines
2010 Update Subcommittee

Regional Targets Advisory Committee Coordination Workgroup

Teleconference Meeting Notes – Summary

Wednesday, November 4, 2009 1:00 PM to 3:00 PM
Sacramento Area Council of Governments

Facilitator: Gordon Garry, SACOG

Welcome/Introductions:
Gordon Garry provided a welcome and introductions were made. Gordon began the meeting by asking workgroup members to bring forward any recommendations or issues from the Regional Targets Advisory Committee (RTAC) report relevant to the guidelines.

Key Comments:
- Pete Parkinson – there are some topics in the RTAC report that cross over to the RTP guidelines such as the use of empirical data; the need for calibrating models; and the need to identify key assumptions.
- The modeling subcommittee is addressing the need to calibrate models.
- With respect to the housing and social equity recommendations in the RTAC report, it is important to be careful with incorporating RHNA guidance to avoid conflicts with the purpose of the RTP guidelines.
- Ontario has a high particulate air quality issue despite housing is located close to transit given the housing is also located near a goods movement corridor. How should this be addressed in the guidelines?
- To the extent the RHNA process is included in the RTP, it should mirror the statute.
- The language in SB 375 was to provide flexibility between regions and this should be carried forward in the guidelines.
- The key issues is the notion of "flexibility". This is very important.
- The RTAC report recommends a 'bottoms up approach" to public participation and involvement of local public officials as these perspectives will inform SCS development. This should be brought forward to the guidelines.
- Concern raised on timing of RTAC report and overall ARB process. Susan Bransen, CTC, reminded the group the RTAC report is an information item with ARB, and no official action is to be taken. Justin Paddock, ARB, reviewed that RTAC report is only information for the ARB (Board) to consider while Targets developed. Justin again referred the group back to the report's Section 2 (advises the ARB re "general rules of thumb") and Section 3 (good for MPOs to consider when developing an RTP)
- Susan Bransen again, as requested, clarified the next series of events in the overall RTP Guideline timeline: November 10 for final comments due on 2nd draft Guidelines distributed; November 23 when 3rd draft to be distributed; December 9 & 10 meeting as a CTC "information item" and February 1st for a deadline for a final draft. Susan

emphasized that at the end of January the Guidelines need to be done to meet the February 1st deadline. She continued that the Guidelines could be adopted in April, possibly May if there are issues. Susan also noted that the Federal Guidelines/Re-authorization will be coming soon, as well as the Federal Climate Bill. These events will probably need to be reflected in another RTP Guidelines update.

- Reference the SCS section to other public participation sections as to how the public participation process informs the SCS process through public input and the input received from elected officials.
- La Nae VanValen, Caltrans, referred the group to section 4.29, page 95 of the October 26, 2009 RTP Guidelines Working draft with respect to performance measures. She questioned whether the group thought anything was needed to be added in response to the RTAC report.
- Suggested that the RTAC report recommendations with respect to performance measures for GHG and social equity and public health, could be cross referenced to the list of performance measures.
- Suggested work for balance between social equity and reducing GHG levels, while still being aware of statutes.
- Concern also raised in general about being flexible and still being aware of "shoulds" and "shalls" in the process. It is also anticipated that local entities/governments will ask for more guidance.
- Important to focus on VMT, GHG, and keep the language broad with respect to other programming requirements.
- RTAC report, page 16 – add the empirical evidence phrase to the modeling chapter since this is already being done now.
- Strike references to BMP and rely on post processing language.
- CSAC will send rural sustainability financial element information taken from Government Code Section 65080(b) (4) (c).
- General recommendation was made as to how things could be improved statewide by requiring that other state agencies provide help to MPOs in the RTP development process.
- Chad Baker questioned the group with respect to page 25 of the RTAC report on Statewide Modeling Assumptions. ARB will continue working on this. MPOs are starting to discuss this and bring suggestions forward. Gordon Garry thought this was outside the guidelines modeling chapter.
- Recommendation was that because the RTAC report recommends to include statewide assumptions related to cars and light trucks for target setting, as a best practice the MPOs could use this in the entire modeling throughout the RTP. Another best practice is to communicate with ARB on what data points and topics should be used for 2020 and 2035 targets.
- Chad Baker questioned page 16, 2nd bullet of the RTAC report as far as whether the guidelines should incorporate the empirical evidence recommendation in the modeling guidance. Gordon Garry said that MPOs are already using empirical data and should just provide this clarification in Chapter 3 of the guidelines. Model validation and calibration were terms that were used in the past. Now the RTAC gave this a new name "empirical evidence" and should be explained in the guidelines.

- Pete Parkinson said that we need to improve the transparency of the RTP planning process as related to the SCS. To the extent we can show the public there is validation for the type of transportation system the better chance we will have of meeting GHG reduction goals. It was agreed that this should be tied into chapter 4 of the guidelines.
- SCAG wants to make sure that we are not too prescriptive in the guidelines.
- SB 375 gave MPOs a lot of duty with no authority so it is implicit that the MPO has to find a way to get targets achieved. Do we need to say any words in the guidelines? Can we just keep silent in the guidelines despite this tremendous burden? Agreed that the MPOs need to be encouraged without writing the lack of funding for implementation into the guidelines.

Action Item Summary:

- CSAC will submit language to the financial element from section 65080b(4)(c) of the Government Code.
- Caltrans will update the guidelines to incorporate RTAC report recommendations relating to social equity and environmental justice.
- Caltrans will update the SCS chapter to reference public participation input from local elected as informing the development of the SCS.
- Caltrans will update Chapter 4 of the guidelines to address the need for consulting on statewide assumptions and best practices.
- It was agreed that this workgroup would not meet again unless a need was identified after the next working draft is issued.