

POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE (PAC) – MEETING NOTES

Tuesday, October 27, 2015

Dave Ceppos, Associate Director, Center for Collaborative Policy (CCP), CSUS, called the meeting to order and thanked the PAC members for their continued interest. He went over meeting logistics including snacks and restrooms.

Welcome and Remarks – Katie Benouar, Caltrans, Chief, Division of Transportation Planning (DOTP)

And Brian Annis, Undersecretary, California State Transportation Agency (CalSTA).

- Katie Benouar thanked everyone for attending the PAC meeting and for all of their help throughout the entire process of developing the CTP. She reviewed the CTP workshop outreach, noting how staff went around the State engaging with stakeholders and the public to inform everyone about the document. She thanked partner State agencies and acknowledged the Air Resources Board (ARB) and Cambridge Systematics for helping with the modeling and scenarios. Lastly, she thanked all of the Caltrans staff and welcomed Brian Annis to the meeting.
- Brian Annis thanked everyone for attending the meeting. He noted how this is the first CTP under SB 391 and discussed the importance of the CTP to influence achieving a low carbon transportation system statewide. He touched on how there have been many refinements in modeling and wants to make sure that different types of readers and audiences will be able to comprehend the message contained in the CTP. He requested feedback from the group on the Top Ten Final Draft Recommendations handout and encouraged more public input in the next few weeks when the draft is released.
- Dave Ceppos asked to go around the room for introductions.
- Chris Ratekin went over the agenda to give an overview of what topics and presentations would be presented for that day.

Overview of CTP 2040: Gabriel Corley, Caltrans, Office of State Planning

Gabriel Corley stated the main objective of his plan overview presentation was to go over the major differences between the March CTP Draft and the Final CTP draft. Gabriel first explained the new table of contents and discussed the new layout of the chapters in the final draft. He then presented a slide that showed the March draft's chapters listed and compared to the new chapters. He clarified nothing was deleted but rather all of the language from the previous draft was condensed and information was moved around to make the document more readable. The more in-depth technical analysis information was moved to technical appendices, which gives those people interested the opportunity to refer to the detailed analysis.

He then asked the PAC members to look at the Top Ten Final Draft Recommendations handout. He ended by sharing where the plan is and what the next steps are. The CTP document is still under management review and should be out for 30-day public review in a few weeks. .

PAC Member Comments/Questions to the Overview of CTP 2040

- Linda Wheaton (Department of Housing & Community Development): What are the trends and opportunities specifically identified in the document?
 - Gabriel Corley: Some of the opportunities are related to demographic trends and other travel behavior trends such as an increase in bicycling/walking, changes in per capita VMT and development of cleaner alternative fuel markets.

Final Transportation Forecasts: Ron West, Cambridge Systematics

Ron West explained the refinements conducted using the California Statewide Transportation Demand Model (CSTDm) for all three scenarios for the final draft of the document. For Scenario 2, analysis of the pricing strategy was refined as 8 cents a mile in auto-operating costs in rural areas and 16 cents a mile in urban areas. The transit assumption regarding transit speed was decreased by 50% compared to doubling the speeds in the draft run. All other assumptions for GHG reductions strategies were not changed in the analysis.

Ron went over the VMT changes that occurred from the March draft to the final draft due to the refined analysis. The CSTDm VMT reductions went from -24.3% to -22.6%. The off-model adjustments went from -9.2% to -10.2%, with the final draft including a 1% VMT reduction for car pool lanes. He then went over additional statewide VMT adjustments and explained about the San Joaquin Valley changes to make more realistic projections. The VMT was lowered for San Joaquin Valley Counties due to lower projected growth than what was included in the SCSs.

When analyzing impacts of auto-operating cost, the CSTDm only took into account direct fuel and maintenance costs to drivers, which resulted in a lower starting point. Ron wanted to make this distinction since costs such as financing and insurance are not included like they are in AAA data.

PAC Member Comments/Questions to Final Transportation Forecasts

- Marco Gonzalez (Caltrans): Regarding "Policy vs. Objective"-- it has been taken out to avoid confusion. Everything analyzed is now listed as strategies.
- Huasha Liu (Southern California Council of Governments): How did the total GHG reduction estimated to be achieved by 2050 statewide compare to the contribution of the four big MPOs?
 - Ron West:
 - The overall governor's order, AB 32 lays out the statewide goal of reducing GHG emissions below 1990 GHG levels by 2020.
 - The contribution and relation to the big four MPOs is assumed in Scenario 1, including all changes from the SCS or MPO assumptions. The contribution of MPOs by regional plan is not readily available right now.
- Huasha Liu (continued):
 - How do the impacts of the mobile source strategies relate to the total GHG emission inventory including stationary source reductions? Need to have a 'fair-share' discussion as part of the big picture.
 - What do the three scenarios mean to the MPOs SCS for meeting current targets and developing future targets?
 - Brian Annis: In the CTP, Chapter 3 "Analysis" gives an idea of the magnitude of strategies necessary to reduce emissions. The CTP is a vision plan that will help inform subsequent policy actions. The strategies analyzed in Chapter 3 are not the same as the policy recommendations in Chapter 4.
- Susan Bransen (California Transportation Commission): She mentioned the new SB 1077 as it calls for the replacement of the excise tax on gas. Since this is a policy document, it makes it seem the State is intent on increasing the price of fuel, which can send mixed messages. Are these assumptions built upon what the MPOs already have? How does it impact what the MPOs plan to do? Does it set new statewide policy for pricing? Is there a phase-in period? How do impacts to the economy tie into all of this?
 - Brian Annis: The variable use charge has been clarified to avoid confusion in the final draft of the document. The strategies analyzed were to determine the magnitude of change needed to achieve GHG reductions. Subsequent policy actions will need to be determined by policy makers in other venues.

- Susan Bransen: Is this an increase in excise gas tax or is there a mileage charge?
 - Ron West: Neither. The analysis and the recommendations presented today do not point to either of those directly. Ron explained that the model is limited and it can assess the auto-operating cost changes, which can be characterized in several ways; dependent on policy direction. Further, the cost to operate vehicles in 2040 could be assumed to go up the modest amount analyzed via market forces alone. The analysis was designed to assess various ways to reduce VMT throughout the State.
- Muggs Stoll (San Diego Association of Governments): He feels that a lot of time was spent on talking about the difference between SCS/RTP vs. CTP. CTP is aspirational and RTPs are fiscally constrained and a CEQA document must be prepared for MPO plans. With all of the reformatting of the CTP, he asked that the discussion be retained, because there is a high potential for confusion. It is important to make the distinction between fiscally constrained RTPs and an aspirational, visionary CTP.
 - What baseline were the VMT reductions based on?
 - Ron West: It is relative to transportation Scenario 1 (business as usual) – RTP/SCS assumptions that include all MPO assumptions regarding population, housing, jobs as well as the State modal plans out to 2040. It results in a net increase on GHG overall
- Chris Ganson (Office of Planning & Research): CTP isn't so much a plan, but rather it is more of a vision document. There are a series of measures that were run through a model in order to see how much of an effect they would have. We're using it as a place for generating ideas. Shows what's possible if we do those things. He included a caveat that limitations of the models are they don't include land use and how that changes pricing. Models are used to generate ideas to show the possibilities.
- Ron West: Keep in mind strategies analyzed wouldn't be implemented in the next year, but more like out 25 years.
- Bill Higgins (California Association of Councils of Governments): Regional Transportation Plans, have a name for aspirational un-constrained plans and it's called the "alternative planning strategy" or APS. That's what this is for the State. That's ok because it is a vision. The connection between the two (RTP vs. CTP) should be very clear.
 - The analysis for transit implies that we're going to increase transit ridership, efficiency, increase transit speed, etc., by 50% but doesn't say how we're going to get there. The pricing strategy analyzed implies a specific policy be implemented but without the plan, it is unclear what is being recommended. In the plan, the pricing should be kept more general to avoid impacting other funding discussions in process.

CTP 2040 Scenarios of GHG Emissions: Cody Howard, ARB

Cody Howard explained ARB ran the VISION model tool using outputs from the CSTDM. They analyzed the three scenarios. Scenario 1 reflected baseline VMT for all vehicles. Scenario 2 analyzed VMT reductions from aggressive statewide transportation strategies. Scenario 3 looked at the magnitude of transformations needed to reach 2050 GHG reduction goal.

Since the last CTP draft, ARB took the updated CSTDM data and generated new data. Scenario 1 showed tank-to-wheel broken down by Light Duty Vehicles (LDV) and Heavy Duty Vehicles (HDV), rail, etc. Scenario 2 shows the reduction of emissions of only LDVs, not HDVs. Scenario 3 is one of many paths to reach 2050 assumptions. LDV by 2050 shows new vehicles are four times more fuel efficient than today's levels. 20 million ZEVs are assumed to be on the road by 2050. Also HDVs by 2030 will be 12% of electric vehicle sales. Freight rail and aviation will have an increase of 2% per year efficiency fleet wide.

He then gave a summary of what is expected of the three scenarios. The 2050 Scenario 1 emissions were projected to be 10% above 2020 levels. Scenario 2 showed GHG emission reductions to be 15% below 2020 levels by 2050 (23% by 2040). Scenario 3 assumed aggressive assumptions in advanced technology powertrains for vehicles, alternative fuels and vehicle efficiency to achieve the targets.

PAC Member Comments/Questions to CTP 2040 Scenarios of GHG Emissions

- Muggs Stoll: Why is there an increase between 2040 and 2050?
 - Cody Howard: The strategy employed in the CSTDM only goes out to 2040, after that we assume those strategies are fixed. As the population increases, the numbers go up because new strategies are not analyzed beyond 2040 in Scenarios 1 and 2.
- Bill Higgins: Does the vision model have sub-regions in the state? Are there differences in the sub-regions?
 - Cody Howard: There are different regions in the vision model, but the GHG reduction strategy is an overall statewide reduction strategy. The focus was on the statewide reduction estimates.
- Elizabeth O'Donoghue: What does "other transportation" mean? Where does that fit in?
 - Cody Howard: That includes support equipment, transportation refrigeration units and off-road vehicles (ex: airport baggage carts).
- Elizabeth O'Donoghue: Where would active transportation be in this chart?
 - Cody Howard: It is not included because it wouldn't emit any GHG. Those reductions would be reflected in Scenario 2 mode shift strategies to achieve a reduction in GHG for LDVs.

Open Discussion: Dave Ceppos

Dave Ceppos opened the discussion and asked committee members to focus on lessons learned, feedback on the process for the next CTP, input for next scenarios to be developed, and recommendations and preference on how the rollout of the plan should be implemented.

PAC member's suggestions:

- Elizabeth O'Donoghue: List of her comments below:
 - Wants the CTP to be mindful of the audience. It needs to be more about the regular public and less about transportation experts/specialists.
 - She thinks that the CTP is tied to policies like AB 32 instead of just being an aspirational document. From a messaging standpoint, she would like to see the CTP be more inspirational rather than aspirational.
 - She thought that the Top Ten Final Draft Recommendations were well done. One thing that was absent were the climate goals. We need to do everything we can to achieve our climate goals.
 - She suggested that a table or chart for the technical analysis be added into the document (ex: columns for "where we are", "how to get there", etc.)
 - For the next CTP, wants the document to look at land use and behavior change of transportation projects in a comprehensive way.
 - She feels that this document shouldn't just be about transportation and mentioned that the document should look at co-benefits.
- Jacqueline Duerr (California Department of Public Health): In terms of lessons learned and moving forward, we do not have a good sense of the transportation costs. She would like to look at the true cost of transportation. She also suggested framing championing California's vision, because California is ahead of the curve and it would show the state's awareness to come together and discuss climate change and sustainability. As for the Top Ten Final Draft Recommendations, they need to be more aggressive directional statements (ex: recommendation #7 add in language "grow

and expand” or “increase the share of”). She also mentioned the lack of community and health within the recommendations.

- Ed Long (Department of Aging): He mentioned that it is very satisfying for the Department of Aging to be engaged with the CTP development. He brought up a rollout concern about how to make this CTP more comprehensible to people outside of the transportation field. His concern was that since the CTP is an alternative planning strategy, is this plan meaningful at the local level? If so people need to know how they can use it. He suggested having a page or two to describe how to use the plan, which would help with engaging the older aged demographic. Regarding recommendation #9, he doesn't understand “maximize biological benefit”. Lastly, he suggested the recommendations to use language such as “human, people, etc.”
- Ted Link-Oberstar (Senate Staff): He brought up the comparison between aspirations vs inspirational and thinks there's a huge communication gap. There also needs to be a balance between GHG reduction and the other goals. Lastly, Scenario 2 has a lot of transportation factors on how and where people get around, it gets us part of the way. Elaborated on how there needs to be less reliance on improved technology, and more emphasis should be on what transportation-related strategies will achieve from the goals set forth.
- Chris Ganson: List of his comments below:
 - A lot is also with VMT reduction and where its co-benefits are.
 - Regarding the Top Ten Final Draft Recommendations, he suggested that “alternatives” is not the right word to be used and that a better word needs to be used.
 - He brought up recommendation # 2 “fix-it-first” and suggested that we mention reverse angle parking, add bike lanes, complete streets etc.
 - Convert HOV lanes rather than adding lanes. It would be better for GHG reduction.
 - Regarding roadway pricing, the CTP is an opportunity to show the effects/benefits. If not in the CTP, where else can we mention roadway pricing?
 - Must be clear about additional work it will take to achieve goals. Also his concern is that people will just look at it and think there's already a solution in place and be complacent. There's more work that needs to be done on this end.
 - For the next CTP, it should grapple with land use, and use the PECAS model.
 - He would like a more holistic economic analysis. He feels that parts of the picture were missed. The CTP needs to show the economic benefits of decreases in VMT.
 - Wants co-benefits added in, such as health and quality of life.
- Linda Wheaton: She didn't feel comfortable to address all of the themes that Dave had listed at the beginning of the discussion without the draft document. She feels that it is a daunting task to reach the current goals within the plan and wants to know some concrete ways to make our goals attainable. As for the recommendations, she feels they are light and don't have enough reference to the assembly and senate bills. She wants the recommendations to have more concrete objectives and strategies.
- Bill Higgins: He feels owners of most of the roads within the State (counties/cities) aren't represented well enough at the PAC meetings. He wanted to know if local city/county officials were more involved, what outcomes would be seen. He suggested adding “work with local government to achieve...” to the recommendations. Also he mentioned that the document should frame it as where we are going if we don't do anything and where we will go if we do something. He also doesn't see strong commitment in the Top Ten Final Draft Recommendations.
- Muggs Stoll: Regarding the recommendations, he felt they are very general. He suggested adding in a recommendation that deals with technology by itself. Also he believed that the PAC should bring in tech industry people to give us an idea of what is going on in their end. Regarding the aspirational vs. fiscally constrained talk, he emphasized that there needs to be a balance between achieving inspiration plans and the reality of constraints that MPOs have to follow. Need to work together to highlight early positive actions already underway by MPOs.
- Dave Ceppos: The discussion was ended and the main comment themes brought up by PAC members were summarized:

- Readability of the document. Illustrate “where we are, where we are going, and how to get there”
- On the Top Ten Final Draft Recommendations: members wanted greater focus on technical element.
- Comments regarding land use role on transportation. There is a gap between linking transportation and land use plans.
- Members want bolder/aggressive statements for the recommendations.
- Members wanted more climate change focus displayed within the recommendations.
- Rollout plan: Illustrate what needs to be achieved to reach our goals?

Next Steps/Updates: Chris Ratekin

Chris thanked the PAC and TAC members for their commitment. She mentioned that staff will be documenting the notes taken at the meeting and that once the final draft of the CTP is available it will be sent out for a 30 day public review.

Wrap-Up: Katie Benouar

Katie looks forward to working with PAC and TAC members in the future. After the CTP is wrapped up, the CTC will start developing guidelines for the next CTP. She then concluded by thanking everyone for all of their commitment and effort towards the development of the document.

ATTENDANCE

Name	External Organizations
Azadeh Doherty	Sacramento Area Council of Governments
Bill Higgins	California Association of Councils of Governments
Brian Annis	California State Transportation Agency
Chris Ganson	Office of Planning & Research
Cody Howard	California Air Resources Board
Connie DaMant	Department of Rehabilitation
Dave Ceppos	Center for Collaborative Policy, CSUS
Ed Long	Department of Aging
Elizabeth Grassi	California Strategic Growth Council
Elizabeth O'Donoghue	The Nature Conservancy
Heather Adamson	Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments
Huasha Liu	Southern California Association of Governments
Jacqueline Duerr	California Department of Public Health
Janet Dawson	Assembly Transportation Committee
Karen Magliano	California Air Resources Board
Kristine Cai	Fresno Council of Governments
Linda Wheaton	Department of Housing and Community Development
Mardy Thomas	Glenn County Planning and Public Works Agency
Melissa Dumond	California High Speed Rail
Melissa White	California Association of Councils of Governments
Muggs Stoll	San Diego Association of Governments
Nesamani Kalandiyur	California Air Resources Board
Ron West	Cambridge Systematics
Stephanie Horii	Center for Collaborative Policy, CSUS
Susan Bransen	California Transportation Commission
Tami Grove	California Coastal Commission
Ted Link-Oberstar	Senate Staff
Victoria Alvarez	California Assembly

ATTENDANCE (Continued)

Name	Caltrans
Barry Padilla	Caltrans, Economic Analysis Branch
Chris Ratekin	Caltrans, Office of State Planning
Christian Bushong	Caltrans, Office of State Planning
Coco Briseno	Caltrans, Deputy Director of Planning & Modal Programs
Gabriel Corley	Caltrans, Office of State Planning
Garth Hopkins	Caltrans, Office of Regional Planning
Jahangir Kashkooli	Caltrans
Jan Persheler	Caltrans, Department of Rail & Mass Transportation
Josephine Hsai	Caltrans, Office of State Planning
Katie Benouar	Caltrans, Division of Transportation Planning
Marco Gonzalez	Caltrans, Office of State Planning
Mark Barry	Caltrans, Office of State Planning
Marlon Flournoy	Caltrans, District 3, Division of Planning and Local Assistance
Michael Sidhu	Caltrans, Office of State Planning
Patrick Record	Caltrans, Office of State Planning
Rose Agacer-Solis	Caltrans, Economic Analysis Branch
Ryan Ong	Caltrans, Economic Analysis Branch
Scott Sauer	Caltrans, Office of System and Freight Planning