

DISCLAIMER: This is not a verbatim transcript of the RTP/CTP Guidelines workgroup meeting and is based upon the written notes of a participant, attendee, or observer. To ensure staff is able to adequately compile and address stakeholder feedback, written comments are kindly requested.

# California Transportation Plan Guidelines and Regional Transportation Plan Draft Guidelines Workgroup Meetings

July 13-14, 2016



Prepared by:



Moore Iacofano Goltsman, Inc.  
800 Hearst Avenue  
Berkeley, CA 94710

July 2016

DISCLAIMER: This is not a verbatim transcript of the RTP/CTP Guidelines workgroup meeting and is based upon the written notes of a participant, attendee, or observer. To ensure staff is able to adequately compile and address stakeholder feedback, written comments are kindly requested.

DISCLAIMER: This is not a verbatim transcript of the RTP/CTP Guidelines workgroup meeting and is based upon the written notes of a participant, attendee, or observer. To ensure staff is able to adequately compile and address stakeholder feedback, written comments are kindly requested.

## Table of Contents

Introduction.....	1
I. RTP Guidelines—Modeling.....	2
II. CTP Guidelines—Modeling.....	6
III. RTP Guidelines—Public Health, Active Transportation and Social Equity .....	8
IV. CTP Guidelines— Public Health, Active Transportation and Social Equity .....	14
V. RTP and CTP Guidelines—Performance Measures and State & Federal Regulations.....	16
VI. RTP Guidelines—Sustainable Communities Strategy Guidance on SCS Development.....	19
VII. CTP Guidelines—Addressing State Goals.....	23
VIII. RTP Guidelines and CTP Guidelines—Climate Change Adaptation, Air Quality, Other Environmental Concerns.....	26
IX. RTP Guidelines—Freight Issues .....	29
X. CTP Guidelines—Freight Issues .....	30
XI. List of Attendees.....	32

DISCLAIMER: This is not a verbatim transcript of the RTP/CTP Guidelines workgroup meeting and is based upon the written notes of a participant, attendee, or observer. To ensure staff is able to adequately compile and address stakeholder feedback, written comments are kindly requested.

## Introduction

The RTP/CTP Draft Guidelines Workgroup Meetings were held on July 13 and 14, 2016, in the Caltrans Satellite Building at 1500 5th Street in Sacramento. The meetings were hosted by staff from Caltrans and the California Transportation Commission (CTC) to solicit input on the draft guidelines for the Regional Transportation Plans (RTPs) and the California Transportation Plan (CTP). Garth Hopkins, CTC, opened the work sessions and welcomed the participants in the room and those participating by conference call. He introduced members of the team that included: Laura Pennebaker (CTC), Gabe Corley, Caltrans and Priscilla Martinez-Velez, Caltrans. He also introduced Joan Chaplick, MIG, Inc. who would serve as the facilitator for the workgroup meetings and Maria Mayer, MIG, who would take notes on the comments and questions received.

Garth explained that the group would follow the schedule on the agenda to accommodate the needs of those participating via conference call. Both in-person and telephone participants were able to provide their comments and ask questions.

There were over 100 participants who attended via teleconference and in-person. A broad range of stakeholders, local, regional, State, and Federal agencies attended the workgroup sessions.

A list of attendees is provided at the end of the document.

Joan Chaplick, Facilitator, MIG, welcomed participants to each session and introduced California Transportation Commission (CTC) and Caltrans staff who shared the following points:

- Each session began with a short presentation that explaining the focus of the relevant section of the guidelines, what has changed and giving some direction regarding topics on which comments would be helpful.
- Sessions were convened to receive comments on the draft guidelines; no determination or resolutions of issues are to be expected.
- Key dates in the process:
  - July 20: scheduled for a possible follow-up session if needed.
  - First-second week of August: Workgroup meetings in Los Angeles (requested by Southern California stakeholders).
  - August 5: Deadline for comments on the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) RTP Guidelines and CTP Guidelines drafts.
  - August 15: Deadline for comments on the RTP Guidelines for Regional Transportation Planning Agencies (RTPA).
  - August-September: Additional workgroup meetings as necessary.
  - Mid-September: Second draft of guidelines released for comment.
- Draft should be considered a starting point for the discussion. We are seeking to learn where it could be clarified or improved. Our intent is to achieve a general consensus that most State and regional planning agencies feel comfortable with implementing.
- Encouraged participants to provide written comments and suggested language for specific portions of guidelines as early as possible. The comment form is available on the Caltrans website. An email with the link was sent before the workgroups and will be sent again afterward. Depending on the volume of comments received on any given topic, it may not be possible to integrate all proposed wording, but staff will incorporate as much as possible.
- If there is a need, there may be more workgroups, but stakeholders are welcome to contact Caltrans directly with questions and comments.

# I. RTP Guidelines—Modeling

## Session Overview

### Reza Navai, Caltrans:

- Purpose is to provide relevant info and directions to MPOs and RTPAs, as applicable, on Traffic Demand Model (TDM) to support RTP air quality conformity and SCS implementation based on Federal and State requirements. Intended to ensure coordination and consistency.
- Kelly Egan of Caltrans led a working group of subject matter experts from State agencies and MPOs in a preliminary review of Chapter 3 in 2010 guidelines. Looked at recent Federal and State law changes as applied to modeling practices.
- The chapter reflects current modeling information and information gained from reviewing: TDMs from the first group of Sustainable Communities Strategies (SCS); most important living reference documents; and comments already received from State and Federal agencies.

## Discussion

- **Governor’s Office of Planning and Research (OPR):**
  - Expressed concern that 25 pages of guidance on modeling, broken down by different size MPOs, has been cut to 5 pages.
  - **Response:**
    - Caltrans: An early working draft had only a small amount incorporated; it is now up to 24 pages. Please let us know of specific areas where details are missing so we can address them. Nearly 90% of comments received are incorporated; some general, unspecific comments were held over for workgroup discussion. Please provide specific text references regarding elements that are missing and we’ll be glad to incorporate them; however, there is little difference in substance between the two documents.
- **UC Davis:** Provided three handouts detailing his comments (attached as Appendix 1). Summary:
  - Disagrees; believes the 2010 version gave detailed modeling advice, distinguishing requirements from recommendations and clarifying which pertained to each of 8 categories of MPOs. This guidance has been substantially reduced and moved to Section 3.5, “RTP Modeling Improvement Program.” Changes the meaning, simply gives suggestions for what MPOs might want to do to improve their models. Recommendation: Retitle the section and use language from 2010 RTP Guidelines.
  - The USEPA/USDOT rule for air conformity analysis in nonattainment areas, 40 CFR 93.122, which gives specific modeling recommendations, is only indirectly referenced in Chapter 3.
  - Chapter 2.7 of SB 743 states that “the OPR may also establish criteria for models used to analyze transportation impacts to ensure the models are accurate, reliable and consistent with the intent of this section.” His interpretation is that the OPR has direct authority in the adoption of these guidelines.
  - **Response: Caltrans:**
    - On page 56, the revised Guidelines state clearly that “the following requirements relate only to regional emissions analysis in serious, severe, and extreme ozone nonattainment areas and serious CO nonattainment areas if their metropolitan planning area contains an urbanized area population over 200,000 (40 CFR 93.122(b).” It appears that there’s only one place in California required to use a TDM under this rule.
    - Agrees there’s an important need for models to do this extensive analysis and to conform with SB 375. This is why the RTP Guidelines document is linked to living documents which are updated more frequently and specifically to keep everything relevant. The RTP is intended as a broader document.
  - **UC Davis:** The document misquotes 40 CFR 93.122(b). He also believes that Caltrans is misreading the “and” in the statement quoted on page 56; the requirement applies to most regions in California. This statement is not quoted in Section 3.5, “RTP Model Improvement Program,” but in Section 3.4, “RTDM Quality Control and Consistency,” where one would never expect to find it.

- **Cambridge Systematics:**
  - Update appears to improve format and readability. The title headings were an improvement.
  - Suggestions:
    - Add section on data and data collection. It would lengthen the chapter but be helpful. Additional sources of observed data—big data such as cell and GPS data—are available and will help validate and calibrate model systems.
    - Some MPOs use off-model analyses, and a discussion of these things which TDMs can't estimate, but which would impact VMT, would be relevant as well.
- **Sacramento Area Council Of Governments (SACOG):**
  - The conformity analysis contains no reference to the particulate matter nonattainment areas.
  - Best management practices are mentioned in several places—for example, on page 51, with reference to the RTAC report—but no clarification what this means or what their role should be. There's been much discussion as to what best management practices should be as opposed to use of regional TDMs. Some clarity regarding this definition and role would be useful, particularly in light of off-model calculations that are part of the SB 375 calculation process, since there is some overlap.
  - Regarding UC Davis Professor Bob Johnston's handout on SB 743: because it applies to CEQA analysis for projects, it has a direct relevance to the extent that an RTP is a project under CEQA. The broader context is that the vast majority of SB 743's impact, once the regulations are fully completed and defined, will be on projects by lead agencies that are not MPOs/RTPAs. However, this is an opportunity to use these tools efficiently to achieve those policy ends. The clarification between project-level and RTP-level analysis must be included in these guidelines.
- **Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC):**
  - Passing on recommendations from MTC modeling staff. They feel that Section 3.6, "RTP Travel Analysis Groupings," gives the clearest guidance. Recommendations:
    - The rest of the chapter could be restructured to fit within those agency types.
    - Look at the overall organization of the chapter—it seems a little disjointed.
  - On page 50, reference is made to using the same land use policy across regions, which conflicts with the idea of considering different land uses in the SCS. Recommendation: Update this reference in the RTP Guidelines to match the SCS.
  - Regarding the "Model Calibration and Validation" section on page 55: these are pretty complex topics. The discussion of validation could do more harm than good, motivating overfitting of models as opposed to a really good calibration process.
- **California Association of Councils of Governments (CALCOG):**
  - Suggestions for overarching considerations for this workgroup discussion:
    - In comparing this draft to the 2010 Guidelines, we must recognize what changed. We've learned what has and has not worked from the RTAC Report. The meaning of "best practices" is very different today than in 2010.
    - Re: SACOG's point about project-level analysis versus a RTP level of analysis—important to focus on modeling in the context of the RTP, not how individual projects are modeled. Individual projects may not choose to use a regional model; the draft SB 743 guidelines developed by the OPR contain other options.
    - In discussing SB 743 and other performance-based metrics which will be included in the RTP Guidelines, must recognize the current stage of progress in developing those processes. A number of processes moving forward may also impact the process, including: several Federal processes; SB 743 guidelines; and a Federal notice of proposed rulemaking regarding how multiple MPOs within an urban area must work together. Must keep these things in mind while discussing RTP guidelines update, and consider whether to incorporate these various other guidelines now, or later when it's clearer how they'll play out on the Federal and State side.
- **Nevada County Transportation Commission (NCTC): Question:** Will be a recap of questions and responses, and can handouts can be sent to those on the phone? **Response:** Yes.

- **California Air Resources Board (ARB):** Many items that are requirements are currently listed under best practices. Suggestion: Move those to the requirements (“Shalls”) section. ARB can provide references if needed.
- **Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG):** There are a number of places where the guidelines are confusing and need to be made clear—many of these on pages 61-62. Need to be open to the differences in how different size MPOs operate. He will send comments in writing.
- **Public Advocates:**
  - A group of outside stakeholders will submit some high-level principles to guide the update process. These include:
    - Transparency in modeling statement: modeling is an exercise in probabilities based on assumptions. The guidelines should ensure that both the assumptions and the margin of error are specified transparently.
    - Modeled outcomes on paper should not be a substitute for investments and policies in RTPs that are well-tailored to actually achieve SB 375 mandates to reduce GHG emissions at all income levels of the population and achieve social equity.
    - Projected GHG reduction and housing production during the four-year RTP/SCS term should be specified.
  - **Question:** Does the new chapter include any language to ensure consistency in the modelling methodology between the different alternatives in the EIR?
    - **Response—Caltrans:** We need to go back in and ensure consistency.
    - **Caltrans:** There is some information on consistency and quality control in the section. State law requires that the methodology used for the TDM model through SB 375 is made available to the public in a way that they can understand, which is important. Also the internal consistency requirement of SB 375.
    - **CALCOG:** The reality of the modeling in the different processes is that, since it’s the same TDM, the methodology is consistent. The TDM costs millions of dollars to create, so we’re not creating multiple TDMs. The differences come in in terms of where land uses are located and the different kinds of collaborative transportation and housing investment scenarios—from most aggressive to least aggressive—not in the tools being used to assess those scenarios.
  - **Public Advocates:** During the last round of RTP updates, there was a situation in one region where alternatives were run through the land use model, and the housing fell where it fell—except in the preferred alternative, where the housing was distributed in certain pre-set numbers within particular zones and the model was only used to locate housing on sites within those zones.
    - **Response—CALCOG:** What likely happened is that they ran scenarios through their land use model, then presented them to their local jurisdictions and wound up with a hybrid of those scenarios. They probably made some manual changes based on existing entitled developments and other factors not captured in the original scenario modeling, but using the same fundamental modeling process.
    - **Facilitator:** Recommendation: follow-up and speak to Kelly directly rather than getting situation-specific in this forum.
    - **Tehama County Transportation Commission:** That point is appreciated since this is guidance for all MPOs. Every region is different and modeling is not an exact science.
- **ARB: Question**—can we see the aggregated comments before the next draft is published?
  - **Response—Priscilla Martinez-Velez, Caltrans:** Yes, all comments will be posted in the form of an Excel spreadsheet log on the website.
- **OPR:** In addition to statutes that guide modeling, there is also a State law that requires best practices. Suggestion: think about the legal implications and whether best practices really belong in a separate category outside of “shoulds” and “shalls.”
- **MTC: Recommendation:** The modeling chapter should contain requirements for modeling; guidance on things that modeling is used for should be in other chapters.
- **Reza Navai, Caltrans** thanked everyone and noted that we look forward to receiving written comments – we’ll compare to others and incorporate into next draft. Our role is not writing the document, we’re facilitating the development of this guidance and relying on your comments and suggestions. **Kelly Egan, Caltrans** also encouraged specific language, and that it be categorized as a “Shall,” “Should” or “Best Practice.” “Shalls” are required by State

or Federal legislation; “Shoulds” are recommendations made in Federal or State legislation; “Best Practices” are not recommended or required but are the best thing to do.

## **Further Discussion of RTP Modeling Guidelines**

- **Garth Hopkins, CTC:**
  - Should RTP modeling be on the agenda for an additional workgroup on July 20th, or is this discussion sufficient for stakeholders to submit comments to Caltrans?
- **Consensus:**
  - All would prefer to wait until all comments on modeling have been received (after August 5th comment deadline) to see if additional discussion is warranted. Staff will organize comments and send them out, ideally with a draft revision of the chapter to show how they have affected it. July 20th is too soon.
  - Also suggested that a subcommittee or technical working group be formed to discuss modeling in more detail.
  - Timing for additional session: potentially, first-second week of August. Technical working group of modelers will convene to discuss, possibly in early August. Those on workgroup signup will receive more info.

## II. CTP Guidelines—Modeling

### Session Overview

#### Gabriel Corley, CTP Project Manager, Caltrans:

- These are the first-ever CTP Guidelines; will be effective for the 2020-2045 plan.
- There are no statutory modeling requirements for the CTP. However, SB 391 requires that Caltrans address how the State will achieve maximum feasible statewide reduction of GHG emissions to reach the 2040 and 2050 goals.
- SB 391 also mandates that we look at economic growth, vitality and development by performing economic forecasts and recommendations. To meet these mandates in the CTP 2040, we utilized the California statewide TDM to develop three scenarios:
  - Scenario 1 wrapped up all the SCSs and RTPs from around the state to predict statewide travel demand, then collaborated with our partners at ARB to run it through their vision model and developed GHG metrics.
  - Scenario 2 built upon Scenario 1 by plugging about 16 VMT reduction strategies into the model, then once again ran it through ARB's vision model to see the further reductions based on that.
  - That still didn't allow us to meet the desired GHG reductions. With ARB's help we crafted a third scenario that used vehicle technology and vehicle fuels to get us there.
- In addition, the CTP ran economic forecasts through a TREDIS economic model, which led us to a series of policies and recommendations resulting in a vibrant economy throughout the state. The guidelines essentially describe what was done in CTP 2040 in terms of best practices; also recommends that for future iterations of the CTP, Caltrans should utilize the best available econometrics models available that can reasonably be obtained and employed with existing resources.
- The discussion today should focus on: Do we have the right approach to forecasting how various policies and strategies will perform economically, as well as predicting other transportation metrics such as VMT and GHG reduction?

### Discussion

- **OPR:** Caltrans is leading a statewide modeling advisory committee, chaired by Gordon Garry of SACOG. It is working to forward the CSTDM by looking carefully at necessary advances and making recommendations for improvement. He'll make sure this question is carried to the group. It includes representatives of the statewide modelling advisory committee; State, regional and local agencies; policy and technical modeling staff.
  - **SACOG:** Among things that have come before that committee recently is a new project to do some improvements to that modeling, for which Caltrans has just selected a consultant. Questions:
    - In the guidelines, can Caltrans provide a status as of a given date on what that work entails and what the expectations are as to how useful it will be in the 2020 CTP update?
    - Also, will there be a summary of the model validation occurring in the first round and the validation tasks included in this new consultant contract, in terms of what the calibration and validation the model will be subject to prior to its use?
- **Neil Maizlish, Independent Researcher** (recently retired from the California Department of Public Health [DPH]):
  - Suggestion: Since there are no strict requirements for what could be included in the statewide modeling effort, broaden it to include other health impacts other than injuries and air pollution. Increase our knowledge about transportation health modeling. Would encourage the inclusion of the physical activity pathway as important for generating health co-benefits and, potentially, GHG reduction. Not here to advocate any particular model but a number of models have been used by MPOs throughout the state that could shed light on this.
  - Reviewed CTP guidelines and didn't see the coordination of mitigation and adaptation strategies in modeling efforts. Suggestion: In the modeling effort, identify climate changes and other impacts. This is an issue for state-level activities; we have clear statutes on GHG mitigation and adaptation. In the modeling effort, must identify zones whose land uses will be changing over the next decades. We're counting on that GHG mitigation effort,

but it may be imperiled by sea level rise or involve an urban heat island concentration. So that's another high-level consideration. What are improvements in modeling that will help with this?

- **Response—Caltrans:** Adaption is different than GHG mitigation, for which we have much more data. However, Caltrans is working on a statewide and regionally specific report on resiliency that will specify all the resources and assets impacted by climate variations. Once that becomes available, we have more reliable data. We fully intend to use that study as a baseline to provide some general guidance on the adaption side of climate change.
- **Neil Maizlish:** Suggestion: in that process, leverage State assets such as Cal-Adapt. Also, use State sea level rise guidance to inform these activities; ensure alignment between agencies across the state.
- **SACOG:** Noted that, while not disagreeing with these comments, they might fit better into other parts of the agenda for this workgroups discussion, such as performance metrics and the coordination of plans by partner State agencies and regions, rather than modeling.
  - **Facilitator:** The team will be listening for comments that are cross-cutting; otherwise will redirect them to the appropriate sections of the guidelines.
- **SACOG:**
  - Suggestion regarding modeling coordination, in reference to the "CTP 2040 Modeling" flow diagram graphic on page 28: the vision model and the TREDIS model might have a use further up (or earlier) in that process. In the scenario developments, the vision model could be used to coordinate transportation elements with ARB's mobile source strategy elements. The TREDIS model could create earlier feedback about the scenario's economic impacts, given that the CTP is a more aspirational, less regulatory plan than the RTPs. Include both vision model and TREDIS model in assessment of scenarios rather than just assessing the final draft plan as it is used now.
- **OPR:** To reinforce this—this CTP provides an opportunity to get real about a lot of things, particularly how to reach our 2050 goal on GHG emissions. If we can think sooner about the balance of strategies to use in terms of VMT reduction, vehicle technology, fuels, and how the ARB vision model informs that, we can be more realistic and useful about how we're getting to 2050.

# III. RTP Guidelines—Public Health, Active Transportation and Social Equity

## Session Overview

### **Laura Pennebaker, California Transportation Commission:**

- Introduced Caltrans subject matter experts who will help staff the update of these sections—Marilee Mortenson and Priscilla Martinez-Velez.
- Since the 2010 RTP update, these three interrelated areas have emerged as increasingly important considerations. The 2016 update is an important opportunity to reflect the ever-evolving state of practice in these areas.
- Framework for the discussion:
  - These three policy areas are all supported by statutory requirements found in California and United States codes, the Code of Federal regulations, Title VI, the Civil Rights Act, Presidential Executive Orders, etc. which, in aggregate, direct the RTPs to articulate a transportation system that: promotes safety and accessibility for all modes and all people; supports economic growth; and protects natural resources and improves air quality. Additionally, RTPs must include public participation plans to ensure the involvement of all stakeholders and the entire range of community interests in the process, and also plan for and implement improvements that will benefit all residents equally, preventing any disproportionate impacts to low-income communities and communities of color.
  - In 2012, California AB 441 amended California government code to provide clear opportunities to expand the discussion of public health, active transportation and equity in the RTP guidelines. It directed the Commission to include an attachment in the next RTP Guidelines providing a summary of the policies, practices and projects employed by MPOs in their RTPs to promote health and health equity.
- New sections added, expanded or clarified (so far) to address these policy areas:
  - Section 2.3: new section, “Promoting Public Health”—added to set some context and highlight public health as an additional planning consideration.
  - Sections 4.2, 4.3: sections on social equity and environmental justice, newly separated to be addressed individually.
  - Chapter 6, “RTP Contents,” provides an opportunity for guidance on modal discussions regarding active transportation facilities. Section 6.25 discusses the SCS contents and provides an opportunity for discussion of social equity as a consideration in the development of the SCS.
  - Appendix L: established to meet the intent of AB 441 by starting to compile a list of best practices information related to health and health equity.

**Joan Chaplick, Facilitator:** Suggested as a starting point for comments: considering sharing practices from the RTP process that are working to help illustrate your suggestions.

## Discussion

- **Sacramento County Office of Sustainability:**
  - What works well: Caltrans’ inclusion in the 2017 ATP of specifically awarding points to applicants who have engaged with their public health departments in responding to health attributes of particular projects. Many regions struggle with understanding how this is actually implemented in projects. Lessons learned at the California DPH and other agencies regarding how to really integrate public health departments and officers in the details of creating regional plans are helpful.
- **Public Advocates—Suggestions:**
  - Dedicated chapter on civil rights and EJ requirements, and associated best practices.
  - Would like to direct attention to the California ARB funding guidelines for equity in GHG reduction—contains great language regarding meeting the needs of underserved community residents. How do we operationalize social equity at the regional and local level? How do we find out what needs are rather than assuming them and how do we address them? He will submit specific suggestions in writing.

- **CTC:** Social equity and environmental justice are included in Chapter 4 because they're part of the established public participation development process.
- **Richard Marcantonio:** I see it the other way around—public participation is one important part of civil rights and environmental justice. Would like to see the guidelines call upon MPOs to seek out and address the needs of underrepresented communities. Is an equally fair share of both those needs and others' being met?
- **CTC:** We are interested in seeing your suggestions. Please submit your suggested language.
- **California Pan Ethnic Health Network (CPEHN).**
  - Echoing Sacramento County Office of Sustainability's comment about integrating the connection between MPOs and local public health departments. Important venue to raise these issues. CPEHN was not involved in the previous RTPs, can't say what's working but can provide constructive suggestions for additions to incorporate public health. Suggestions for terms to be used differently:
    - When discussing minority community health goals—shape language to reflect current language used for communities of color.
    - Define—what is adequate public notification?
    - Will provide specific written comments.
  - Appendix L is a good step forward. We'd like to encourage finding a way to promote an equity perspective when incorporating projects at the local level. Active transportation projects clearly impact public health, but it's difficult to discern whether equity has been a priority for a given project. For example, where new bike lanes have been added, is that a low income community? Again, will share written criteria suggestions.
- **CALCOG:** More big-picture suggestions:
  - In the guidelines for environmental justice and social equity, must ensure we're allowing sufficient flexibility for different MPOs to identify and specifically address their community and to measure their success. An example from my former job at SJCOG: according to the Federal guidelines defining environmental justice or low-income, minority communities, the entire county qualifies! That's not a useful assessment—rather than saying that everyone in the community is impacted equally because all are low-income, we need to determine actual, specific impacts throughout the community. In our SJCOG RTP we went into that level of detail.
  - Again, let's ensure we're continuing, as we discuss the RTP Guidelines, to talk about the RTP itself, rather than the projects within it and their social and equity impacts. That is a different assessment—although they look at some of the same things, they are not identical in how they view and meet the requirement of not creating adverse impacts.
- **CTC:** We do plan to ensure that public health is a stakeholder at the table, which was not necessarily represented in the 2010 guidelines. In sections of the guidelines that discuss consultation and coordination, we want to ensure we properly reference county departments of public health and the various other health organizations that a region would interact with.
- **Tehama County Transportation Commission:**
  - In our county, which is small and rural, we've put two cycles of CMAC funding into the state highway system because there is no sidewalk and no bike lanes. And despite this and benefits from the Prop B bond program, we've had to reduce other benefits that increase mobility such as transit ridership, senior dial-a-ride and Veterans' ride programs. Because our county hospital closed, public health has not brought any money to the table. Plans are important for guidance, but I think everyone here is an advocate on these issues. Lack of funding is the elephant in the room. We need partners and funding.
  - As Dan Landon of Nevada County said at the kick-off meeting, the RTPAs are stewards of local values, and some of us really do the right thing for the right reasons.
- **Sacramento County Office of Sustainability:** The guidelines request metrics, but it's difficult to acquire metrics and data pre- and post-project. There's no funding for documenting the different benefits and evaluating success. Suggestion: There needs to be a mechanism to extend funding post-project so that the data needed to drive further work forward can be acquired. It's a huge gap.
- **California Walks—Suggestions:**

- Returning to the point about the need for separate EJ and equity chapters: regions are struggling with operationalizing meeting the needs of low-income communities of color and with ensuring people receive benefits on an equally timely basis. Creating a separate chapter to clearly spell out how that might be done is critical.
- Some baseline guidance from the CTC is needed around identifying communities of concern. For instance, in my work on the Active Transportation Program, using the definitions of disadvantaged communities according to Title VI is not necessarily working well. We need some guidance from CTC so that regions are competing fairly against one another as they pursue their ATP responsibilities. This is complicated and will have to be worked on together.
- **Response—CTC:** Thanks for that observation. Hopefully this workgroup process provides an opportunity for practitioners and advocates to work together to create reasonable baseline guidance.
- **Policy Link: Suggestion:**
  - The checklist in Appendix C should include operationalizing Title VI requirements and ensuring that the needs of low income communities and communities of color are met. There should also be clear questions regarding the RTP benefits and impacts for low-income communities. We'll be submitting suggested language regarding this.
- **Safe Routes to School National Partnership:** Also related to ATP and other grant programs: there are a lot of new grant programs established since 2010, and many equity requirements associated with new legislation. Often the requirement is to be consistent with the RTP and it's not always clear exactly what that means. **Suggestion:** In order to promote equity and help make the MPOs more competitive for these grant programs, it would be helpful for the guidelines to reference how the goals of these programs relate to the broader goals of the RTP.
- **AMBAG:** Agree that there's confusion about goals, but we may have things in the wrong order. Suggestion: The CTP, and then RTP, are the overarching plans, and must contain the goals promoting walkable, safe communities, sustainable transportation, etc. Then funding programs should reflect and be the means of achieving the goals of the CTP and RTP. This will create a better connection between the funding programs and the overall plan goals—currently a huge disconnect.
- **Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG):** Re. the “Promoting Health” section—in general, the draft did a really good job of consolidating many different inputs in the Appendix, and there are a couple of terms that should be explicitly called out:
  - The “Health in all Policies” (HIAP) approach—incorporating health into all of the RTP policies, which we did in our last RTP at SCAG. It's pretty well known in public health circles.
  - Incorporating terminology regarding the social determinants of health, so we include environmental factors that help create disparities in health outcomes in addition to personal behavior.
  - Also, broaden the scope of what is discussed in this section. Although access to jobs and healthy food, recreation, etc. are mentioned, it did seem active transportation-heavy. Many other areas where public health is affected such as transportation safety, air quality, access to affordable housing. In our SCAG RTP we defined seven specific focus areas and used our RTP performance measures to examine how the RTP would affect those health outcomes. More clarity and direction here would help regions to incorporate health more fully into their next RTP.
- **Sacramento County Office of Sustainability: Question:** The State of California has adopted health in all policies—doesn't that extend to the CTC?
  - **Response—CTC:** The HIAP document applies to all State agencies and the Commission is part of the State Transportation Agency. We will take the HIAP report and the HIAP Task Force's findings into consideration in this guidelines update.

- **California Department of Public Health (CA DPH):**
  - HIAP Task Force staff provided comments to the Commission and Caltrans about language, including definitions, for topics such as social determinants of health and health equity. This didn't include HIAP policy definitions, will be happy to work with you on that.
  - We provided some additional language that went beyond active transportation and access to destinations to include subjects such as mental health practice related to transportation, and how we mitigate for potential negative impacts.
  - We provided a potential framework for Appendix L. I would be interested in hearing from CTC and Caltrans how they envision that and how stakeholders can provide input so that it arises from a shared vision.
  - **Response—CTC:** the first draft of Appendix L was our first attempt—we understand it will be enhanced through this process. Thank you to CA DPH for the comments provided—it gave staff a lot to think about regarding how we can meet the statutory intent of AB 441 and create an Appendix L that's useful for practitioners.
- **MTC: Question—**When do you expect a complete version of Appendix L? Right now it's just case studies.
  - **Caltrans:** the survey was a template for the MPOs to state what policies, programs and projects were contained in their latest RTP to promote health and health equity. The majority of MPOs responded, and the draft Appendix L is our compilation of submissions. It's missing background information and an introduction. We also plan to follow up with the MPOs we haven't heard from so we can include their information as well. We also wanted to put the comments from CA DPH forward for workgroup discussion to ensure we're incorporating this advice into the guidelines.
  - **CA DPH:** this is a great start, but we'd like to see it refined so it's a little more accessible to the practitioners using it as a guide. Suggestion: Try to synthesize the lessons learned and best practices—pick a variety of examples including both rural and urban areas.
    - Would also like to work with you on the background section. There are many learning opportunities from grant programs and elsewhere on how transportation, land use and health are inextricably linked.
- **Transform:**
  - One important consideration for the social equity component is the amount of funding, particularly discretionary funding, going towards operations and maintenance of transit. Very often these needs are left underfunded, leading to either fare increases or service cuts. Suggestion: include guidance on best practices from MPOs who are able to identify sources of full funding for operations and maintenance within their RTPs.
  - There's still nearly \$7 billion of highway expansions on the books as of a few years ago. Suggestion: a strategy that is gaining validity is "optimizing equity"—converting general purpose lanes into express lanes rather than expanding, which can reduce spending on highway widening, freeing up funds to be spent on active transportation, transit and other needs. The draft SB 743 guidelines are recommending this as either a mitigation or analysis before proceeding with expansions. This is currently being studied in San Mateo on Highway 101. Caltrans also just recommended a study on converting a lane on 94 in San Diego, where the community didn't want more air pollution impacts from widening. Both of these efforts lead to different thinking—not just how to spend money well, but also how to avoid spending money on projects with potentially negative social equity and health impacts.
- **United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA):** It's great to promote active transportation and other solutions to support health. However, as previously mentioned, there are also existing transportation networks that impact health. Suggestion: Although there are separate sections and workgroups focusing on environmental impacts and freight issues, it would be helpful to acknowledge this in the public health section as well, and to identify solutions to specifically reduce those public health impacts that the current transportation networks are causing. It doesn't seem to be called out as much as it should be.
- **Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR):** There's a movement at the national level—including Federal agencies such as the US DOT, EPA and HUD—to focus on removing or mitigating the effects of existing transportation systems on both public health and social equity. This provides an opportunity for California to join in on this effort. Will send materials that can help inform language for the guidelines along with written comments.

- **Sacramento County Office of Sustainability:** Mitigations for health impacts are the same things that mitigate for climate impacts. If those can be addressed in the health and climate sections of the guidelines, that's terrific. However, they're cross-cutting. Some factors such as landscaping, tree planting and urban greening improve the community and mitigate for traffic, and also help get individuals outside for their physical and mental health. Land uses and safety improvements, including both roadway improvements and facilities like street lighting, are also involved. It can't be stated often enough to help people understand the relationship between those activities.
- **California Natural Resources Agency (CNRA):** Our new "Safeguarding California" draft report update is due in January. Historically, we have been more focused on infrastructure—for instance, ensuring that we don't invest in plans for areas of the coast that will be underwater in 20 years—but we also are taking the opportunity to include the direct impacts on people in those considerations. We need to consider active transportation investments in a more holistic way, in light of what we know is coming, such as increased heat waves or more precipitation, and so include features such as cooling stations or tree-lined streets. Suggestion: add that new level of analysis to this section of the guidelines.
  - **Sacramento County Office of Sustainability:** the current Safeguarding California guidelines are useful, with a whole chapter on public health.
  - **CNRA:** A copy of the new draft guidelines will be sent to CTC.
- **SCAG: Suggestions:**
  - In addition to the case studies already compiled, and to strengthen and balance out the active transportation and other sections, reach back out to the MPOs for examples of activities or practices that support health equity. SANDAG included an entire appendix on public health in their last RTP, as SCAG did—will forward that information. OPR also includes some great research in their new General Plan guidelines. This can help the effort to better connect the RTP and SCS.
  - Researching and consolidating information on the performance measures that MPOs around the state are using to measure progress on their public health goals would be helpful. Perhaps a summary table format?
- **Public Advocates:** Environmental justice requirements also stipulate that there be no significant delay in receipt of plan benefits by lower-income and minority populations. MTC recently provided advocates with a list of major projects in the different scenarios they're considering, listed in order of the date they actually would be built. I believe this transparency about the timing of investments is also a Federal requirement, but I haven't necessarily seen it in RTPs. What's directly relevant to this workgroup is some analysis of the first four years of the plan that examines whether benefits to the low income and minority populations are being received on an equally timely basis.
- **Neil Maizlish, independent researcher (recently retired, CA DPH):** To tie this back to this morning's discussion—the modeling section doesn't show any guidance for doing equity analysis. There's been much advancement in activity-based modeling and the ability to micro-simulate populations including many different attributes (ethnicity, income, etc.) This kind of information could be used to extend the equity analyses possible in the planning phase. It does add to the workload, but some MPOs are successfully doing this kind of work already. Suggestion: Adding some best or promising practices to the modeling section regarding equity analysis might be useful.
- **Tehama County Transportation Commission:** Suggestion: utilize tables in the RTPs to make it easier for public to understand and translate information. TCTC did this effectively in their most recent update and will provide examples.

## Closing Remarks for the Topic:

- Laura Pennebaker, CTC Staff, committed to following up with those who stated they had specific comments to provide.
- The group discussed whether these three policy areas should be included in a potential workgroup meeting on July 20th. The consensus was that it would be more efficient and effective to see how the comments are incorporated in the next draft before discussing further. Staff will work on compiling something for an early August time frame—

possibly the workgroups to be held in Southern California. A videoconference will be planned to enable more participants. It also might be effective to schedule multiple or longer sessions so each area can be followed up in more detail.

- Finally, a suggestion was made to coordinate with ARB, who are updating their scoping plan with considerations of how to make land use, transportation and health work together, using a holistic approach and getting out of silos.

## IV. CTP Guidelines—Public Health, Active Transportation and Social Equity

### Session Overview

#### Gabriel Corley, CTP Project Manager, Caltrans:

- Statutory requirements, such as AB 857 and 23 CFR, require the CTP to promote public health, active transportation and social equity. Page 16 of the draft CTP Guidelines shows the policy framework with six goals and 18 supporting policies. We've included goals, policies, strategies and recommendations supporting these three policy areas. We've highlighted the statutory requirements and the areas where we need to carry these out in the next CTP—our question to you is, have we done enough to pinpoint these?
- Tried to highlight the link between the CTP and the RTPs—it's a cyclical process. The CTP is an overarching policy document, which ideally trickles down into the RTPs across the state. In turn, we use the RTPs in building our framework for the next CTP. SB 391 states that we must examine how Sustainable Communities Strategies are affecting multi-modal transportation systems across the state, interregional travel and also what kind of system is needed to reach the GHG levels mandated in AB 32. We've modeled scenarios for reaching those goals at a statewide level.

### Discussion

- **Los Angeles Metropolitan Transportation Authority (LAMetro): Question**—re. the structure and ordering of elements in the CTP: participated in a workshop for development of the current CTP that listed sustainability last on a chart of 17 elements. Concerned that this is not in line with current priorities and legislation.
  - **Response—Caltrans:** The chart in question did not reflect that sustainability is highlighted throughout the new plan; it's very much the focus and message.
- **CA DPH—Suggestions:**
  - Important to coordinate and collaborate with schools and school systems—and in the RTP as well—considering how much their ridership contributes to GHG, etc. Can help you identify who to work with at the State Department of Education.
  - Great to see the evaluation of emerging trends to keep in mind. Suggest including guidance on how to consider how this impacts different communities including children, elderly, etc.
- **California Natural Resources Agency:**
  - Appreciated the description on page 4 of the RTP Guidelines of taking the environment into account in planning and investment decisions. The Executive Order summary in the CTP only highlights GHG reduction goals and not the adaptation planning goal that the Executive Order included.
  - Also wondering if EO B-10-11, the tribal consultation policy, should be included when discussing social equity.
- **Sacramento County Office of Sustainability:** Question—will you consider comments made about the RTP guidelines in the context of the CTP guidelines as well?
  - **Response—Caltrans:** We will but please repeat what you'd like to highlight.
  - **Sacramento County Office of Sustainability:** Livability wasn't addressed in the RTP guidelines. It addresses everything, equity, climate, health, etc., and drills down deeper to some of the environmental, economic and educational disparities that affect health outcomes. To address things in a holistic manner, it's important to explain that relationship clearly—livable neighborhoods are safe and equitable neighborhoods. The SF Reserve Bank stated that there is a \$300,000 disparity in lifetime earning potential between children from low income neighborhoods and those from mixed-income communities. How are you planning to address the ability for people to remain healthy in their communities, in addition to transportation to access health care? I understand that Caltrans is putting together some metrics for livability?
    - **Response—Caltrans:** Yes.
- **Tehama County Transportation Commission:** Our regional blueprint plan, for a rural RTPA, spoke to livability. It included a scenario for “strong cities and communities.”

- **CTC:** Many of these aspects of livability are aspects are considered in the SCS development process. In tomorrow's discussion of SCS development, perhaps we can touch on the co-benefits that result from that process and discuss guidance in that regard.
- **California Walks:**
  - In the advisory committee for the CTP 2040, we started with Caltrans' three E's—economy, environment and equity. We established goals for economy and environment, but equity was not a goal of its own; it was intended to be imbued in every other goal. The result is that it doesn't come through as strongly as the other two, especially for the untutored person. With climate change being such an important priority, equity must be central since the effects of climate change are unevenly spread. Suggestion: the CTP guidelines should call that out and clarify that the regions need to call it out in their RTPs as well.
- **Neil Maizlish, independent researcher (CA DPH, retired)—Question:** Since the CTP process, unlike the RTP process, is unconstrained, what guidance will it include for scenario development with more explicit equity analyses? Also, active transportation must be made explicit as an independent pillar of strategy, and we must keep pace with the data showing an increasing rideshare for biking and walking. We need guidance to consider the adverse effects of other strategies on active transportation so we don't actively undermine those investments.
- **Strategic Growth Council:**
  - Question—Noticed that SB 246, which discusses climate adaptation and the program the Governor's Office is putting together, isn't mentioned in either draft. Will you include guidelines on that?
  - Also note that SB 1350 discusses GHG projections with all kinds of evidence of its effect on public health and other things. Suggestion: It would be helpful to include that as something folks can use as a guide and to help them understand that there are standards. The Governor's Executive Order B-30-15 says all investments, especially infrastructure, must comply with adaptation rules in order to get funding. Just wanted to make that clear.
- **Sacramento County Office of Sustainability—Suggestions:**
  - As with the RTP guidelines, include the necessity of engaging with public health agencies in responding and developing projects.
  - Often the initiative for including health or examining health benefits in a project gets kicked to the planning group, but not passed on to engineering for implementation and delivery—a large disconnect.
  - Also need to make connections with climate change and co-benefits—we'll get into this more with the SCS discussion.
  - Again, need to create appropriate funding for pre-project and post-project data collection, so we can narrow efforts to things that are successful. Broaden that funding so individuals in both health departments and transportation agencies understand they are all eligible applicants in a grant program, but must get out of silos and collaborate.
- **California Walks:**
  - In the current CTP land use modeling was not included, but nearly all of the population is within MPOs/RTPAs which already have been including land use. Suggestion: The State should require MPOs/RTPAs to include their land use in useable form, the impacts so that can be included. Will be very important for the next CTP.
  - On active transportation, agree with point just made. Also, many of the MPOs don't include any transit or active transportation in their modeling, and they don't include induced demand either – so improved modeling, especially around the strategies that it takes to reach our climate change goals, need to be communicated to MPOs/RTPAs. They must be required to report progress in the ATP process, otherwise there's no way of judging progress. Many of the regional plans don't even propose how to get there.

## V. RTP and CTP Guidelines—Performance Measures and State & Federal Regulations

### Session Overview

#### Garth Hopkins, California Transportation Commission:

- This session was created to address questions regarding how SB 743 and the new Federal performance measure requirements will impact the RTP process. Also, let us know of other requirements we haven't discussed that will impact the process. Note it may be premature to discuss how the performance measures will impact the process, since they are not yet complete.

### Discussion

- **MTC:** Generally supportive of how you're reflecting MAP-21 and FAST Act requirements since they're not yet defined. The State and the MPOs must work together. It would be premature to include the congestion and performance measures since they're far from being complete. However, the safety measures are now final, and the clock for Caltrans to implement them has already begun, so it's possible to start integrating them.
- **OPR:** This administration has put a very high priority on reducing GHG emissions. Looking at VMT and GHGs is fundamental since transportation is responsible for about half the emissions in California. It would be useful for this document to reflect statewide priorities rather than just statutory obligations and requirements. The performance measures are a great opportunity to do that.
- **OPR:** Even though only one set of performance measures is final at this point, it's clear that these aren't the only things to measure. Regions are welcome and encouraged to go beyond that even though it's not required. There are some important updates stemming from the FAST Act and MAP-21—will those be incorporated into the next version?
  - **Response – CTC:** Yes, and staff would appreciate any language you can provide.
- **MTC:** The final planning rule set in May reflects some of the priorities.
  - **Response – CTC:** Staff is in the process of summarizing the final planning rule.
- **Safe Routes to School National Partnership:** Make sure that we are addressing active transportation, public health and equity in the performance measures. In addition to existing metrics, include metrics about factors such as goods movement, health, etc. that affect equity.
- **Santa Barbara County Association of Governments (SBCAG): Question**—curious how regions can respond to the finalization of the various performance measures. The timing doesn't allow for them to be included in this round of the process, but do you plan to update them again following the finalization?
  - **Response— CTC:** It's been done before—guidelines can be amended as new statutes make necessary.
  - **SBCAG:** How will this work with the timing regarding the deadlines for regions to set performance measures and then targets?
  - **CTC:** It's a separate process. Caltrans is working with the MPOs on those measures. It won't affect the RTP guidelines now, but once settled we'll have a better idea.
  - **SBCAG:** As of now, SB 375 sets the only target but eventually, will we have targets for each and lay the groundwork for their incorporation?
  - **CTC:** Yes, it can be mentioned, but we'll have to wait for finalization to be specific.
- **OPR:** The Federal government will supply metrics for the FAST Act and MAP-21. There will be some flexibility as to how we use those metrics. Generally, California is ahead of the Federal government on many fronts, including existing explicit goals to reduce climate change, do infill and reduce VMT. Question—What ability will we have to take the metrics we're given, yet emphasize and base our actions on metrics that get us where we want to go?
  - **Response—Caltrans:** We have performance targets for various things including injury reduction, etc. Safety is the one performance measure approved so far.

- **CALCOG:** Good idea to coordinate them to the extent they can be without overstepping bounds, so goals and targets don't overlap, although since the feds are at a different point there will be some disconnect. But these are performance metrics, not performance measures which are a baseline, expected to improve over time. Metrics tell us whether the future will look better over time as well.
  - **Response—Caltrans:** the metrics are very clear cut. The methodology is not up to us. We'll need to coordinate with the Office of Traffic Safety to get the same performance measures. The accident target will be tough to meet.
  - **Response—Federal Highway Administration (FHWA):** A couple of things to understand:
    - A big part of the performance measures and targets are still in comment stage; the deadline is August 20. We encourage all to submit ideas and comments about where FHWA's proposals have disconnects from California, as that does influence the outcome. Also, there may not be flexibility in the final rule, but you should be flexible where you are allowed.
    - Can't speak to the safety rules, but agree with CTC staff that it's premature to incorporate performance measures and targets in these guidelines. The final rule could also take some time to come out.
- **OPR—Suggestion:** Frame this differently by asking what California can do as a state. The Federal government has specific limitations on what they can require us to measure. It's a limited number of measures, but a step in the right direction. Flexibility comes in where regions measure whatever else they want to add.
- **Climate Resolve:** in the RTP Guidelines update there's an awareness of SB 375, etc. but not seeing SB 743 translating to the RTP level.
- **CTC:** CEQA regulations associated with SB 743 have not been finalized and therefore the RTP Guidelines cannot specify "shalls" or "shoulds" until OPR's process is complete.
- **Strategic Growth Council—Question:** Am aware that the parallel processes are tough to coordinate, but due to the role that CEQA guidelines may play in RTP development, is there an option to add an appendix or amendment in the future?
  - **Response—CTC:** We can complete an appendix to the current guidelines to incorporate any suggestions, as soon as we can specify how the CEQA guidelines impact the RTPs.
- **SACOG:** With SB 743, all groups are concerned about the impact of CEQA processes which may or may not be finalized. SB 743 is different from the FAST Act—that is truly top-down, whereas SB 743 mandates will come from the State but allow lead agencies discretion in how they implement it. There's some value to referencing 743 but it may not be analogous to the FAST Act.
- **OPR:** A couple of items are on the table:
  - How SB 473 is addressed in the RTP guidelines;
  - An addendum once the measures are finalized.
    - **Response - CTC:** We will work with the OPR to coordinate this.
    - **OPR:** It will be worthwhile to examine the language to see how it can be made useful.
- **Tehama County Transportation Commission:**
  - Echoing the point that it's not appropriate to second-guess the impact of measures and legislation when the dust hasn't yet settled. There are all these regional plans and groups that steward community values that will step forward. We must keep in mind that these are in process of completion, but not muddy the waters by incorporating them prematurely.
  - **Climate Resolve:** Would encourage the group to engage regarding these concerns.
- **California Walks:**
  - The FAST Act and the existing SCS require that the guidelines state that requirements such as performance measures and special rules are to be finalized, so they're incorporated within guidelines by reference. These are not subject to interpretation and not discretionary—the guidelines must implement final rules. Suggestion: Note the measures that are not final but will be final and mandatory within the life of this plan, then amend when they are final.
- **MTC:** Strongly support the final prioritization as stated on page 134—that's very important.



## VI. RTP Guidelines—Sustainable Communities Strategy Guidance on SCS Development

### Session Overview

#### Laura Pennebaker, CTC:

- Background and context: The 2010 RTP guidelines update focused on capturing the statutory requirements of SB 375 and articulating general guidance on SCS development. Since all MPOs have now completed at least one SCS, this is a good opportunity to clarify this guidance.
- Direction is primarily contained in Sections 6.3-6.7 of the draft guidelines.
- We collaborated with ARB as they are the State agency responsible for working with MPOs/RTPAs to oversee SB 375 implementation.

#### Terry Roberts, Manager of Sustainable Communities Planning Policy, ARB:

- ARB staff has reviewed and evaluated the SCS plans from all regions and has followed their SCS development processes including public participation, alternative scenario development and their board decision-making processes. ARB has learned a great deal about the challenges and opportunities that MPOs are dealing with.
  - SB 375 focused on GHG reduction. The SCS plans developed by MPOs demonstrate many other benefits to the region and local governments, including: better public health; more mobility choices; more housing choices; potentially lower cost of infrastructure; open space preservation; and more. Because of these benefits, stakeholders and decision makers have become more interested in the RTP process.
  - MPOs are learning to have a more transparent process, and to develop plans more easily understood and accepted by the public.
  - Plans must be clear about specific land use and transportation, housing policies and investments that are included, and explain how these strategies contribute to regional GHG reduction. MPOs must help interpret their model outputs for the public and help them understand the forecasted outcomes of the plan.
  - ARB has a copy of the MPO models so we know their capabilities, and in some cases, their achievement. However, there's no requirement for MPOs to monitor the achievement for their forecast of GHG reduction. The residents of the regions expect feedback on how the plan is being implemented and whether it's actually helping to achieve regional goals. Performance measures are a good way to communicate this to the public and decision makers about how the region is changing. ARB looks at an MPO's performance measures as an important part of our evaluation to decide whether a region will meet their GHG reduction targets.
  - We know that Caltrans and CTC are focused on statutory requirements that would lead to guideline revisions, but need to approach the guidelines more broadly since there are many implied requirements in SB 375. It's left open to ARB to assess whether MPOs' plans could meet their target. ARB's 2011 technical methodology review document informs MPOs of specific data and information for our evaluation process, so glad to see the RTP guidelines referencing it.

#### Laura Pennebaker, CTC:

- This workgroup is intended as an opportunity for a variety of stakeholders to talk through the guidelines for development of an SCS. Are these guidelines clear, helpful and sufficiently flexible to account for regional diversity?

### Discussion

- **Transportation Solutions Defense and Education Fund (TRANSDEF):**
  - Stated the need for ensuring that local and regional plans are consistent with emissions reduction policies in SB 375 and CTP 2040 and contain mechanisms to implement them. Local planning is where emissions reduction really takes place. Some sales tax measures currently on the ballot do not take this into account and will lock in funding for projects that will prevent attainment of State policy goals. For instance, in MTC, county transportation plans—consistency of local plans with State policy—was made voluntary. There is no connection between what local agencies do and Caltrans or ARB planning.

- Suggestion: Guidelines should direct MPOs to request that CEQA documentation for environmental impact review of transportation plans be attached to local plans.
- **CTC:** Asked who in the room has had an opportunity to read Chapter 6 of the guidelines, and for workgroup members to reflect on any input they may have stemming from their experiences in engaging in RTP or CTP updates.
- **TRANSDEF:** One issue from the MTC's RTP, which a colleague challenged, is a listing of "priority development areas" with more intense development and requirements for frequent transit service to encourage mode split. Many of these areas don't have transit service that meets this standard, and it appears that the RTP doesn't provide for that degree of transit service. This affects planning at the regional and local level. Jurisdictions are overly focused on highways, so they won't include funding that will actually allow the priority development area plan to work.
- **ClimatePlan:** Suggestion—the social equity factor in public participation can be elevated by working with community-based organizations (CBOs). An example is Fresno COG which gave a CBO grant money to conduct outreach to Title VI populations. RTP guidelines should include some language recommending that MPOs/RTPAs partner with CBOs, using the Fresno COG example. Climate Plan is working on a document addressing this, complete in October—will submit a draft before the August 5th comment deadline.
- **CALCOG:** That's a great idea, but since a lot of MPOs/RTPAs have limited resources, the CTP should encourage the State to figure out how to provide resources to the MPOs/RTPAs enabling them, in turn, to provide those resources to CBOs.
- **Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD):** Comments regarding SB 375 requirements for housing and transportation planning:
  - The intent of 375 was to coordinate housing and transportation planning. In framing those provisions, the requirement was for MPOs/RTPAs to provide HCD with twelve-month notice of an estimated RTP adoption date. That allows HCD to then set its Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) consultation and planning period start date. Based on an estimated RTP adoption date, HCD then determines the regional housing need allocation, which ultimately gets distributed to the local governments to update their local housing elements. The local government housing element update planning period begins on the date when the RTP is actually adopted, and the local government SB 375 housing element must present their update to HCD 18 months later. In the first cycle, the actual RTP adoption date for MPOs/RTPAs fell behind the estimated date—in some cases, by several months. Once that period shifts based on actual RTP adoption, it no longer aligns with the regional housing allocation period and the region doesn't get the requisite number of housing units during that time. Suggestion: The RTP checklist should include a question to further alert MPOs/RTPAs on the importance of ensuring their estimated RTP adoption date is realistic and attainable so this doesn't happen. We'd be happier if MPOs/RTPAs provided the latest possible "drop dead" date for adoption; then if they choose to adopt earlier it's not a problem.
- **Sequoia Riverlands Trust and Southern Sierra Partnership:** Commended staff for including a discussion of policy to address resource areas and farmland in Section 6.24.
  - Proposed a resource for that section: the Trust has researched and compiled conservation policies and best practices from all SCS plans from the first round.
  - A simple best practice, in addition to a regional conservation framework, for MPOs that don't necessarily have sufficient resources to create something like the Bay Area Network's priority conservation areas: Include map layers representing resource areas and farmland in land use scenarios, use them as constraints to development. Tulare and Santa Barbara counties both did this in the first round of SCS, and found it useful in land use forecasts, considering where development will go and what transportation would serve it. Happy to send report and sample language.
- **Climate Resolve:** To second California Walk's point about transparency—interested in MPOs to including more info in the RTPs about how they're reading the GHG reduction targets. We need robust analysis to make this happen. We're running into an issue in the SCAG region with a new freeway planned with off-ramps going into nowhere, and are expecting a lot of sprawl if planning is not done around it. We'd like to access that data to ensure that induced VMT is accounted for. There have been new hurdles introduced in this round of the RTP. Really want to make a call for opportunities for public interest groups to contribute to that analysis. Will provide suggested language.

- **California Building Industry (CBIA):**
  - Regarding the role of SCS and application of performance measures: the SCS is supposed to identify a strategy to reduce GHG emissions in a region over a period of time—typically over an expanded 8-year RHNA. The projects in the RTP are scrutinized and partially prioritized based on their ability to accomplish that goal, where feasible. Some regions are discussing or attempting to add additional criteria to evaluate the performance of projects in the RTP as a practice to help rank them. While not opposed to this, it’s a highly subjective undertaking. Unlike analysis that examines project benefits and costs, measures such as housing displacement, the potential of infill and jobs are significantly qualitative. It’s important to understand that drawing those connections between performance measures and more non-traditional criteria is subjective and difficult to confidently assess.
  - We strongly support more interpretation of model results for the public by MPOs/RTPAs.
- **ClimatePlan:**
  - To build on Climate Resolve’s point about transparency: Tahoe did a great job in their RTP of showing transparency about GHG reductions. Their SCS explicitly calls for reductions through land use and transportation. That’s a good example that you could include.
  - I saw that there’s a placeholder on ARB’s target update. I’d like to hear what ARB is considering in terms of that language. I’m not certain where this fits, but encourage things like fully minimizing committed projects, having a transparent scoring process—this has been done in the Bay Area, in Fresno and by SACOG. The examples are there. Make sure the projects selected are ultimately going to reduce GHG.
  - Also, this may be more relevant to the modeling section, but make sure we’re including equity assessment.
  - Regarding the affordable housing piece: We’ve been struggling to figure out how to use this process to either create affordable housing or at least track displacement. MTC has done some good work that’s a start, and I know the Bay Area has the Transit-Oriented Affordable Housing Fund.
    - **Response— ARB:** ARB is working toward target updates. SB 375 requires targets to be updated every 8 years. These were first due in 2010; 2018 is the next due date. We began discussing this with our Board in 2014. Discussing the process was an agenda item at the October 2015 ARB Board Meeting. The Board was very supportive of continuing to use the bottom-up process used in the first round. The ARB will exchange information and technical data regarding model inputs and assumptions with the MPOs. Work on this has continued, and ARB has had several meetings with MPOs encouraging them to develop the technical basis for target recommendations. All 18 MPOs are working on target recommendations to submit to the ARB by the end of the year. In October 2015, one of our board members suggested that targets shouldn’t be lower when we update—we encourage all MPOs to do at least as well as they did in first round. Almost every MPO was able to meet their targets, and some exceeded them. We will take this to the public next spring, and around the middle of next year, we’ll present them to our Board for adoption.
- **Safe Routes to School National Partnership:**
  - Echoed the comments regarding transparency.
  - Also, this is a good place to talk about the active transportation, public health and equity co-benefits, as mentioned yesterday, and how those can be integrated into the SCS and RTP.
- **Strategic Growth Council:** Appreciates the ability to hear comments from other State agencies and practitioners.
  - Question—is there an opportunity to use the July 20th meeting date to have a more structured conversation about data that informs the SCS, challenges in creating statewide guidance, and how to encourage transparency? It’s a great opportunity and we haven’t had this conversation at a statewide level. If not next week, a further conversation at some point would allow more formal comments to come forward.
  - **Response—Facilitator:** The staff would need more than a week to prepare for that conversation.
  - **Strategic Growth Council:** I agree, framing is necessary, and maybe more open-ended conversations with MPOs and State agencies. This is a good opportunity since the RTP and CTP guidelines don’t provide a mechanism for that conversation.
- **Facilitator:** There were many comments on transparency, and ClimatePlan provided some examples of best practices. Please share more examples of best practices that are working and we can see if they’re transferrable.

- **SACOG:** Question—how will those best practices that are submitted be vetted and chosen for inclusion? How is this related to the potential volume of the document?
  - **Response—CTC:** Staff will receive any/all suggestions, but a best practice should be an established, achievable example.
  - In terms of inclusion in the guidelines document: we would like to represent different MPOs around the state—for example, urban and rural. Also, this is not an implied baseline standard—those are only in the requirements of the guidelines. It’s not feasible to hold all agencies to some of these practices, they serve only as examples of good planning practice. The staff is very open to any suggestions regarding making the best practices included most effective.
  - **CTC:** As to the volume of the document, we’ll provide basic information and web links to learn more, rather than adding too much of a dissertation in the guidelines themselves.

## VII. CTP Guidelines—Addressing State Goals

### Session Overview

#### Gabriel Corley, CTP Project Manager, Caltrans:

- This portion of the guidelines addresses State goals, statutory requirements pertaining to other plans, and how we handled them in the CTP 2040. The CTP is mandated to consider a wide multitude of other plans and their goals. It should include consultation and opportunities for review and comment with CTC, Strategic Growth Council (SGC), ARB, California Energy Commission, Air Quality Management Districts, transit operators and regional transportation planning agencies at the very minimum. The CTP should be continuing, cooperative and comprehensive in working with a considering all plans and goals with our partner agencies.
- With that in mind, what goals and plans in particular should we be addressing to make sure they're included in the next CTP?
- I would refer you to the policy framework on page 16 of the draft CTP guidelines for the goals, which are based on Caltrans' "three E's:" Economy, Education and Environmental Health. This was created with our Policy Advisory Committee. Many of these goals are cross-cutting, and cover pretty much everything. The CTP 2040 contains a list of recommendations that drives attainment of these goals.

### Discussion

- **TRANSDEF:**
  - We provided very detailed comments on the CTP, congratulating staff on the profound cultural change at Caltrans which it represents. However, while acknowledging SB 375, it avoids commitment to accomplishing its goals. The document includes scenarios that lead to meeting the goals, but doesn't necessarily include them in recommendations. In multiple locations it specifies that those scenarios are not recommended.
  - The adopted CTP is also not consistent with SB 391. Government Code section 65072CFR 650.72 mandates that these policies will be consistent. It shows how the state could get to the 80% reduction but doesn't contain an actual plan to do so—this should be the focus of the entire CTP. Moving this from policy recommendations made in Sacramento to something that affects everyone's lives is a big challenge requiring political will.
- **Earth Justice:** The policy framework is a good overview of what you're trying to accomplish, but for some of the policies—particularly the Environmental Stewardship Policy 3 and the Foster Livable and Healthy Communities Policy 3—it would be good to see a more outcome-based goal. Integration is good but it doesn't necessarily mean that you'll reduce impacts. Show how these policies will actually be put into practice to reduce disparate impacts.
- **The Nature Conservancy:**
  - Suggest adding a couple more plans with which the CTP should achieve consistency: Safeguarding California Plan, California Water Plan and the State Wildlife Action Plan.
  - I served on the Policy Advisory Committee for the CTP along with many of you and it was a good process. However, one disappointment was that I hoped to see the CTP be more than just guidance, that all plans incorporated would actually roll up into the CTP so that the CTP represents both vision AND implementation for transportation in California. This means that projects implemented should all roll up into and agree with the CTP. Currently, there's a big disconnect. This could be an iterative process over time, but we like to see the plan actually result in change on the ground, rather than just sitting on the shelf. Not sure how this would be accomplished in the guidelines—language asking for consistency between all these plans would help.
- **Strategic Growth Council:** To build on Liz' comments regarding implementation – we refer to the CTP as a visioning document, but it does contain fairly broad policy recommendations. However, it stops there with a disconnect to what is happening on the ground. Suggestion: Provide an implementation plan in the guidelines to tie every recommendation to some existing planning effort. Show how each would be implemented or what plan would implement it. This would help increase consistency and provide suggested next steps for implementation. That would help the CTP to close the loop and provide meaningful recommendations rather than sitting on the shelf.

- **California Walks:** My comments in the last session are really more pertinent to this session.
  - **Response—Facilitator:** Staff will redirect comments to the appropriate section.
- **California Walks:**
  - Staff has made a very good start on the new guidelines and CTC and Caltrans have worked together well. I think it's headed in the right direction.
  - Recommend reversal of emphasis in RTP development. Many start with historical guidelines, requirements or emphasis areas, then add how they need to adapt to SB 391 and how those requirements and factors have changed. It would be very helpful to start with how SB 391 fits in with SB 375 and for the first time, changes the role of the CTP.
  - Any places where consistency, disclosure and transparency requirements, recommendations and best practices can be added to the guidelines will support this.
  - Local projects driving the STIP and investments, many of which are contrary to statewide goals, are not disclosed transparently in the regional plans, and their impact on the entire statewide plan is not clear. RTPs must show how they comply with SB 375 on the major project level, and how they'll benefit or detract from emissions reduction.
  - The CTP's emphasis as whole is on what it takes to achieve the goals. Our job now is to chart the path that everyone needs to follow to get there, using their own methods, practices, projects, investments and policies. Regions need to make clearer how their land use and housing components impact the transportation system; many don't fulfill the requirements due to either the high cost of housing or the lack of jobs.
- **Caltrans:** Regarding SGC's comments, something like that was done in the previous CTP, which included an implementation list of plans that would carry out the recommendations. That's worth considering this time.
- **OPR:**
  - Speaking to SGC's comments—there have been some who have suggested using the CTP as a framework document, a policy vision document that other plans point to. I'm in support of that.
  - Also in support of suggestion to include an implementation element. In order to do that, the plan will need to become less of a visioning exercise and ground itself in more sophisticated policy. For example, the plan currently talks about doing things "big picture"—for example, adding VMT pricing across the whole state or doubling transit—the kind of things that you wouldn't actually do, they're just examples. We might need to add more detailed and sophisticated policies recommending more careful modeling efforts in this round. That would address some of these concerns about making the CTP implementable and actually getting to the 80% reduction goal.
  - **Response—CTC:** yes, that's the value of some of those scenarios—what do you need to do to meet that goal?
  - **TRANSDEF:** Question—when do we actually start doing that?
  - **Response—Facilitator:** It's not possible to specify timing right now.
- **OPR:** Would assert that if we make the modeling more realistic and use this as a framework plan that other plans are tied to in specific and quantitative ways, it will help. This should be our endeavor with these guidelines.
- **CALCOG:** RTPs are fiscally constrained plans. The CTP doesn't have that requirement and is allowed to be more visionary. I would add to Chris' suggested implementation framework by noting there's a resource side to this as well. The fiscal constraint analysis gets at what you can realistically do with the resources you can reasonably assume. If you can assume, for example, that you'll get more out of a road user charge based on VMT, how would you use that as a reasonable metric ceiling? That would be an interesting analysis and a pathway to get there, and maybe that's the future of the CTP. But right now, there's a relationship—there's also a value to visioning.
- **California Bicycle Coalition:** Comments regarding including more concrete implementation steps that are somewhat related to resources available to the State during the plan timeline:
  - Specifically point to issues in the CTP 2040. It underestimates the potential of active transportation to be a bigger component in reaching our 2040 and longer-term GHG reduction goals. Part of that is due to the fact that there isn't a fiscal constraint to the plan. Biking and walking facilities can be hugely cost-effective ways to get to those goals and also achieving other State goals, such as public health and equity goals, as well. Those modes

should be prioritized. CTP 2040 showed only a doubling of biking and walking; it didn't acknowledge the trend since 2000 of these modes doubling over only a decade. That trend is not acknowledged in the draft guidelines; would like to see it, along with acknowledging its potential to increase even faster over the next CTP horizon. I understand that RTPs are projecting significant mode shift, but don't see it reflected in projections and suggestions in CTP 2040. More constrained implementation plans such as SGC suggested would help.

## VIII. RTP Guidelines and CTP Guidelines—Climate Change Adaptation, Air Quality, Other Environmental Concerns

### Session Overview

#### Garth Hopkins, CTC:

- The purpose of this workgroup is to look at the broader environmental issues as they are addressed in both sets of guidelines. A couple of issues to touch on:
  - There's a lot on climate change, GHG emissions and mitigation.
  - There is some material on adaptation but not a lot of State direction in terms of requirements. Discussion on what folks think about broader environmental requirements. Pages 24-25 discuss climate change requirements and the Executive Order.

### Discussion

- **The Nature Conservancy:** Have a number of comments and will follow up and submit in writing.
  - In the environmental section a lot more can be done—in particular, with SB375 talking about environmental considerations and not only emissions but also identifying and considering natural resources areas. Also many best practices were not cited in here. The Nature Conservancy prepared a report that looked at all the SCS's. The report was released in January 2016. It looked at conservation elements and what folks asked for in model policies/best practices from what MPOs have done and also what was learned from stakeholder workshops. It included feedback from the MPO's with Adam Livingston interviewing representatives from every MPO. Report is available on the Nature Conservancy's website. This section can include more about what can be done to achieve SB 375, State planning priorities, mitigation, etc. More updated information regarding mitigation can be included and updated from 2010. It should also include new policies promulgated by the Federal government with FHWA, BLM and other policies that get to similar goals as California, including regional emission planning, integrating conservation plans, with dual goal of accelerated project delivery and conservation outcomes. They can be improved from delivery and outcome perspectives.
  - Other State policies: AB 498, Habitat Connectivity, is an emerging issue with the importance becoming more and more obvious to both the transportation and environmental sectors. More on climate can be incorporated into the environmental consideration section. There is a need for additional performance metrics related to habitat and economic considerations. Considering looking at a new tool created by IFC for the Transportation Resources Board. It may work better in the CTP than RTP, but performance metrics for natural resource conservation world can be better incorporated in both.
  - One final thing, consistency with local general plans. Butte County as part of their RTP took all habitat conservation plans existing or in development into the RTP and provided funding to make them consistent with each other. This is really good for a small county that doesn't have many resources. It would be good to highlight this as a best practice.
- **Tehama County Transportation Commission:** Caltrans provided blueprint planning money, and in our RTP we have blueprint plan in there. One of the goals is preservation of open space and agricultural land. We also have scenarios for strong cities and counties. Also wanted to thank CT for the blueprint money.
- **OPR:** These guidelines, rather than just recording bare bones of law, should represent State legislation and intention. One policy example is CEQA requires best practices in many cases under case law and that also out to be brought in there instead of just bare bones of State requirements.
- **CALCOG:** wanted to understand how to incorporate CEQA in the guidelines – aren't we just doubling up?
  - **OPR:** This can help articulate the best practices. This guideline ought to go above and beyond and we should be bringing CEQA into it.
  - **CALCOG:** What we are trying to convey is the reality that CEQA is ever-changing—and we agree there are places where specific things should be added. CTP is ruled by CEQA so that means we're doubling up. There are likely to

be significant changes in CEQA in six years and so if we make the guidance too specific, we will be creating guidance that will be superseded.

- **OPR:** Point taken—but I think we shouldn't leave out best practices because they may be updated. Maybe we should update more often.
- **CALCOG:** I'm not saying they shouldn't be inserted but look into what kind should be included. If these best practices will provide safe harbor, then it is a very good thing—but the law doesn't always work that way and may not agree with a recommended best practice. I think there's value in what you said but it needs to be fully thought out, there's potential there.
- **The Nature Conservancy:** This makes me think about how OPR is still developing general plan guidelines and have it less static, on line; can point to different best practices and data. Instead of being a static doc as pdf with embedded links, can it become more dynamic to allow for best practices to emerge?
  - **Response—CTC:** we want to make sure we don't need to have extensive stakeholder meetings every year. Point well taken but not sure how we get this to where it's a more relevant doc.
  - **OPR:** one example is deployment of SB743—technical advisory—can provide links and point to websites.
- **Caltrans Division of Environmental Analysis (DEA):** Back to natural resources. Regional issues such as habitat corridor planning and wildlife migration are important. Not just mentioning it in Chapter 5—equally important to point out in Chapter 2 planning process—where we can encourage identifying resources earlier on and including these in plans. Chapter 5 is more of a chapter which is shifting into CEQA and NEPA environmental review. It is important to capture all natural resource planning in planning document. Happy to see the programmatic mitigation section added to 5.4. In the May 2016 final rule for metropolitan planning programmatic mitigation section encouraged regional agencies to create a programmatic mitigation plan. Bring in fish passage, etc. through programmatic mitigation plans. Might want to mention in Chapter 2 RTP plan process. Quick question: how are you addressing the May 27 2016 final rule?
  - **Response—Caltrans Division of Transportation Planning:** DEA is referencing what they've been working on together—they provided program mitigation language—when this final rule came out, the draft was already in the update process—initially, we didn't have the updated code of Federal regulations that implements FAST Act and MAP-21. We got the final rule and were going through and tagged a lot of sections in draft RTP guidelines which need to be updated. Haven't been updated since SAFTEA-LU in 2008. At the beginning, where it talks about Federal impacts to the RTP will need to be updated completely. There are a lot of things to cover including optional programmatic mitigation. I need to review these closely and make sure they're all inserted in the appropriate place and will be working with Federal partners. All these updates will be reflected in final draft released in September.
- **The Nature Conservancy:** Following the August 5 deadline for comments on final draft—will there be an opportunity to comment on second draft?
  - **Response—CTC:** Yes, we'll send it out for as long a comment period as possible.
- **California Walks:** Recommends working with legal counsel on terminology so guidelines clarify that the applicable Federal and State statutory and executive regulatory and administrative authority to be followed in order to be in compliance with RTP CTP Guidelines are those in effect at the time of RTP/CTP/Executive adoption. The document would state that the guidelines automatically update and incorporate by reference the latest statutory, regulatory and legal authority including executive orders.
- **Caltrans DEA:** Noticed a new paragraph and have a question for the MPOs on GHG analysis. One of the challenges is to create strong rules for locals developing projects; RTP and SCS are more incentive than language on page 24 language calls out – MPOs speak to challenges of working with local entities. Page 124 middle of page, added paragraph re climate change/GHG emissions.
- **CALCOG:** speaking to best practice that is currently happening out of process in former job at SJCOG. One of the things that happened after RTP/SCS in San Joaquin asked for a consistency determination between SCS and Valley Plan. Does it actually match in detail strategies used in the land use component? Because of working with them it's mostly consistent on the county level in terms of density, etc. what essentially happened was SCS was found consistent with Delta Stewardship Plan.

- **USEPA:** One of the things that changed since last guidelines is movement toward zero emissions technology and a growing understanding of impacts and effects of emissions. In this forum there's an opportunity to acknowledge the emissions from transportation network and on a regional level one of the best places to identify zero emissions and alternative technology corridors. Is there a way to suggest this here as a best practice to include these corridors and acknowledge the impact of these corridors?
- **Coalition for Clean Air:** I second USEPA comments and noting emissions from diesel. There are a couple places where calling out Federal emissions standards make link clear between air pollution and public health. Need to adjust over time – and add that we're aware that it has a health impact. Charging and fueling infrastructure will change over time. We could also talk about more best practices in where to site those resources and new technologies beyond zero emission corridors and actually into infrastructure.
- **California Natural Resources Agency:** on RTP guidelines—need to add the environmental impact and mitigation program—a direct offset of transportation program—can take money and put toward Governor's Executive Order B-30-15 and safeguard corridor looking at affordable housing and sustainable communities program. Urban heat island index is an example of tool to link to. Current state of this and how to address, urban greening, forestry. Use of Cal-Adapt tool to predict rises in sea level, etc. also would suggest the affordable housing and sustainable communities program at large in section where you highlight State planning initiative.
- **California Walks:** to follow up on last couple points: noticed freight plan on table 2, page 19 as one of the plans but sustainable freight action plan is not. Should be added as one. Know it is on page 21 but I think updating the plans and initiatives on page 19. Thank you for incorporating these plans.
- **The Nature Conservancy:** Building off what CNRA staff said and the section on the Executive Order that's related to natural infrastructure. It bears mention in and of itself but also because it's strong language, include examples of how it can be incorporated: urban trees, complete streets, use of wetlands for absorbing, etc. Regions are doing a lot of innovative things and we have an opportunity to learn collectively. That one section on the Executive Order could use its own section in the guidelines.

## IX. RTP Guidelines – Freight Issues

### Session Overview

#### Garth Hopkins, CTC:

- Provided an overview of the section and noted the freight section begins on page 147. The section mentions the CA Sustainable Freight Action Plan, and will review to make sure the references are included throughout. It will also reference the national multi-modal freight network. Caltrans is working with MPO's to identify the statewide framework.

### Discussion

- **Coalition for Clean Air:** Overall, the freight section seems to be a little off from the direction of the Freight action plan in terms of emission reduction and defining efficiency in terms of emissions. More about freight speed which could actually drive up emissions. Need to compare between this and Governor's Executive Order B-32-15 as it relates to competitiveness, efficiency and zero emissions.
- **Earth Justice:** Looking that the criteria on page 164-165, it is important to include a performance measure that gets at emission reduction in the areas most impacted by freight. This includes geographic areas nearest ports, railyards, along freeways. A general goal for reduction is important but if we don't assess by area, we could reduce emissions in region as a whole or on average but not address conditions in areas that are most impacted.
- **California Walks:** Had a follow-up point on this last comment: Title VI requires that prior disparate impacts of our transportation investments or emissions load should not be worsened but we should show in the plan how we're lowering emissions and how investments are not adding. We're looking at this from a different perspective so that really needs to be the overarching way of evaluating that Environmental Justice component. This translates in all other sections. With expansion of freight investment, how emissions are being mitigated is a required part of the plan. Pedestrian fatalities are high on arterial roads and there is a lot of freight travel on arterial connections. We need to point out that these impacts have fallen disproportionately on high need areas. It was one of our goals to have equity included in each of other goals. This occurred but the approach doesn't make equity prominent like other two E's so carrying those through in each section is important. Mitigation needs to be included in order to help previously impacted locations. This would be helpful.
- **California Natural Resources Agency:** On page 147, Environmental Justice appears in the bracket of negative impacts. This is not appropriately characterized. This needs to be reframed.
- **OPR:** I appreciate that my comments and suggestions provided in the preliminary state round were incorporated on offering resources on induced vehicle travel from roadway expansion. It's a phenomenon we've managed to ignore for a long time, we can't do so anymore in either climate or traffic context. We often forget about science in the freight discussion and think we can expand our way out of congestion. Consider that road expansions often in high capacity area may have limited effect on enhancing freight mobility. Having dedicated freight lanes will help but having general lanes just leads to more trucks caught in traffic.
- **Earth Justice:** The freight section includes a focus on efficiency in options that MPOs consider and then discuss in the Sustainable Freight Action Plan. We should include some kind of reference to the fact that you can also evaluate what forklifts etc. and other aspects of freight contribute.

## X. CTP Guidelines—Freight Issues

### Session Overview

#### Gabriel Corley, CTP Project Manager, Caltrans:

- As far as freight goes, statutory requirements State and Federal regulations require long range planning for safe, efficient transportation etc. for needs of people and freight, to support economic vitality, and other State goals. In CTP 2040, in cooperation with the freight branch and advisory committees we crafted freight language goals, policies and recommendations for movement and competition of freight. This is described on page 18 and includes concepts from regional plans and modal plans. Some questions for the participants include: where do we integrate these plans into the development process of the CTP to create policy and guidance and also freight plan as implementation of policy. Did CTP 2040 adequately address? Have we captured what's needed as far as freight goes?

#### Garth Hopkins, CTC:

- Just a reminder that many of the comments we have heard on RTP can carry over to the CTP. You don't need to reiterate your comments unless there's something different you want to emphasize.

### Discussion

- **OPR:** The CTP guidelines can serve as an umbrella and provide direction for modal plans; we want to play that role for freight. Can we resolve or inform tensions around goals that might be opposing or conflicting when doing the tough work of planning? Here's an example: in the RTP guidelines we agree moving freight is important and yet we are not totally clear on how we can do that. Expansion doesn't get us to our goal but it also causes impacts. I would suggest a question for the document to answer: How can the CTP help inform the resolution of those tensions and find a path forward? Look into pricing for example. It can take a number of shapes: congestion or VMT pricing; the basic notion that freight would pay higher rent for its space on the roadway than private traffic. We can get traffic moving and receive the environmental benefits. It is very easy for freight to shell out tolls along roadway given value added of movement. This general principle is the type of solution that the CTP could provide to resolve these tensions.
- **Coalition for Clean Air:** Question re: how do various plans relate and how are they prioritized? The Sustainable Freight and Caltrans Freight Mobility Plans. How do you look at these two plans—does one take precedence? How do they relate to each other if you're an MPO?
- **Caltrans Office of Freight Planning:** The CA Freight Mobility Plan is a Federal requirement, with Map 21 requiring each state to have a freight plan and FAST Act allocates funding to freight specific projects. Governmental EO requires State entities to collaborate on the Sustainable Freight Action Plan which is a higher level plan. Other states are not that far yet. Actions in Sustainable Freight Plan are higher level—research, exploration, etc. whereas freight mobility plan is looking specifically at projects and where there are bottlenecks. The plan doesn't directly relate but should more in future. There is no requirement to update the Sustainable Freight Action plan but we must update the State mobility plan.
- **SCAG:** Regarding the RTP guidelines—freight section. In the complete streets section, even though it doesn't call out freight, you can see these are vital assets—and freight has to be mentioned within framework of complete streets. Once you see interventions from freight users, there is a newly added section starting on page 147 regarding cost-effective technologies. For example, in southern CA, SCAG works closely with ports but we don't have authority to tell them what to do. There is an incentive to work cooperatively but it also means we can't identify alternative technology and hold ports accountable for implementing. Where trucks are shared with commuter rails, we have to make decision as to how we're going to respond to demand from freight and community. On page 148, number 5 in the list: it is suggested we highlight that (at least in Southern California) the demand for goods movement isn't driven by local population growth but instead by national and global growth and demand. We have more

considerations than just the region's growth. In item 8: it is important we consider and make sure that airports have land side infrastructure that can handle the airport's growth.

- **California Walks:** recalled that for the Alameda CTC's transportation plan, there was an Alameda County Freight Impact Health Assessment done. It resulted in some of the adopted policies influencing the development of the Alameda CTC freight plan. It's an example best practice to look how those stakeholders can be engaged and how that can impact having a sustainable freight plan.
- **CALCOG:** California Walks' suggestion is a really good one and Alameda CTC has done some good work there. There are a number of ideas that have been coming out the MPO process. We may want to consider a principle that as we're asking our agencies at various level to take on new tasks that we have a principle to figure out how to resource them to do it. For instance, we're also moving to more requiring more data so the care and feeding of the data as well as making it accessible to public for transparency is expensive. We need to make an important investment so we can broaden these discussions. He encourages the CTP to embrace that principle and include a statement saying that not only should we be doing this but we are setting up systems to do it.
- **CTC:** Please provide any comments you have as early as possible and by the August 5th deadline so we have time to review and incorporate into the next draft. The second draft should be avail in early to mid- September—depending on the number of comments received.0th

## Conclusion

### Garth Hopkins, CTC:

- Workgroup meetings: It's likely we may not need to have a meeting on July 20th but we are working to address the request for a meeting in Southern CA. He will send out more information as it becomes available.

## **XI. List of Attendees**

The following individuals participated in the July 13 – 14, 2016 RTP and CTP Draft Guidelines Workgroup meetings in person or via teleconference:

Aaron Hoyt, Placer County Transportation Planning Authority  
Adam Livingston, Sequoia Riverlands Trust and Southern Sierra Partnership  
Allison Joe, Strategic Growth Council  
Bhupendra Patel, Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments  
Bill Sadler, Safe Routes to Schools National Partnership  
Chris Ganson, Governor's Office of Planning and Research  
Chanell Fletcher, ClimatePlan  
David Schonbrunn, Transportation Solutions Defense and Education Fund  
Gordon Garry, Sacramento Area Council of Governments  
Heather Adamson, Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments  
Isael Ojeda, Stanislaus County Association of Governments  
Liz O'Donoghue, The Nature Conservancy  
Luke McNeel-Caird, Placer County Transportation Planning Authority  
Marilee Mortenson, Caltrans Division of Transportation Planning  
Neil Peacock, Caltrans Division of Environmental Analysis  
Patricia Chen, Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority  
Rocio Gonzales, California Pan-Ethnic Health Network  
Sarah De Guia, California Pan-Ethnic Health Network  
Shrayas Jatkar, Coalition for Clean Air  
Stephen Hanamaikai, Stanislaus County Association of Governments  
Stephen Kent, Caltrans Division of Transportation Planning  
Tanisha Taylor, California Association of Councils of Governments  
Jonathan Spencer, San Joaquin Council of Governments  
Veronica Garibay, Leadership Counsel for Justice and Accountability  
Darwin Moosavi, Strategic Growth Council  
Michelle Pariset, Public Advocates  
Wendy Alfsen, California Walks  
Katie Jackson, El Dorado County  
Stuart Mori, California High Speed Rail Authority  
Dave Vautin, Metropolitan Transportation Commission  
Adam Noelting, Metropolitan Transportation Commission  
Liz Grassi, Strategic Growth Council  
Meredith Lee, California Department of Public Health  
Adenike Adeyele, Earth Justice  
Barbara O'Keefe, Tehama County Transportation Commission  
Judy Robinson, Sacramento County Office of Sustainability  
Ron West, Cambridge Systematics  
Erika Rincon-Whitcomb, Policy Link  
Neil Maizlish, Independent Researcher  
Tony Dang, California Walks  
Martha Vasquez, California Highway Patrol  
Scott Taylor, California Highway Patrol  
Claudia Wade, El Dorado County  
Kelly Egan, Caltrans Division of Transportation Planning  
Ted Link-Oberstar, Senate Office of Research  
Christopher Escarcega, ClimatePlan

Natalie Porter, El Dorado County  
Richard Marcantonio, Public Advocates  
Teri Duarte, Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District  
Kula Koenig, The American Heart Association  
Ann Mahaney, Caltrans Division of Transportation Planning  
Rose Agacer, Caltrans Division of Transportation Planning  
Nikita Daryanani, Leadership Counsel for Justice and Accountability  
Bob Johnston, University of California, Davis  
Richard Lyon, California Building Industry Association  
Bruce Grisenbeck, Sacramento Area Council of Governments  
Bill Higgins, California Association of Councils of Governments  
Jack Lord, Federal Highway Administration  
Jerry Barton, El Dorado County Transportation Commission  
Maura Twomey, Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments  
Sahar Shirazar, Governor's Office of Planning and Research  
Courtney Aguirre, Southern California Association of Governments  
Terry Roberts, California Air Resources Board  
Nesamani Kalandiyur, California Air Resources Board  
Nicole Dolney, California Air Resources Board  
Mike Becker, Santa Barbara County Association of Governments  
Peter Imhoff, Santa Barbara County Association of Governments  
Lewis Brown, Policy Link  
Kristine Cai, Fresno Council of Governments  
Glen Campora, Department of Housing and Community Development  
Paul Cort, Earth Justice  
Kit Curtiss, Caltrans District 4  
Lauren Dawson, Fresno COG  
Connell Dunning, United States Environmental Protection Agency  
Maureen El Harake, Caltrans District 12  
Demi Espinoza, Safe Routes to Schools National Partnership  
Richard Fahey, Caltrans District 4  
Ilene Gallo, Caltrans District 11  
Melissa Garza, Fresno Council of Governments  
Amy Golden, Caltrans Division of Environmental Analysis  
Darin Grossi, Tuolumne County Transportation Council  
Dan Landon, Nevada County Transportation Commission  
Bryn Lindblad, Climate Resolve  
Kacey Lizon, Sacramento Area Council of Governments  
Monte Marable, Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority  
Andrew Martin, San Diego Association of Governments  
Shirley Medina, Riverside County Transportation Commission  
Dillon Miner, Caltrans Division of Transportation Planning  
Julia Biggar, Caltrans Division of Transportation Planning  
Erin Thompson, Caltrans Division of Transportation Planning  
Raef Porter, Sacramento Area Council of Governments  
Brenda Powell-Jones, Caltrans Division of Environmental Analysis  
Sophia Sadaat, Townsend Public Affairs  
Tim Schott, California Association of Port Authorities  
Craig Scott, Automobile Club  
Rodney Tavitas, Caltrans Division of Transportation Planning  
Phil Trom, San Diego Association of Governments

Zoe Unruh, Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority  
Amy Volz, California Air Resources Board  
Jeanie Ward-Waller, California Bicycle Coalition  
Allison Wood, San Diego Association of Governments  
Mike Woodman, Nevada County Transportation Commission  
Molly Wright, Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District  
Stephen Yokoi, Caltrans District 4  
Mike Zeller, Transportation Agency for Monterey County  
Garth Hopkins, California Transportation Commission  
Jose Oseguera, California Transportation Commission  
Laura Pennebaker, California Transportation Commission  
Priscilla Martinez-Velez, Caltrans Division of Transportation Planning  
Gabriel Corley, Caltrans Division of Transportation Planning  
Joan Chaplick, MIG Inc.  
Maria Mayer, MIG Inc.