

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA



**ASSOCIATION of
GOVERNMENTS**

Main Office

818 West Seventh Street

12th Floor

Los Angeles, California

90017-3435

t (213) 236-1800

f (213) 236-1825

www.scag.ca.gov

Officers

President

Pam O'Connor, Santa Monica

First Vice President

Glen Becerra, Simi Valley

Second Vice President

Greg Pettis, Cathedral City

Immediate Past President

Larry McCallon, Highland

**Executive/Administration
Committee Chair**

Pam O'Connor, Santa Monica

Policy Committee Chairs

Community, Economic and
Human Development
Bill Jahn, Big Bear Lake

Energy & Environment
Margaret Clark, Rosemead

Transportation
Paul Glaab, Laguna Niguel

MEETING OF THE

PLANS & PROGRAMS TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Wednesday, August 10, 2011

1:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.

**SCAG Offices
818 West 7th Street, 12th Floor
Board Room
Los Angeles, CA 90017
(213) 236-1800**

Videoconferencing is available with a 72-hour advance notice by contacting Margaret Lin at lin@scag.ca.gov or 213-236-1866.

Teleconferencing Information:

Number: 1-800-230-1059

Silent Live Web PowerPoint Presentations:

<https://www.webmeeting.att.com>

Meeting #: 8772145010 | Participant Code: 159785

If members of the public wish to review the attachments or have any questions on any of the agenda items, please contact Margaret Lin at 213-236-1866 or lin@scag.ca.gov

SCAG, in accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), will accommodate persons who require a modification of accommodation in order to participate in this meeting. If you require such assistance, please contact SCAG at (213) 236-1866 at least 72 hours in advance of the meeting to enable SCAG to make reasonable arrangements. To request documents related to this document in an alternative format, please contact (213) 236-1866.

Membership

August 2011

Charlie Larwood, Chair

Kevin Viera, Vice-Chair

Member

Alan De Salvio

Bill Trimble

Carol A. Gomez

Charlie Larwood

Dave Simpson

David Cordero

Diana Chang

Eric Shen

Franklin Dancy

Fred Zohrehvand

Genie McGaugh

Gloria Ohland

Jacob I. Alvarez

Kerry Cartwright

Kevin Viera

Kim Fuentes

Lisa Webber

Lori Abrishami

Marc Seferian

Marianne Kim

Mark Baza

Mark Herwick

Mark Roberts

Marlon Boarnet

Matt Dessert

Maureen El Harake

Maurice Eaton

Melissa Joshi

Michael Hollis

Miles Mitchell

Nancy Pfeffer

Richard Kite

Ryan Snyder

Sera Wirth

Shirley Medina

Steve DeGeorge

Terry Roberts

Ty Schuiling

Valarie McFall

Valerie Edwards

William Gayk

Representing

Antelope Valley AQMD

Mojave Desert AQMD

San Gabriel Valley COG

South Coast AQMD

Orange County Transportation Authority

Orange County COG

SCAG Region Special Districts

Westside Cities COG

Port of Long Beach

Morongo Band of Mission Indians

Arroyo Verdugo

Ventura County APCD

Move LA

Coachella Valley AG

Port of Los Angeles

Western Riverside COG

South Bay Cities COG

North LA County – South

Los Angeles County Metro

Las Virgenes/Malibu COG

American Automobile Association

Imperial County Transportation Commission

County of Los Angeles

Caltrans District 8

UCI Dept. of Planning, Policy, and Design

Imperial County APCD

Caltrans District 12

Caltrans District 11

Caltrans District 7

Metropolitan Water District of Southern California

City of Los Angeles

Gateway Cities COG

North LA County – North

Non-Motorized Transportation

SCAG Region Local Agency Formation Commissions

Riverside County Transportation Commission

Ventura County Transportation Commission/Ventura COG

Air Resources Board

San Bernardino Associated Governments

Transportation Corridor Agencies

Los Angeles Unified School District

Riverside County Planning Department

PLANS & PROGRAMS TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE AUGUST 10, 2011

TIME *PG#*

- 1.0 **CALL TO ORDER**
 (Charlie Larwood, OCTA and P&P TAC Chair)

- 2.0 **PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD** – Members of the public desiring to speak on items on the agenda, or items not on the agenda, but within the purview of the Plans & Programs Technical Advisory Committee, must fill out and present a speaker’s card to the assistant prior to speaking. Comments will be limited to three minutes. The chair may limit the total time for all comments to twenty minutes.

- 3.0 **REVIEW AND PRIORITIZE AGENDA ITEMS**

- 4.0 **CONSENT CALENDAR**
 - 4.1 **Approval Item**
 - 4.1.1 Minutes of July 12, 2011 P&P TAC Meeting 1

- 5.0 **DISCUSSION ITEMS**
 - 5.1 Active Transportation Chapter Update **Presentation: 15 min** 14
 (Margaret Lin, SCAG Staff) **Discussion: 10 min**

 SCAG staff will provide an update on the Active Transportation Chapter of the 2012 RTP.

 - 5.2 Performance Measure Update **Presentation: 10 min** *
 (Naresh Amatya, SCAG Staff) **Discussion: 15 min**

 SCAG staff will provide an update on the proposed performance measures for the 2012 RTP.

 - 5.3 Potential Technology Alternatives Analysis **Presentation: 10 min** *
 (Jonathan Nadler, SCAG Staff) **Discussion: 10 min**

 SCAG staff will present the initial alternatives analysis.

* Attachment under separate cover

PLANS & PROGRAMS TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE AUGUST 10, 2011

TIME *PG#*

- | | | | |
|-----|---|--|----|
| 5.4 | <u>Base Year and Baseline Transportation Preliminary Model Results</u>
<i>(Tarek Hatata, SCAG Consultant)</i> | Presentation: 10 min
Discussion: 10 min | * |
| | <p>SCAG consultant will provide a presentation on the base year and baseline transportation system performance.</p> | | |
| 5.5 | <u>East-West Corridor Update</u>
<i>(Annie Nam, SCAG Staff)</i> | Presentation: 10 min
Discussion: 10 min | 22 |
| | <p>SCAG staff will provide an update on the East-West Corridor.</p> | | |
| 5.6 | <u>Integrated Growth Forecast and RHNA Methodology</u>
<i>(Frank Wen and Ma'Ayn Johnson, SCAG Staff)</i> | Presentation: 10 min
Discussion: 10 min | 28 |
| | <p>SCAG staff will provide a presentation on the Integrated Growth Forecast and RHNA methodology.</p> | | |
| 5.7 | <u>Aviation Update</u>
<i>(Michael Armstrong, SCAG Staff)</i> | Presentation: 20 min
Discussion: 10 min | 37 |
| | <p>SCAG staff will provide an aviation update.</p> | | |

6.0 FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

- ◆ Alternatives Evaluation
- ◆ Preliminary Regional SCS (Mark Butala)
- ◆ Express Choice Study
- ◆ Freight Works Study

7.0 ADJOURNMENT

The next meeting of the P&P TAC will be Tuesday, September 13, 2011 from 1:30 to 4:30pm.

Meeting of the
Plans & Programs Technical Advisory Committee (P&P TAC)
of the
Southern California Association of Governments

July 12, 2011

Minutes

THE FOLLOWING MINUTES ARE A SUMMARY OF ACTIONS TAKEN AND/OR DISCUSSIONS BY THE PLANS & PROGRAMS TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE. AUDIO OF THE ACTUAL MEETING IS AVAILABLE FOR LISTENING IN SCAG'S DOWNTOWN LOS ANGELES OFFICE.

The Plans & Programs Technical Advisory Committee held its July 12, 2011 meeting at SCAG's downtown Los Angeles Office.

Members Present

Charlie Larwood	Orange County Transportation Authority
Miles Mitchell	City of Los Angeles
Naomi Guth	City of Los Angeles – Alternate
Bill Trimble	San Gabriel Valley COG
Walter Siembab	South Bay Cities COG – Alternate
Deborah Diep	OCCOG
Nancy Pfeffer	Gateway Cities COG
Steve De George	Ventura County Transportation Commission/Ventura COG
Carol A. Gomez	South Coast AQMD
Genie McGaugh	Ventura County APCD
Marlon Boarnet	UCI Department of Planning, Policy and Design
Lisa Webber	North LA County – South
William Gayk	Riverside County Planning Department
Ty Schuiling	San Bernardino Associated Governments
Sarah Jepson	Los Angeles County Metro – Alternate
Gloria Ohland	Move LA
Marc Seferian	Las Virgenes/Malibu COG
Kim Fuentes	South Bay Cities COG
Franklin Dancy	Morongo Band of Mission Indians
Gregory Nord	OCTA
Melissa Joshi	Caltrans District 7
Valerie Edwards	Los Angeles Unified School District
Lori Abrishami	Los Angeles County Metro
Ryan Snyder	Non-Motorized Transportation
Terry Roberts	Air Resources Board
Steve Smith	San Bernardino Associated Governments
Richard Kite	North LA County – North
Diana Chang	Westside Cities COG

Dave Simpson	Orange County COG
Earl Withycombe	Air Resources Board – Alternate
Kerry Cartwright	Port of Los Angeles
Valarie McFall	Transportation Corridor Agencies

Members Excused

Maureen El Harake	Caltrans District 12
Michael Hollis	Metropolitan Water District of Southern California

Members Not Present

Aimee Kratovil	Federal Highway Administration – Alternate
Alan Ballard	Ventura County APCD – Alternate
Alan De Salvo	Antelope Valley AQMD/Mojave Desert AQMD
Aurora Wilson	Coachella Valley AG – Alternate
Beth Landrum	Caltrans District 11 – Alternate
Connie Chung	County of Los Angeles – Alternate
David Cordero	SCAG Regional Special Districts
Dianna Watson	Caltrans District 7 – Alternate
Eric Shen	Port of Long Beach
Everett Evans	Caltrans District 12 – Alternate
Fred Zohrehvand	Arroyo Verdugo
Grace Alvarez	Riverside County Transportation Commission - Alternate
James Camarillo	Caltrans District 8 – Alternate
Jolene Hayes	Port of Long Beach – Alternate
Karen Heit	Gateway Cities COG – Alternate
Kathryn Higgins	South Coast AQMD – Alternate
Kevin Viera	Western Riverside COG
Larry Stevens	San Gabriel Valley COG – Alternate
Marianne Kim	American Automobile Association
Mark Baza	Imperial County Transportation Commission
Mark Herwick	County of Los Angeles
Mark Roberts	Caltrans District 8
Martha Eros	Westside Cities COG – Alternate
Mary E. Pritchard	Los Angeles Unified School District - Alternate
Matt Dessert	Imperial County APCD
Maurice Eaton	Caltrans District 11
Mike Behen	North LA County - North – Alternate
Rosa Lopez-Solis	Imperial County Transportation Commission - Alternate
Sam Elters	Transportation Corridor Agencies – Alternate
Shirley Medina	Riverside County Transportation Commission

Stephen Finnegan	American Automobile Association – Alternate
Dave Peterson	North LA County - South – Alternate
Danny Wu	South Coast AQMD
Monica N. Soucier	Imperial County APCD – Alternate
Sera Wirth	SCAG Region Local Agency Formation Commissions
Fernando Castro	Caltrans District 7 – Alternate

1.0 CALL TO ORDER AND INTRODUCTIONS

The meeting was called to order at 1:31 p.m. by Charlie Larwood, OCTA & P&PTAC Chair.

2.0 PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

There were no public comments. Chair Larwood stated Wally Siembab, South Bay Cities COG, will update the committee on the results of a neighborhood electric vehicles study underway in the area. Mr. Siembab stated the study is part of an Air Quality Management District grant and it tracked the use of a designated group of electric vehicles in the South Bay using a vehicle GIS as well as personal driver GIS to track VMTs per household. Preliminary reports from the study group show approximately 99% of all vehicle trips were within 3 radial miles of the home and were on average 5 miles or fewer. Mr. Siembab stated the findings are revealing insight into driver patterns and the details are available on Southbaycities.org. Mr. Siembab stated he will bring additional information about this to the committee as more study results are known.

3.0 REVIEW AND PRIORITIZE AGENDA ITEMS

There were no comments received regarding the review and prioritization of agenda items.

4.0 CONSENT CALENDAR

4.1 Approval Item

4.1.1 Minutes of June8, 2011 P&P TAC Meeting

Wally Siembab, South Bay Cities COG, asked that section 5.3, Proposed Draft Alternative Scenarios, to reflect his recommendation that SCAG consider a land use transportation scenario that incorporates fleet

electrification particularly because SCAG is the lead applicant on the CEC grant application to develop a plug in vehicle readiness plan for the region. Additionally, the application requires the applicant make the connection between the plan and the Sustainable Communities Strategy.

Miles Mitchell asked that his and Ty Schuiling's comments in section 5.3, Proposed Draft Alternative Scenarios, were expanded to include suggestions to format them in a more thematic way using pie charts so subregionals would have a better picture of how the alternatives would impact their subregion.

Mr. Larwood stated the minutes are approved with the exception of the requested revisions in section 5.3.

5.0 DISCUSSION ITEMS

5.1 Update on Financial Forecast

Chris Williges, SCAG Consultant, provided an update on financial forecasts. Mr. Williges stated the purpose of today's presentation is to look at committed costs within the RTP. Mr. Williges further stated the cost estimates are based on those projects committed as part of the FTIP, the transit O & M & rehab cost as well as debt service. After the committed costs are presented they will be compared to available revenue.

Mr. Williges presented a chart which forecasts available revenue from 2011 to 2035 broken down by local, state and federal contributions. The chart demonstrates during this time \$217 billion or 71% is estimated to come from local funding, \$53 billion or 17% will come from state funding and \$35 billion or 12% will be available through federal funding. It is forecasted \$306 billion will be available for RTP funding over this period.

Mr. Williges next presented a graph showing increases in highway construction costs. Mr. Williges further stated there was a spike in construction costs leading up to the year 2004 but costs have declined with the onset of the great recession. When viewed over the 30 year period from 1980 to 2010 the average increase in construction costs is 3.2% annually. Mr. Williges stated the 3.2% cost increase average is consistent with U.S. Army Corps of Engineers estimates.

Next, Mr. Williges presented a pie chart indicating committed costs by specific category. The cost by category is shown as follows; 1) Transit O&M Preservation, \$124 billion, 2) Transit Capital, \$78 billion, 3) Highway Capital, \$59 billion, 4) Debt Service, \$33 billion, 5) Other (non-motorized, TDM, ITS, grade separation, regional rail capacity) \$21 billion, 6) Highway O&M and Preservation, \$20 billion, 7) Regionally significant Local Roads, \$16 billion. The total committed cost during this period is \$351 billion.

Mr. Williges next presented a bar chart comparing committed costs with anticipated revenue. The graph demonstrates a projected \$45 billion revenue shortfall. Mr. Williges further explained costs excluded other needs such as preservation, East-West corridor, potential rail electrification and/or Tier IV acceleration.

Chair Larwood led the committee through a discussion. Ty Schuiling, San Bernardino Associated Governments, asked if the costs provided for Transit O&M is sufficient to maintain the current transit system. Mr. Williges stated the total is not sufficient as it does not account for additional unmet needs. So the funding gap of \$45 billion actually increases when the unmet needs are folded into the estimates.

Wally Siembab stated it would be worthwhile to review the capital funding in Measure R versus the maintenance funding.

Mr. Schuiling stated there has been a decrease in state and federal transportation funding over the past 25 years which has meant a greater funding need from local revenue sources.

5.2 **Transportation System Preservation Needs**

Tarek Hatata, SCAG Consultant, provided an update on transportation system preservation needs. Mr. Hatata reviewed three transportation systems preservation needs areas and their funding shortfalls, 1) Transit O&M Preservation Needs, 2) Local Streets and Roads (pavement, essential components, bridges) 3) State Highway Operation and Protection.

Mr. Hatata began the presentation with a chart showing SCAG Region Transit O&M and Preservation Needs and its projected unmet funding gap for the next 10 years. The chart demonstrated a \$14 billion unmet funding

gap over the next 10 years for transit O&M. When projected through the year 2035 it is estimated the funding gap will be \$46.4 billion.

Next, Mr. Hatata reviewed maintenance funding projections for Local Streets and Roads. A chart was presented indicating \$43 billion would be needed to maintain the roads in a “good state of repair”. It indicates \$9.7 billion in funding is allocated leaving a \$33 billion funding shortfall. When projected through 2035 the unmet funding gap is \$70.8 billion. Mr. Hatata stated there is value in maintaining roads to a good state of repair as repairs becomes more costly once a roadway’s condition declines beyond a certain point.

Mr. Hatata further stated the next available option is to “maintain current conditions” of the roadways. To maintain roadways in their current condition over the next 10 years it is estimated \$27 billion is needed. Further, \$9.7 billion is available which leaves a \$17.3 funding gap. When projected through 2035 the funding gap is projected to be \$56.4 billion.

Next, Mr. Hatata reviewed the State Highway Operations and Protections (SHOPP) funding. Mr. Hatata stated a \$19.3 funding gap is projected over the next 10 years and through 2035 this gap will be \$50.6 billion. Next, Mr. Hatata presented a chart comparing SHOPP maintenance funding needs alongside available funding. The chart demonstrated a progressive widening of the gap between maintenance funds needed and funds available. For example, the 2004 SHOPP indicates \$2.8 billion in maintenance costs and \$1.8 billion available to address those needs or a \$1 billion funding gap. In comparison, the 2012 SHOPP maintenance cost is projected at \$7.4 billion with \$1.8 billion allocated for an unmet funding gap of \$5.6 billion.

Mr. Hatata concluded by summarizing the collective funding gap for the three transportation categories. It is estimated the three systems will have a \$153 billion funding shortfall given its current funding trajectory.

Chair Larwood led the committee through a discussion of this item.

5.3 **Environmental Justice Update**

Jennifer Sarnecki, SCAG Staff, presented an update on SCAG's Environmental Justice process. Ms. Sarnecki began the presentation by stating the three fundamental principles guiding the Environmental Justice efforts; 1) To avoid, minimize, or mitigate disproportionately high and adverse human health and environmental effects, including social and economic effects, on minority populations and low-income populations. 2) To insure the full and fair participation by all potentially affected communities in the transportation decision-making process. 3) To prevent the denial of, reduction in, or significant delay in the receipt of benefits by minority and low-income populations.

Ms. Sarnecki further stated they are guided by several documents including Title VI of the Civil Rights Act (1964), Executive Order 12898 (1994) and others including SCAG's Environmental Justice Policy. Ms. Sarnecki reviewed SCAG's Environmental Justice Policy and began by stating SCAG is committed to being a leader in analysis of the environmental, health, social, and economic impacts of our programs on minority and low-income populations. Additionally, SCAG seeks out traditionally underrepresented groups and provides them early and meaningful public access in the regional transportation planning process. Ms. Sarnecki further stated when there is a disproportionately high and adverse impact on minority and low-income populations SCAG takes steps to propose mitigation measures or consider alternative approaches.

Next, Ms. Sarnecki reviewed SCAG's analysis process. Ms. Sarnecki stated analysis includes a region-wide analysis for the RTP that begins by comparing the RTP with "no project". Additionally, two core questions are examined; 1) Are people better off or worse with or without the plan? 2) Is there a disproportionately negative impact on any group? Ms. Sarnecki further stated additional tools include Traffic Analysis Zone (TAZ), socioeconomic variables, Travel Demand Models (TDM) and Direct Transportation Impact Model.

Ms. Sarnecki stated new areas of analysis are added as they emerge and the 2008 RTP resulted in four new areas of consideration; 1) non-work trip analysis, 2) accessibility based on same travel time for different modes, 3) accessibility to parks, 4) county-level analysis.

Further, Ms. Sarnecki stated outreach workshops have taken place in June 2010 and June 2011 to better understand areas of concern. Comments received from stakeholders during the June 2010 workshop include a request to focus more on bicycling and walking for all ages. Benefits should be provided to impacted communities, bring public health to the forefront, and address gentrification.

Ms. Sarnecki stated this exchange led to additional areas of concern for the 2011 workshop including a request to form focus groups on environmental justice as a forum for stakeholders to provide input earlier in the process. Additional comments include a request for more localized analysis and mitigation and a request to consider job/housing fit (comparing local wages to housing costs).

Ms. Sarnecki concluded her presentation by stating the committee can assist the effort by gathering data and informing SCAG of methodologies to address new and emerging areas of analysis.

Frank Wen, SCAG Manager, Research Analysis and Information Services, continued the presentation by reviewing 4 potential new areas of study; 1) rail related impacts. Mr. Wen stated this looks at the container imports and freight corridors. Mr. Wen stated this seeks to examine the effects of rail activity and stated 60% of all container imports are shipped out of the region. Rail activity study examines rail impact on local residents, the areas where rail lines pass through, their ethnic composition, income strata of residents and the general impact on highly traveled rail corridors. 2) gentrification and displacement. As strategies such as urban infill and Transit Oriented Development are employed their impact on the economic, gentrification and potential displacement of residents would be examined. 3) Air quality impacts along freeways and highly traveled corridors. This is not a new analysis area for SCAG but was requested to be included by stakeholders. It will include an analysis of the demographic characteristics (income and ethnicity) of those populations living proximate to highly traveled corridors. 4) Impacts of pricing strategies. Mr. Wen stated pricing strategies can be regressive to low income populations. Mr. Wen further stated this area of study seeks to understand how various pricing strategies may affect specific income or ethnic groups disproportionately.

Chair Larwood led the committee through a discussion of this item.

5.4 **Growth Forecast Update**

Frank Wen, SCAG Manager, Research, Analysis and Information Services, presented an update on growth forecast. Mr. Wen stated on May 13, 2011 a revised growth forecast was issued which incorporated 2010 census information. This was based on input from P&PTAC and CEHD. Additionally, the projection period for the 5th RHNA cycle was produced based on the forecasting period January 1, 2011 to September 30, 2021. This was sent to local jurisdictions for further confirmation and verification. This was based on their previously provided local input as part of the “bottom up” process and then census data was incorporated.

Mr. Wen further stated growth forecast revisions were sought by approximately 30 local jurisdictions who felt the previously provided growth figures were high based on the current state of economy. Mr. Wen stated consultation with HCD is ongoing to determine their views on adjusting growth forecast for the jurisdictions.

Mr. Wen further stated as part of the RTP/SCS process SCAG Staff has begun consultation with ARB staff to familiarize them with SCAG’s growth forecast, data, model development, structures and policy elements. Mr. Wen further stated ARB will evaluate if an MPO’s SCS can achieve the emissions reduction target adopted by the ARB Board.

5.5 **Regional Housing Needs Assessment Update**

Ma’Ayn Johnson, SCAG Staff, presented an update on the Regional Housing Needs Assessment. Ms. Johnson stated the RHNA process is moving forward and currently SCAG is in consultation with HCD in an effort to arrive at a regional determination. It is anticipated this will be received in August 2011. Ms. Johnson further stated one area of discussion is whether tribal lands are to be excluded from the RHNA. Ms. Johnson stated efforts are underway with Riverside County and SANBAG to exclude tribal lands from the regional determination as they are considered sovereign nations excluded from local land use control.

Ms. Johnson further stated a preliminary forecasting document will be released in a week which estimates existing housing needs in the region. That document will be provided to P&PTAC. Ms. Johnson stated the RHNA Subcommittee last met on June 24, 2011 and began discussion of

the RHNA methodology. The draft methodology will be distributed on September 1, 2011 at the CEHD Policy Committee meeting. A 60-day comment period will follow and a public workshop will be held during that time. It is anticipated the final RHNA methodology will be presented to the Regional Council for its adoption in November 2011.

The RHNA Subcommittee also discussed Social Equity Adjustment. This adjusts the current income distribution for impacted jurisdictions and moves them toward the county distribution. As part of RHNA methodology the subcommittee recommended the adjustment be 110% of the county distribution. This is the same adjustment percentage as the previous RHNA cycle.

Ms. Johnson stated the next RHNA Subcommittee meeting will be August 12, 2011 where the remainder of the methodology issues will be discussed. Ms. Johnson further stated the subcommittee has also discussed local jurisdiction housing surveys. These include the AB 2158 Local Planning Survey and the Replacement Needs Survey. Ms. Johnson stated staff is looking to the Replacement Needs Survey to provide data to assist discussions with HCD for their regional determination.

Chair Larwood led the committee through a discussion of this item.

5.6 **Alternatives Scenario Update**

Naresh Amatya, SCAG Transportation Planning Manager, presented an update on RTP/SCS Alternative Scenarios. Mr. Amatya presented the committee with a matrix showing 4 alternatives, each one broken down by its constituent parts as follows; land use, transit, high speed rail, transportation system management, travel demand management, non-motorized transportation, highways, goods movement, system preservation and pricing. Mr. Amatya reviewed each alternative briefly and also reminded the committee this is a work in process and their input is welcomed during the meeting and outside of it via email. This input along with information received in the workshops will further assist us in shaping and refining the alternatives.

Mr. Amatya stated alternative 1 focuses on maximizing the existing transportation system. This alternative is comparatively less capital intensive and seeks to improve operation effectiveness to maximize the

existing transportation system. For land use this alternative assumes mostly local input based on their general plans.

Mr. Amatya stated all the transportation plans committed by the county transportation commissions are incorporated into each of the four alternatives and each alternative progressively builds upon its central components. Mr. Amatya further stated high speed rail involves the implementation of Phase I of the California High Speed Rail system which in Los Angeles County would connect North LA County to Union Station to Anaheim station. Transportation System Management seeks to utilize traffic signal synchronization as well as advanced ramp metering. Travel Demand Management seeks to encourage higher levels of auto trip diversions by incentivizing and encouraging telecommute and encouraging non-auto modes.

Non-motorized focuses on implementing the bike plans the cities and counties have planned currently. Mr. Amatya further stated the highway plans seek to utilize Congestion System Management solutions on select corridors. The Goods Movement strategy seeks to improve critical truck bottlenecks, rail capacity enhancements and corresponding grade separations. For system preservation the goal is to maintain current asset conditions for transit, arterials and state highway system. Mr. Amatya stated given Alternative 1 does not rely heavily on capital projects, pricing strategies such as VMT fee assumed in this scenario may help in managing demand in addition to providing funding for roadway preservation, non-motorized and transit improvements.

Mr. Amatya stated scenarios 2 and 3 primarily differ based on growth and land use strategies. Mr. Amatya further stated as the scenarios progress from 1 to 4 the land use component moves progressively away from single family homes toward smaller lots, mixed land use, and TOD development. Mr. Amatya stated Alternative 4 is the most aggressive in both land use and transportation planning. For pricing, scenarios 2 and 3 seek to implement Strategic HOT lane networks as well as cordon pricing around key activity centers, for example, around downtown Los Angeles and potentially LAX.

Chair Larwood led the committee through a discussion. Ty Schuiling, San Bernardino Associated Governments, asked if the projects defined under Measure R are present in the alternatives. Mr. Amatya stated they are embedded within each scenario. Mr. Schuiling stated he did not see a scenario consistent with the "Powering the Future" document co-produced

by ARB, AQMD and SCAG. Mr. Schuiling stated that report contains a set of strategies essential for air quality attainment and should be in the RTP. Mr. Amatya stated the incorporation of these strategies is a work in progress and it was debated if these should be placed in a separate scenario or incorporated into an existing one. Mr. Schuiling stated he would be interested in seeing it woven into multiple scenarios.

Tarek Hatata stated it may be optimal to identify these strategies into a single alternative so its specific attainment can be measured. Additionally, the major transportation related investments include rail electrification, incentives for private electric vehicles penetration and potentially a zero emission truck freight corridor.

Deborah Diep, OCCOG, stated similar scenario documents lists as the first scenario a “business as usual” or baseline option and asked if the alternatives matrix would benefit from having a baseline scenario option. Mr. Amatya stated they have such a scenario but are debating the best position for it. Ms. Diep recommended that a baseline scenario be based on the 2008 RTP. Additionally, Ms. Diep stated 75% of households planned for Orange County are attached housing and questioned how this will align with projected land use goals of the four alternatives. Ms. Diep asked about the component to increase telecommuting. Mr. Hatata stated efforts are continuing to define this component.

Ryan Snyder, non-motorized transportation, stated he would like to see the RTP better define what is needed to meet air quality and climate change goals. Mr. Snyder stated he would like to see greater efforts to; 1) provide a robust bus scenario where every freeway is treated as a bus way with stations and transfer points along the way. 2) double or triple local bus service to increase reliability. 3) return to TDM strategies similar to those used in the 1990’s such as carpools and rideshare. 4) improve the bicycle plan to include a bikeway every half mile. 5) improve the pedestrian environment to increase and promote pedestrian activity for local trips.

Wally Siembab, South Bay Cities COG, offered to provide input for telecommuting incentives based on his years of experience working in this field. Mr. Siembab further stated efforts to increase pedestrian traffic have not been effective based on beautification efforts, that factors such as time and distance play a greater role in promoting pedestrian activity. Further, Mr. Siembab stated planning would be more effective if it sought to compact destinations rather than places or origin. It’s about compactness of

destinations rather than compactness or trip origins. This will also help promote pedestrian and bicycle transportation use. Mr. Siembab stated South Bay planning is termed, “Neighborhood Oriented Development” rather than “Transit Oriented Development”. Move retail and commercial sites into compact centers located everywhere.

Mr. Siembab stated, in contrast, each of the scenarios use transit as a reference point. Additionally, development is already making more dense communities so efforts would be more strategic if they sought to compact destinations.

Nancy Pfeffer asked if additional efforts can be made to make the scenarios matrix more thematic. Titles, names or capsule descriptions are suggested to better define the differences. Mr. Hatata stated there is a bit of a refrain from using these to keep viewers from judging by the title.

5.7 **Active Transportation Chapter Update**

Due to time constraints this item was moved to the August 10, 2011 meeting.

6.0 **FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

Goods Movement Study Update – Annie Nam, August 10th

RHNA Update – Mark Butala, August 10th

Travel Demand Model Basics – Guoxiong Huang, August 10th

Aviation Update, Michael Armstrong, August 10th

7.0 **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m. The next meeting of the Plans & Programs Technical Advisory Committee will be held on Wednesday, August 10, 2011 from 1:30 p.m. to 4:30 p.m.
