



SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION of GOVERNMENTS

Update on Alternatives Analysis Framework

September 13, 2011
Plans and Programs Technical Advisory Committee

Background

- Developed three preliminary scenarios
 - Presented to TAC
 - Requests for more detail
 - Provided details in matrix format to the TAC
- Conducted a high level evaluation using Rapid Fire model
- Used the scenario descriptions and preliminary results in 18 workshops to get input and feedback to the RTP/SCS

RTP Alternatives

- Alternatives build on original scenarios (with specifics and changes) and will be modeled with SCAG's travel demand models
- Alternatives
 - Business as Usual Alternative – Modified 2008 RTP
 - Progressive Alternative
 - Environmentally Superior Alternative
 - Energy Cost Increase Alternative
- All initial tests will be conducted for 2035, followed by 2020 testing as appropriate

RTP Alternatives ... continued

- All alternatives have all county projects consistent with the 2008 RTP amendment #4.
- Despite requests to evaluate scenarios that modify county decisions, SCAG strongly feels county decisions as well as sales tax measure votes must be respected.
- The "Clean Vehicle Technology" alternative will be analyzed using off-model techniques.
- Primary differences among alternatives:
 1. Socio-Economic Data (SED)
 2. Congestion Pricing and Revenue Generation strategies
 3. Incremental spending from new revenues on transportation: preservation, transit, environmental mitigation, regional projects, non-motorized

Baseline

- Technical Trend Socio-Economic-Data (SED)/Land Use
- Only fully programmed projects in the current TIP (2011 FTIP) that have environmental clearance – Projects that are ready to go
- Baseline represents No Project Alternative
- All alternatives will be compared to Baseline

Business as Usual Alternative (Modified 2008 RTP)

- SED/Land Use updated by local input for the 2012 RTP
- Funding gap and some preservation shortfall addressed by various sources (e.g., toll revenues on 710 truck lanes, increase in gas tax commensurate with historical trends, other)
- No additional regional projects/strategies beyond the 2008 RTP (e.g., no additional HOT Lanes)

What are we looking for from the Business as Usual Alternative?

- To what extent do the progressive land use strategies already reflected in the locally supported SED in conjunction with committed transportation projects by the counties contribute to achieving our goals :
 - Conformity
 - SB 375
 - System performance

Progressive Alternative

- Locally supported SED/Land Use Enhanced
- Funding gaps addressed by congestion pricing revenues and other sources (e.g., toll revenues on 710 truck lane)
- Congestion pricing strategies: Strategic HOT Lane Network, Downtown Los Angeles Cordon Pricing, Use Fee
- High Speed Rail – Phase I and LOSSAN improvements
- Preservation – Maintain current conditions
- Goods Movement – EW Corridor, selected grade crossing, selected truck bottlenecks improvements, Rail Tier IV acceleration
- Non-motorized and TDM– Increased funding as per non-motorized plan presented before plus higher TDM funding

What are we looking for from the Progressive Alternative?

- What impacts (beyond business as usual) would our congestion pricing strategies in conjunction with non-motorized and TDM investments produce?
 - How much higher will transit mode share be, especially to and from downtown Los Angeles?
 - How many trips are eliminated?
 - How many additional carpools did we incentivize?
 - What is the reduction in VMT?
 - What is the reduction in congestion? Truck delays?
 - What are the reductions in pollutants and GHG emissions?
 - How does this impact conformity/SB 375
- How do the benefits and costs/fees likely to impact the economy?

Environmentally Superior Alternative

- All county projects consistent with the 2008 RTP amendment #4.
- More progressive SED/Land Use beyond locally supported version
- Congestion pricing strategies: Strategic HOT Lane Network, Downtown Los Angeles Cordon Pricing, Use Fee
- High Speed Rail – Phase I and LOSSAN improvements
- Preservation – Maintain current conditions
- Transit – Increased funding for rail extensions, Metro 30/10 initiative, reduction of headways on selected routes
- Non-motorized – Increased funding as per non-motorized plan presented before

What are we looking for from the Environmentally Superior Alternative?

- What impacts (beyond business as usual and compared to the Progressive Alternative) would additional land use balancing and transit investments achieve?
 - How much higher will transit mode share be, especially to and from downtown Los Angeles?
 - How many trips are eliminated?
 - How many additional carpools did we incentivize?
 - What is the reduction in VMT?
 - What is the reduction in congestion?
 - What are the reductions in pollutants and GHG emissions?
 - How does this impact conformity/SB 375
- How do the benefits and costs/fees likely to impact the economy?

Energy Cost Increase Alternative

- Locally supported SED/Land Use
- Funding gap and some preservation shortfall addressed by various sources (e.g., toll revenues on 710 truck lanes, increase in gas tax commensurate with historical trends, other)
- **Fuel costs double by 2035 to \$8 per gallon due to supply/demand imbalances**

What are we looking for from the Energy Cost Increase Alternative?

- What impacts (beyond business as usual) would a further significant spike in energy cost can we expect?
 - How does this impact conformity/SB 375?
 - How much higher will transit mode share be?
 - How many trips are eliminated?
 - What is the reduction in VMT?
 - What is the reduction in congestion?
 - What are the reductions in pollutants and GHG emissions?
- We may consider including a discussion in the RTP/SCS that says how some actions will change if significant energy spikes occur.

Baseline Technical Trend SED

- 2008 RTP local input adjusted to reflect 2012 RTP/SCS regional growth forecast totals for population, households and jobs

Business as Usual Alternative

Locally-Supported SED

- 2012 RTP/SCS local input utilizing updated general plans and existing land use data and consultation with local jurisdictions beginning in May 2009

Progressive Alternative

Locally-Supported SED - Enhanced

- 2012 RTP/SCS local input utilizing updated general plans and existing land use data and consultation with local jurisdictions beginning in May 2009
- Reflects on-going conversations with key jurisdictions with strategic growth opportunity areas (growth centers and transit corridors) to accommodate additional growth (growth recipients)
- Reflects on-going conversations with jurisdictions at the periphery of the region that lack adequate infrastructure and employment to reduce growth (growth donors)
- Reflects strategic intra-jurisdictional redistribution of growth along Transit Priority Project Areas (TPPs) to reflect recent land use trends adjacent to mature transit station areas and well-traveled transit corridors

Environmentally Superior Alternative Envision SED

- Locally-Supported SED - Enhanced
- Reflects additional shifts of households and jobs across jurisdictions to achieve a better jobs/housing balance
- Reflects additional growth in fixed guideway transit oriented development (TOD) districts

Questions?