

---

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

June 8, 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 June 8, 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
Ryan Snyder	Non-Motorized Transportation
Walter Siembab	South Bay Cities COG – Alternate
Nancy Pfeffer	Gateway Cities COG
Terry Roberts	Air Resources Board
William Gayk	Riverside County Planning Department
Lori Abrishami	Los Angeles County Metro
Steve De George	Ventura County Transportation Commission/Ventura COG
Ty Schuiling	San Bernardino Associated Governments
Bill Trimble	San Gabriel Valley COG
Gregory Nord	OCTA
Lisa Webber	North LA County – South
Dave Peterson	North LA County - South – Alternate
Melissa Joshi	Caltrans District 7
Gloria Ohland	Move LA
Danny Wu	South Coast AQMD
Monica N. Soucier	Imperial County APCD – Alternate
Sera Wirth	SCAG Region Local Agency Formation Commissions
Diana Chang	Westside Cities COG
Earl Withycombe	Air Resources Board – Alternate
Maureen El Harake	Caltrans District 12
Carol A. Gomez	South Coast AQMD
Fernando Castro	Caltrans District 7 – Alternate
Richard Kite	North LA County – North
Deborah Diep	OCCOG
Genie McGaugh	Ventura County APCD

---

**Members Excused****Members Not Present**

Aimee Kratovil	Federal Highway Administration – Alternate
Alan Ballard	Ventura County APCD – Alternate
Alan De Salvio	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
Dave Simpson	Orange County COG
David Cordero	SCAG Regional Special Districts
Dianna Watson	Caltrans District 7 – Alternate
Eric Shen	Port of Long Beach
Everett Evans	Caltrans District 12 – Alternate
Franklin Dancy	Morongo Band of Mission Indians
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
Kerry Cartwright	Port of Los Angeles
Kevin Viera	Western Riverside COG
Kim Fuentes	South Bay Cities COG
Larry Stevens	San Gabriel Valley COG – Alternate
Marc Seferian	Las Virgenes/Malibu COG
Marianne Kim	American Automobile Association
Mark Baza	Imperial County Transportation Commission
Mark Herwick	County of Los Angeles
Mark Roberts	Caltrans District 8
Marlon Boarnet	UCI Department of Planning, Policy and Design
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
Michael Hollis	Metropolitan Water District of Southern California
Mike Behen	North LA County - North – Alternate
Rosa Lopez-Solis	Imperial County Transportation Commission - Alternate

Sam Elters	Transportation Corridor Agenices – Alternate
Sarah Jepson	Los Angeles County Metro – Alternate
Shirley Medina	Riverside County Transportation Commission
Stephen Finnegan	American Automobile Association – Alternate
Steve Smith	San Bernardino Associated Governments
Valarie McFall	Transportation Corridor Agenices
Valerie Edwards	Los Angeles Unified School District

## **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**

Chair Larwood stated a letter was received from Jessica Meaney, California Policy Manager, Safe Routes to School. Chair Larwood stated the letter encourages SCAG to insure the 2012 Regional Transportation Plan performance measures and/or indicators include measuring the reduction and/or increase in roadway collision and injuries for our most vulnerable users, those walking and/or bicycling. Additionally, they encourage SCAG to use the Transportation Injury Mapping System (TIMS) and finally, there is a request to meet to discuss these issues.

## **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 May 10, 2011 P&P TAC Meeting**

Nancy Pfeffer, Gateway Cities COG, stated there are three wording corrections in section 5.3 of the minutes. The first is on page 7, the second paragraph which should be amended as follows, “Ms. Pfeffer presented a list of 17 key ‘regional’ transportation projects. The additional amendments should read, “In May 2011, approval to submit the ‘draft’ SCS

---

to SCAG was received from the ‘COG’ Board”. There were no additional comments or corrections to the minutes.

## **5.0 DISCUSSION ITEMS**

### **5.1 Demolition Permit and RHNA Application Replacement Determination**

Frank Wen, SCAG Staff, presented an update on demolition permit and RHNA application replacement determination. Mr. Wen stated as part of the ongoing effort to calculate replacement housing needs for the Regional Housing Needs Assessment, SCAG estimates future replacement need by looking back at the last 10 years of demolition permits for each jurisdiction in the SCAG region. Mr. Wen further stated SCAG staff has compiled 10-year demolition permit data for local jurisdictions. Mr. Wen presented a graph comparing total demolition permits from 2001 to 2011 in Los Angeles County as well as the SCAG region. Additionally, a table was presented listing demolition permit totals for each city and county. Mr. Wen reported there were 44,485 demolition permits issued in the region during this period.

Mr. Wen provided background on the replacement need process and indicated at one time SCAG projections utilized the replacement rates recommended by HCD of 2% per decade, or .02% per year. However, it was learned when this rate was applied to each jurisdiction it resulted in unrealistic estimates for many locations.

Mr. Wen stated, pending further discussion with HCD, SCAG proposes to use 0.7% replacement allowance rate to estimate the replacement housing need for the SCAG region. This is the same rate approved by HCD and used by SANDAG in its RHNA. Additionally, the estimated 44,485 demolitions in the region equate to 0.7% of the total housing stock. Mr. Wen stated there is a meeting scheduled with HCD for June 20, 2011 to discuss this. Mr. Wen stated three issues will be discussed during this consultation; 1) data, 2) methodology to accurately estimate the appropriate replacement housing allowance, 3) income allocation for the replacement housing allowance.

Mr. Wen stated a survey is being sent to each local jurisdiction seeking details about the units demolished in the past 10 years. Information will be sought about the structures demolished as well as any replacements.

---

Additionally, information on zoning changes and the current status of the space will be sought. An attempt will also be made to understand if the result was a net gain in capacity.

Mr. Wen stated the data sought will seek to inform the process about the capacity of the replacement structures as well as the income level of occupants. This will then be incorporated into the historical data and the replacement need estimates will be revised based on the new data and incorporated into the revised RHNA draft. Mr. Wen stated the surveys will be sent within days and data received by July 11, 2011.

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

## 5.2 **RHNA AB 2158 Local Planning Factors Survey Information**

Ma'Ayn Johnson, SCAG Staff, presented an update on AB 2158 Local Planning Factors Survey and its part in the current Regional Housing Needs Assessment. Ms. Johnson stated RHNA methodology requires SCAG survey jurisdictions on a range of 13 factors which could affect a jurisdiction's RHNA allocation. These are the AB 2158 factors. Some of the survey items include existing jobs and housing relationships, lack of capacity for sewer or water service, lands protected by federal and state programs including open space, farmland or environmental habitats, high housing costs burdens and student housing generated by a University.

Ms. Johnson stated similar surveys were sent earlier this year as part of the SCS Workshops. The data received is being reviewed. The results of the survey will shape RHNA methodology. A proposed RHNA methodology hearing is anticipated to take place by October 2011. The final RHNA methodology is anticipated to be adopted by December 2011. Ms. Johnson further stated SCAG staff will be available to meet with local jurisdictions at SCAG satellite offices to provide information on RHNA and field any concerns or question.

Ms. Johnson addressed the committee's questions on the survey and Chair Larwood concluded the item.

---

### 5.3 **Proposed Draft Alternative Scenarios**

Naresh Amatya and Jacob Lieb, SCAG Staff, presented an update on the Proposed Draft Alternative Scenarios. Mr. Amatya began the discussion by stating a handout has been provided to the committee describing three alternatives scenarios for the upcoming 2012 RTP. Mr. Amatya further stated the purpose of today's discussion is to get feedback from the committee. Mr. Amatya stated there will likely be other alternatives developed and it is expected those will take shape as the alternatives development process continues and additional input is incorporated into the process.

Mr. Amatya stated that every alternative will include committed investment strategies such as those committed through Measure R in LA County. Mr. Amatya reviewed the alternatives presented to the committee and stated alternative A relies more heavily on policy-based transportation strategies to achieve the desired outcomes. Alternative A does not suggest any additional major modal transportation system expansion projects but instead relies heavily on system management approach and regional land use that follows emerging local trends. The goals for this alternative include addressing system preservation needs, reducing congestion and improving the environment by including VMT pricing strategy that would not only help manage demand and make more efficient use of our available system but also generate needed revenue.

Some of the specific elements include; 1) Invest in improved maintenance of the current assets thereby halting the downward trend of system conditions. 2) Invest in Transportation Demand Management including traffic signal synchronization networks, advanced ramp metering, enhanced incident management and spot improvements to improve flow. 3) Fully implement real-time passenger information systems and transit signal priority systems. 4) Implement local bicycle plans with additional paths and pedestrian facilities to reduce vehicle demand.

Alternative B employs a combination of policy and infrastructure investments to attain GHG emissions reductions. This would include environmentally-friendly expansion projects and strategies including strategic land use development. Specific elements of this alternative include; 1) Invest in Transportation Demand Management including signal synchronization, HOV lanes, and advanced ramp metering. 2) Increase transit service in productive corridors. 3) Expand the bicycle network. 4)

---

Implement a zero or near-zero east-west freight corridor for good movement.

Alternative C seeks to implement both transportation and land use policies aimed at reducing single-occupant vehicle demand. The supportive land use pattern would build off emerging local trends and seeks to maximize employment and housing growth within TPP areas. It also seeks to improve the local jobs/housing balance by promoting economic development located in closer proximity to higher intensity housing opportunities.

Specific elements of Alternative C include; 1) Transportation Demand Management, 2) System preservation. 3) Significantly expand transit in key corridors to meet new demand, 4) Goods movement delivered by a zero or near-zero emission east-west freight corridor, 5) Expand non-motorized transportation including bicycle networks, and, 6) Create a regional hot lane network.

Jacob Lieb continued the discussion. Mr. Lieb stated current alternatives can be viewed as a work in progress. It is anticipated there will be additional dialogue as a result of the upcoming regional workshops in July/August 2011. Mr. Lieb further stated a capable team of consultants and experts have been assembled to assist the process. Additionally, local input and input from key stakeholders will be incorporated as the process moves forward. Mr. Lieb noted one element to be examined is housing typology and housing mix. Mr. Lieb stated, in the past, land use policies have been limited to distribution strategies but future efforts will incorporate other aspects. Mr. Lieb stated one additional element being considered involves location of jobs as it relates to industry type. Additional elements reviewed include transit oriented development which seeks to maximize density.

Chair Larwood led the committee through a discussion of the draft alternative scenario process.

Gail Shiomoto Lohr from the City of Mission Viejo, made a public comment. Ms. Shiomoto Lohr thanked the committee for presenting this agenda item and requested the RTP/SCS PEIR reflect on 2 issues; 1) To quantify the degree of GHG reductions achieved as a result of land use planning. 2) To state the specific benefits achieved as a result of the different transportation and land use scenarios considered. For example, to

---

state the amount of GHG reduction achieved with specific land use changes.

Wally Siembab, South Bay Cities COG, stated it may be useful to reference a recent booklet issued by CARB titled "Powering the Future". The booklet indicates there will be a need in the future for passenger vehicles to transition away from gas powered technology to a better option which is currently electrification. Mr. Siembab stated the proposed alternatives do not encompass the need to encourage private and public investment to transition to fleet electrification as well as land use scenarios that compacts trip origins such as those underway in the South Bay.

Mr. Siembab stated the South Bay has adopted fleet transition as the major part of its mobility strategy. This is complemented by a land use strategy that seeks to compact trip destinations rather than trip origins. It is termed "Neighborhood Oriented Development" and seeks to facilitate private investment to create compact commercial destinations as a strategy to reduce VMT and green-house gas emissions.

Mr. Siembab stated SCAG is currently a lead applicant on a CEC grant to develop a plug-in vehicle readiness plan for the region and asks that the proposed alternatives reflect fleet electrification and Neighborhood Oriented Development.

Miles Mitchell, City of Los Angeles, stated that the proposed draft Alternative Scenarios needed to be described more clearly to assist decision making by subregions. He requested that the alternatives be presented, in addition to narrative form, in matrix and/or pie chart format to show the degree that each Alternative utilized the main SCS strategies (ie land use, TDM, TSM congestion pricing etc.). One objective of this approach, also mentioned by Ty Schuiling, is to identify "themes" for the different Alternatives. He also requested that SCAG provide more detailed information on the impact on specific subregions of each of the proposed alternatives.

Mr. Lieb indicated future alternatives documents would be formatted for easier visual comparison.

---

#### 5.4 **RTP/SCS Performance Measure Subcommittee**

Naresh Amatya, SCAG Staff, presented an update on the RTP/SCS Performance Measure Subcommittee. Mr. Amatya stated the RTP/SCS Performance Measure subcommittee met on May 31, 2011. Mr. Amatya further stated the meeting was led off by Tarek Hatata of System Metrics Group who presented a discussion on key differences in discussion terminology such as outcomes versus measures. Mr. Amatya stated performance measures are the metrics used to evaluate and quantify the impact of different actions. In contrast, outcomes are the desired end result of the various actions taken. Mr. Amatya further stated the goal is to determine what outcomes we should support and then establish performance measures or metrics that best quantify and depict whether or not we are moving towards the desired outcomes.

Mr. Amatya stated comments were received from American Lung Association, Gateway Cities COG, Move LA, Safe Routes to School and others advocating for desired outcomes. Mr. Amatya stated there was also discussion on how to establish performance measures for desired outcomes beyond transportation measures such as health based impacts and land use measures. Mr. Amatya stated there was also discussion about aligning outcomes with specific goals.

Mr. Amatya stated there will be a second meeting of the Performance Measures Subcommittee and it is anticipated a staff recommendation would be discussed at this meeting. Mr. Amatya stated a staff recommendation would then be brought to the P&PTAC. Once the P&PTAC provides input on staff recommendation, it would then be forwarded to the Transportation Committee for their approval.

#### 5.5 **Statewide Transportation System Needs Assessment**

Naresh Amatya, SCAG Staff, provided an update on the Statewide Transportation System Needs Assessment. Mr. Amatya stated the statewide transportation needs assessment is being prepared by the California Transportation Commission in coordination with major MPO's around the state and Caltrans. Mr. Amatya further stated this is sort of like the follow-up to the 1999 Statewide Transportation Needs survey that was taken of the transportation providers around the state. The current Statewide Transportation Needs assessment is primarily based on input provided by the MPOs across the state based on their existing constrained

---

RTP. The primary purpose of this document is to present a unified and consistent message on statewide needs to a wider audience primarily targeting the re-authorization of the next federal transportation bill.

Mr. Amatya stated the study will be presented to the California Transportation Commission at its June 2011 meeting.

5.6 **RTP PEIR Update**

It was determined the written report submitted to the committee on this agenda item is sufficient and no discussion is needed.

6.0 **FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

CEDP Process (Jacob Lieb/Frank Wen)

Modeling for Dummies (Jonathan Nadler/Frank Wen)

Transportation Model Update (Jonathan Nadler)

7.0 **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 3:53 p.m. The next meeting of the Plans & Programs Technical Advisory Committee will be held on Tuesday, July 12, 2011 from 1:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m.

---