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AGENDA

Introductions

Receive and File
1. Meeting Summary 1-15-15 (Attachment)
2. Agenda Outlook for the Development of the 2016 RTP/SCS (Attachment)

Information Items
3. Overview of RTP/SCS Transit Element (Matt Gleason) (Attachment)
4. Overview of RTP/SCS Passenger Rail Element (Stephen Fox) (Attachment)
5. Scenario Matrix (Jason Greenspan) (Attachment Under Separate Cover)
6. Preliminary Technical Information for Environmental Justice Analysis in the 2016 RTP/SCS (Kimberly Clark) (Attachment)
7. 2016 RTP/SCS Program Environmental Impact Report (Lijin Sun) (Attachment)
8. Public Health Framework for 2016-2040 RTP/SCS (Rye Baerg) (No Attachment)
9. 2015 Active Transportation Program (Stephen Patchan) (No Attachment)
10. 2015 Local Profiles Status Update (Ping Chang) (No Attachment)
11. Best Practices Research Project Status Update (Ping Chang) (No Attachment)
Meeting Summary

The following is a summary of discussions at the Technical Working Group meeting of January 15, 2015.

Receive and File

1. Meeting Summary 12-18-14

2. 2016 RTP/SCS Agenda Outlook
   Gail Shiomoto-Lohr noted that TWG members requested a discussion item for the April 2015 TWG meeting on the framework and scenarios resulting from the SB 375 workshops. Ms. Shiomoto-Lohr requested that this discussion item be added to the Agenda Outlook.

Information Items

3. Draft 2016-2040 RTP/SCSDatasets for Two Scenarios 1) Local Input; 2) Updated 2012-35 RTP/SCS; Analysis Relative to HQTA’s, TPA’s, and Local Specific Plans
   Frank Wen, SCAG staff, presented a slide presentation outlining the 2016 RTP/SCS Local Input Socioeconomic Dataset Analysis. Highlights of the presentation included key strategies and major considerations for the development of the SCS.

   Tarek Hatata, Principal, System Metrics Group, and Jonathan Nadler, SCAG staff, provided an overview of the 2016 RTP/SCS framework development. Highlights of the presentation included key strategies, regional challenges, and core components of regional performance. Staff also outlined the 2012 RTP/SCS implementation progress.
Agenda Outlook for the Development of the 2016 RTP/SCS
(Note: Revised to put the outlook in chronological order as suggested at the Sept. 2014 TWG)
(Updated 1/7/15)

June 2013
• Potential approach/process, coordination between various technical working groups and policy committees, and updated overall schedule for the development of the 2016 RTP/SCS

January 2014
• System Preservation and system operation focus in the 2012 RTP/SCS and our current efforts on Pavement and Bridge condition database/management

February 2014
• System Performance Measures and MAP-21 requirements under Performance Based Planning and implications of MAP-21
• Local Input Process for Growth Forecast/Land Use (Scenario Planning) for 2016 RTP/SCS, including growth forecast and technology

March 2014
• Performance Based Planning and implications of MAP-21: Safety Performance Measures
• Overview of baseline and innovative funding sources adopted in the 2012 RTP/SCS including underlying technical assumptions/methodology/analysis under Transportation Finance
• Overview of cost assumptions/cost modal for the 2012 RTP/SCS under Transportation Finance
• Model and Tools and Datasets to be used in the 2016 RTP/SCS
• Overview of Aviation program in the 2012 RTP/SCS with a focus on ground transportation improvements

May 2014
• OCTA Draft Long Range Plan Update
• System Preservation Update
• Draft Paper on TOD benefits, challenges and best practices
• Active Transportation Program Update
• Local Input Survey Update
• MAP-21 Safety NPRM Update
• CalEnviro Screen Tool

June 2014
• SCAG Active Transportation Results from the 2011 Household Travel Survey
• 2016 RTP/SCS Modeling variables matrix
• Statewide and MPO Planning Rules NPRM Update
• California Active Transportation Program Update

July 2014
• 2016 RTP/SCS Modeling Variables Matrix
September 2014
• 2016 RTP/SCS Development Agenda Outlook
• Status of Local Input for the 2016 RTP/SCS; Growth Forecast Update
• Modeling Update
• CAL LOTS Update

October 2014
• Overview of SCS in the 2012 RTP/SCS
• Current status of SCS implementation (Local Implementation survey)
• Environmental Justice (First EJ Workshop will be held on 10/23)
• Map Collaborator Database (A web based tool to collect data and develop open space plan.)

November 2014
• Discussion on existing and proposed Performance Measures
• Role of Technology in the 2016 RTP/SCS
• Development of alternative scenarios (Scenario Planning) for 2016 RTP/SCS, including growth forecast, technology
• Emerging issues/themes that could influence 2016 SCS
  • Zero/Near Zero/Clean Technology Applications, including Slow Speed/ Electric Vehicle programs (Nov. 2014)
  • Emerging New Technology Applications

December 2014
• Technical assumptions/methodology/data/analysis in the 2012 RTP/SCS
• Potential changes in the 2016 RTP/SCS to technical assumptions/methodology/data/analysis
• Updated forecast/land use distribution for 2016 RTP/SCS
• Overview of Active Transportation Strategy in the 2012 RTP/SCS
• Progress update on Active Transportation Strategy and emerging issues and their implications to the 2016 RTP/SCS
• Zero/Near Zero/Clean Technology Applications, including Slow Speed/ Electric Vehicle programs (Nov. 2014)
• Update on 2016 RTP/SCS Schedule
• Update on research and analysis for RTP/SCS strategies

January 2015
• Asset Management and Infrastructure Performance Measures
• Overview of Goods Movement (GM) Strategy in the 2012 RTP/SCS with a focus on technical assumptions (including technology assumptions)/data/analysis
• Progress update on the GM Strategy with focus on emerging issues and implications on the 2016 RTP/SCS
• Technical assumptions/methodology/data/analysis in the 2012 RTP/SCS
• Potential changes in the 2016 RTP/SCS to technical assumptions/methodology/data/analysis
• Updated forecast/land use distribution for 2016 RTP/SCS
- Updated SCS for 2016 RTP/SCS
- Overview of Active Transportation Strategy in the 2012 RTP/SCS
- Progress update on Active Transportation Strategy and emerging issues and their implications to the 2016 RTP/SCS
  - Draft 2016-2040 RTP/SCS Datasets for two Scenarios 1) Local Input 2) Updated 2012-35 RTP/SCS and analysis relative to HQTAs, TPAs and Local Specific Plans
  - Preview of the Progress Report/General Framework presentation for the 2016 RTP/SCS to be given at the February 5 Joint Regional Council/Policy Committee Meeting

February 2015
- Program EIR
- Public Participation Plan
- Overview of Transit Strategy in the 2012 RTP/SCS
- Progress update on the Transit Strategy and emerging issues/challenges that could influence the 2016 RTP/SCS

March 2015
- Overview of Highway/HOV/HOT/Toll Roads/Express Lanes proposed in the 2012 RTP/SCS with a focus on technical assumptions/analysis
- Progress update and emerging issues related to highways/HOV/HOT/Toll Roads/Express Lanes
- Asset Management and Infrastructure Performance Measures
- Overview of Goods Movement (GM) Strategy in the 2012 RTP/SCS with a focus on technical assumptions (including technology assumptions)/data/analysis
- Progress update on the GM Strategy with focus on emerging issues and implications on the 2016 RTP/SCS

May 2015
- Progress update on the current status of the Aviation component of the 2012 RTP/SCS and emerging issues that may influence the 2016 RTP/SCS
- Overview of TDM/TSM in the 2012 RTP/SCS, including underlying assumptions
- Progress status of TDM/TSM and emerging issues

June 2015
- Progress update on 2012 RTP/SCS revenue/cost
- Potential changes/focus areas and emerging issues in the 2016 RTP/SCS

July 2015
- Transportation Conformity

August 2015
- Finance Plan for 2016 RTP/SCS
Updated GM Strategy for the 2016 RTP/SCS
Updated Transit Strategy for the 2016 RTP/SCS
Updated Active Transportation Strategy for the 2016 RTP/SCS
Highways Improvement Element in the 2016 RTP/SCS
Updated Aviation Element of the 2016 RTP/SCS
Updated TDM/TSM Element for the 2016 RTP/SCS

Note: The Agenda Outlook is intended as a reference for TWG and is subject to change as needed and appropriate as things progress.

Legend:

Light Grey Font: Items already presented

Regular Grey Font: Future Agenda Items

Bold Face Fonts: New or revised Agenda Items
Item 3 Attachment:

Overview of RTP/SCS Transit Element
Overview of the RTP/SCS
Transit Element

Technical Working Group
Southern California Association of Governments

February 19, 2015
Matt Gleason
Presentation Overview

Review of SCAG Region Transit System

Review of Adopted 2012 RTP/SCS Transit Element

2012 RTP/SCS Implementation Progress

Transit Emerging Issues for 2016 RTP/SCS Update
Transit in the SCAG Region
Fiscal Year 2011-12 Performance Data

- The SCAG Region is primarily a bus transit region
  - 82% of all trips in FY11-12
  - 3/4 of all transit service in FY11-12
  - Over 9,000 route miles, 68 fixed route providers

- Total Revenue Service Hours: 19.1 Million
- Total Vehicle Revenue Miles: 293 Million
- Total Passenger Trips: 710.1 Million
- Per Capita Transit Trips: 38.95
- Total Passenger Miles: 3.6 Billion
- Per Capita Passenger Miles: 206.39
Transit Service in the SCAG Region
Fiscal Year 2011-12 Provision Data

Share of Total Vehicle Revenue Hours by Mode, 2012

Bus 75%
Demand Response 19%

Rail Modes
Commuter 2%
Heavy 1%
Light 3%
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Investment (in Billions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>$86.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>$17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region-wide SOGR</td>
<td>$15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metrolink</td>
<td>$8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>$5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Bernardino</td>
<td>$5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ventura</td>
<td>$1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial</td>
<td>$.005*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*FTIP Total
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Total Investment in Nominal Billions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bus Rapid Transit</td>
<td>$4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>$20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commuter Rail</td>
<td>$3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Rail</td>
<td>$13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy Rail</td>
<td>$11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Speed Rail</td>
<td>$47.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 2012 RTP/SCS Major Transit Capital Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Project Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exposition Transit Corridor-Phase 2 to Santa Monica</td>
<td>South Bay Green Line Extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Connector Transit Corridor</td>
<td>Santa Ana/Garden Grove Fixed Guideway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crenshaw/LAX Transit Corridor</td>
<td>San Fernando Valley (East) North/South Transitways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastside Transit Corridor-Phase 2</td>
<td>Orange Line Canoga Extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold Line Extension to Glendora (2a)</td>
<td>West Santa Ana Branch Corridor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Line LAX Extension</td>
<td>Westside Subway Extension (to Westwood)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redlands Passenger Rail Project</td>
<td>Omnitrans E Street BRT (sbX)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCTA Bravo BRT Program</td>
<td>Perris Valley Line, OCTA MSEP, ARTIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed Guideway Gap Closures</td>
<td>Anaheim Rapid Connection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sepulveda Pass Transit Corridor (funded outside the planning horizon of the 2012 RTP)
2012 RTP/SCS
Operational Strategies

- Implement Regional and Inter-County Fare Agreements and Media.
- Implement new BRT and limited-stop bus service.
- Implement increased frequencies in targeted corridors.
- Implement and Expand Transit Priority Systems. Transit priority systems include traffic signal priority, queue jumpers and bus lanes.
2012 RTP/SCS
Access Strategies

- Expanding and improving real-time passenger information systems.
- Implementing new point-to-point express bus service in key corridors in the region’s HOV and HOT lane network.
- Increasing bicycle carrying capacity on bus and rail vehicles.
- First Mile/Last Mile strategies
- Expansion of Local Circulators.
## Plan Performance: Access

Total Tier 2 Travel Analysis Zones (TAZ) Served by Transit in 2035

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Tier 2 TAZs with more than 150 Residents or 50 Jobs per acre</th>
<th>Tier 2 TAZs with more than 50 Residents or Jobs per acre</th>
<th>Tier 2 TAZs with more than 30 Residents or Jobs per acre</th>
<th>Tier 2 TAZs with more than 15 Residents or Jobs per acre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total 2035 Transit Network</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>99.60%</td>
<td>99.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premium Transit Services</td>
<td>88.83%</td>
<td>77.63%</td>
<td>67.30%</td>
<td>53.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapid Transit Services</td>
<td>63.69%</td>
<td>77.63%</td>
<td>41.52%</td>
<td>29.86%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Plan Performance:
### Annual Passenger Trips in Millions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2035 Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Metro Rail</strong></td>
<td>87</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commuter Rail</strong></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bus</strong></td>
<td>622</td>
<td>806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>722</td>
<td>981</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Plan Performance:
### Annual Passenger Miles in Millions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2035 Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Metro Rail</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>1,428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commuter Rail</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>2,462</td>
<td>3,256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>3,423</td>
<td>5,556</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Plan Performance:
### Per Capita Annual Transit Ridership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2035 Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Metro Rail</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>8.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commuter Rail</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>36.98</td>
<td>47.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>42.89</strong></td>
<td><strong>58.30</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Transit Trip Mode Shares
2008 and 2035

Bus declines from 86% to 82% of all Passenger Trips
Passenger Miles Mode Shares
2008 and 2035

- Bus declines from 72% to 59% of all Passenger Miles
- Average trip length steady for bus and commuter rail
- 59% increase for Metro Rail
2012 RTP/SCS Implementation
Projects Started or Completed Since 2008

Projects Completed
- The Yucaipa Transit Center (Omnitrans) 2010
- Metro Orange Line Extension 2012
- Metro Expo Line 2012
- The Brawley Transit Center (ICTC) 2013
- Fullerton Metrolink parking structure station (OCTA) 2013
- Omnitrans SBX 2014
- ARTIC 2014
- Perris Valley Line (RCTC) 2015
- SunLine Transit Administrative Facility 2015

Projects Initiated
- Crenshaw LAX Corridor 2019
- Regional Connector 2020
- San Bernardino Transit Center 2015
- Foothill Gold Line 2a 2016
- Metro Expo Line Phase 2 2016
- Placentia Metrolink Station (OCTA) 2017
- OC Bridges Grade Separations (OCTA) 2018
- San Bernardino Metrolink Station (SANBAG) 2016

Services Initiated
- Metro Silver Line
- Imperial Valley Transit Gold Line
- OCTA Metrolink Service Expansion Project
- Metro Valley Westside Express
- Gold Coast Transit District
- Heritage Valley Service
- Anaheim Service Expansion
- VVTA Barstow Service
2012 RTP/SCS Implementation – Annual Ridership
NTD Annual and Monthly Reporting
2012 RTP/SCS Implementation – Per Capita Ridership
NTD Annual and Monthly Reporting
2016 RTP/SCS Emerging Issues

- Technology
- First Mile/ Last Mile Connectivity
- Emergency Preparedness
- Poverty
- Stagnating per capita demand
Questions?
For more information, please contact:

Matt Gleason – gleason@scag.ca.gov
(213)-236-1832

www.scag.ca.gov/transit/
Item 4 Attachment:

Overview of RTP/SCS Passenger Rail Element
Overview of RTP/SCS
Passenger Rail Element

Technical Working Group

February 19, 2015
Presentation Overview

- Review of Adopted 2012 RTP/SCS Passenger Rail Element
- 2012 RTP/SCS Implementation Progress
- Passenger Rail Vision for 2016 RTP/SCS Update
High-Speed Rail Subcommittee formed to make informed project inclusion decisions for Constrained and Strategic Plans

Due to large number of projects in planning phase - some competing

Nine criteria developed for decision-making process

Robust discussions, stakeholder lobbying, reversals of decisions
Proposed High-Speed Rail in SCAG Region
2012 RTP/SCS
Constrained Plan Projects

- CA High-Speed Train Phase 1
  - Burbank Airport 2022
  - L.A. Union Station 2029 and Anaheim TBD
- Pacific Surfliner – LOSSAN Corridor
  - Speed and service improvements
- Metrolink System
  - Speed and service improvements
- Southern California MOU provides $1 billion in HST funding for Pacific Surfliner and Metrolink improvements
2012 RTP/SCS
Metrolink and Urban Rail
2012 RTP/SCS
Strategies and Recommendations

- Capital projects: double tracking, sidings, and grade seps for more and faster service and safety
- Upgrade segments to 110 mph, more express trips, and Metrolink to San Diego and Coaster to L.A.
- Transition LOSSAN to local control
- Fare cooperative agreements - e.g., fix Rail2Rail; Pacific Surfliner to Santa Barbara MTD
- Joint-Operator timetables
2012 RTP/SCS Strategic Plan Projects

- CA HST Phase 2
- XpressWest (DesertXpress)
- California/Nevada Super-Speed Train
- California/Nevada Super-Speed Train Anaheim to Ontario Initial Operating Segment
- Orangeline Northern Segment
2012 RTP/SCS
Implementation and Progress to Date

- Local control of LOSSAN JPA completed
- Incremental capital improvement progress on LOSSAN and Metrolink corridors
- LOSSAN Corridor joint timetable
- Metrolink Perris Valley Line and downtown San Bernardino Station
- Coachella Valley Service Development Plan
- CA HST construction underway in Central Valley
- CA HST receives dedicated, yearly Cap and Trade funding – speeding implementation to SoCal
- CA HST progress on Southern California segments
State of Existing Passenger Rail - 2014

- Pacific Surfliner ridership up 71% from 2000 to 2014; however down 5.4% since FFY 08 due to recession
- OTP for FFY 2014 low at 78% - needs improvement
- Farebox Recovery FFY 2012 57.6%
- Metrolink 42,400 daily boardings in FY 2014
- FY 2014 down 2.0% from FY 2008 due to recession
- Farebox recovery at 44% in FY 2014
- Up from 37% in FY 2002
- Cost per pax mile 20% lower than peer median
2016 Passenger Rail Recommendations and Themes (Vision)

- Metrolink and Amtrak average speed just 40 mph and 46 mph respectively
- Great potential to increase ridership with added service, increased speeds, improved OTP and restructured fares
- Construct Southern California MOU, Metrolink Strategic Assessment and LOSSAN Strategic Implementation Plan projects
- Implement Metrolink and Amtrak express trips
- Metrolink to San Diego and Coaster to L.A.
2016 Passenger Rail Recommendations and Themes (Vision)

- Improve rail/airport connectivity
- Implement BRT network connecting to rail network
- Greater TOD around rail stations
- Implementation of first mile/last mile policies and facilities around rail stations
- Establish Coachella Valley rail service
- Establish High-Desert Corridor rail service
2016 Passenger Rail Recommendations and Themes (Vision)

- Secure increased and dedicated funding streams for capital projects: double tracking, sidings, and grade separations for more and faster service and safety.
- Bring CA High-Speed Train to Southern California and accelerate blended service.
- Implement fare cooperative agreements - e.g., fix Rail2Rail; Pacific Surfliner to Santa Barbara MTD.
Thank You

Steve Fox, Senior Regional Planner
fox@scag.ca.gov
Item 5 Attachment:

Scenario Matrix
Draft Scenario Planning Matrix

To help facilitate policy discussions during the development of the draft Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy, SCAG will develop one baseline and three additional scenarios to evaluate how each performs in terms of sustainability, mobility and other performance metrics. In response to stakeholder input, scenarios A and B include expanded policy concepts to target health, social equity and reflect advancements in technology.

### Policy Drivers/Performance Metrics

- **Sustainability**
- **Mobility**
- **Accessibility**
- **Public Health**
- **Economy**
- **Environmental Justice**
- **Social Equity**
- **Climate Resilience & Adaptation**

### Policy Inputs

#### Plan Elements - Data Input Categories

- **Land Use Socio-Economic Data (SED) & Housing**
- **Farm & Natural Lands Conservation**
- **Highway/Roadway Network**
- **Transit/High-Speed Rail**
- **Active Transportation**
- **Technology/Innovation**
- **Finance Pricing/Incentives**
- **Transportation Demand Management (TDM) & Transportation System Management (TSM)**

### Performance Metrics

#### 1. No Build/Baseline

- No build network and trend SED
- **Baseline**

#### 2. Updated 2012 Plan/Local Input

- Updated growth forecast
- **Local input**
- **Baseline**

#### 3. Policy A

- Update 2012 Policies for Active Transportation, public health, Environmental Justice (EJ), technology, millennials. Balance GHG, air, livability benefits with transportation capacity efficiency.
- **Scenario 2 +** 2012 land use (LU) policy updated.
  - Emphasize multi-family (based on market research).
  - Target 60/40 Multi-Family (MF)/Single-Family (SF) housing type. Focus on rail corridors and key HGTA's.

#### 4. Policy B

- "Push the envelope." Comprehensive "short trip" strategy. Maximize GHG, air quality, livability, public health, EJ, affordability benefits. Assume profound technology effects.
- **Scenario 3 +** Target 70/30 MF/SF housing type.

### Scenario Details

- **Scenario 2 +**
  - 25% increase in system preservation
  - 25% increase in system preservation
  - 2012 plan amendment 2 +
  - New CTC input for 2016 plan

- **Scenario 3 +**
  - Strategic plan projects
  - Strategic plan projects
  - Strategic plan projects
  - Strategic plan projects

- **Scenario 4 +**
  - Assume additional (modest) benefits - e.g. 1-2% reduction home-based work (HBW) trips; 5% speed, capacity increase
  - Assume additional (modest) benefits - e.g. 1-2% reduction HBW trips; 5% speed, capacity increase
  - Assume additional (modest) benefits - e.g. 1-2% reduction HBW trips; 5% speed, capacity increase
  - Assume additional (modest) benefits - e.g. 1-2% reduction HBW trips; 5% speed, capacity increase

---

**Legend:**

- RTP: Regional Transportation Plan
- SCS: Sustainable Communities Strategy
- CTC: County Transportation Commission
- LU: Land Use
- MGTA: Metropolitan Planning Area
- HQTAs: High-priority Transportation Areas
- CHAP: Combined Habitat Assessment Protocols
- VMT: Vehicle Miles Traveled
- HBW: Home-Based Work
- NEV: Neighborhood Electric Vehicle
- TSM: Transportation System Management
Item 6 Attachment:

Preliminary Technical Information for Environmental Justice
Introduction to SCAG’s Upcoming Environmental Justice Analysis for the 2016-2040 Regional Transportation Plan and Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS)

Overview

- Background on Environmental Justice
- Technical Analysis Introduction
  – Regional and Localized Analysis
- Next Steps
Background on Environmental Justice

**Fundamental Principles:**

- 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.
- To ensure the full and fair participation by all potentially affected communities in the transportation decision-making process.
- To prevent the denial of, reduction in, or significant delay in the receipt of benefits by minority and low-income populations.

- U.S. Department of Transportation, An Overview of Transportation and Environmental Justice

**Guiding Documents:**

- Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964
- Executive Order 12898 (1994)
- US Department of Transportation Order (1997)
  - Federal Highway Administration Order (1998)
  - Memorandum: Implementing Title VI Requirements in Metropolitan and Statewide Planning (1999)
  - FTA Circular 4703.1 on Environmental Justice (2012)
- SCAG’s Environmental Justice Compliance Procedures (2000)
- SCAG’s Public Participation Plan (2014)
Background on Environmental Justice

SCAG’s Environmental Justice Policy:

- Committed to being a leader in our analysis of the environmental, health, social, and economic impacts of our programs on minority and low-income populations in the SCAG region.
- Provides early and meaningful public access to decision making processes for all interested parties, including minority and low-income populations.
- Seeks out and considers the input of traditionally underrepresented groups, such as minority and low-income populations, in the regional transportation planning process.
- When disproportionately high and adverse impacts on minority or low-income populations are identified, SCAG takes steps to propose mitigation measures or consider alternative approaches for the SCAG region.
- Continues to evaluate and respond to environmental justice issues that arise during and after the implementation of SCAG’s regional plans.

Assessment Process

Federal Guidance for Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs)

- Analysis is Plan Specific - MPOs must conduct an evaluation of system-level environmental justice impacts from a collection of projects in long-range plans.
- Environmental justice should also be considered when long-range plans are moved into the short-range Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) or State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP).

Sources: National Transit Institute, Federal Transit Administration.
**Background on Environmental Justice**

**Determination of Disproportionate Impacts:**
- Will low income and racial/ethnic minority groups bear “disproportionately high and adverse effects” from a project?
  - Depends on effects being:
    - Predominately borne by an EJ population group
    - Appreciably more severe than suffered by the non-EJ population
  - Questions to Consider:
    - Will the adverse effects on EJ populations exceed those borne by non-EJ populations?
    - Will cumulative or indirect effects adversely affect an EJ population?
    - Will mitigation and enhancement measures be taken for EJ and non-EJ populations?
    - Are there off-setting benefits to EJ populations as compared to non-EJ populations?

**Mitigation Strategies:**
- Identify avoidance, minimization, and mitigation measures
- Remedies should not impact existing services in a way that creates new EJ issues
  - New EJ issues caused by remedies should also be addressed and evaluated for potential EJ impacts
- Can enhancements be provided for the community in lieu of mitigation

Sources: National Transit Institute, Federal Transit Administration
Identifying EJ Population Groups

Minority:
- A person who is African American, Hispanic or Latino, Asian American, American Indian, Alaskan Native, Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander

Low-Income:
- A person whose median income is at or below the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) poverty guidelines

Other Groups:
- SB 535 Disadvantaged Areas
- Non-English Speakers
- Households without Vehicles
- Disabled/Mobility Limited Population
- Households Lacking Basic Housing Infrastructure (e.g. lacking kitchens or telephone)
- Individuals Without a High School Diploma
- Foreign Born Population
- Young Children Ages 5 and Under
- Population Ages 65 and Above
Regional and Localized Analysis

Regional Analysis:
- Appropriate when determining system-wide impacts (e.g. Financial Benefits and Burdens)

Local Analysis:
- Appropriate for determining adverse impacts at smaller geographic areas, or the community level (emissions, noise, etc.)

Regional Analysis Example
Benefits and Burdens

Share of Retail & Gasoline Taxes Paid & RTP Investments by Ethnicity (2012-2035 RTP/SCS)
- Share of investments outpace retail & gasoline taxes paid for Hispanic and Non-Hispanic Black populations

- Hispanic
- Non-Hispanic White
- Non-Hispanic Black
- Non-Hispanic Asian
- Non-Hispanic Other

0% 5% 10% 15% 20% 25% 30% 35% 40% 45%

Share of Retail & Gasoline Taxes Paid
Share of Transportation Investments
Localized Analysis Example

- Minority and low-income population is **concentrated** if the percentage of minority and low-income population of the affected area is “meaningfully greater” than the percentage of minority and low-income population in the general population.

Neighborhoods in Close Proximity to Highways/Railways

- Guidance and recommendations from various organizations
- 500 ft
- 1,000 ft
- Analysis for the upcoming plan will build on the 2012 RTP/SCS
Gentrification/Displacement Analysis

- Population changes in areas close to rail transit stations
  - ¼ Mile
  - ½ Mile
  - 1 Mile
- Analysis for the upcoming plan will build on the 2012 RTP/SCS

Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) Example

- Communities of Concern
- Overlapping Variables
- Localized Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disadvantaged Factor</th>
<th>% of Regional Population</th>
<th>Concentration Threshold</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Minority Population</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Low Income (&lt;200% of Poverty) Population</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Limited English Proficiency Population</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Zero Vehicle Households</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Seniors Aged 75 and Over</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Population with a Disability</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Single-Parent Families</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Rent-Burdened Households</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2005-09 American Community Survey and 2010 Census (4%)

Existing Regional Emissions

Average Daily Ozone Exposure in Excess of the National 8 Hour Standard (0.075 ppm) (2004-06 & 2007-09)

- Minority areas experience a higher ozone exposure than is seen in the region as a whole
- Areas with large numbers of individuals in poverty tend to have ozone exposure similar to the larger region
Existing Regional Emissions

Average Annual Concentration of PM 2.5 Exposure (ug/m3) (2004-06 & 2007-09)

- Minority areas experience a higher exposure from PM 2.5 than is seen in the region as a whole.
- Areas with large numbers of individuals in poverty tend to have PM 2.5 exposure higher than the larger region.

Next Steps

- Performance Indicators (2012 – 2035 RTP/SCS)
  1. RTP Revenue Sources/Tax Burdens
  2. Share of Transportation System Usage
  3. RTP Project Investment Share by Income and Ethnicity
  4. Impacts from Funding Through VMT Fees (NEW in 2012)
  5. Distribution of Travel Time Savings and Travel Distance Savings
  6. Jobs-Housing Imbalance or Jobs-Housing Mismatch (NEW in 2012)
  7. Accessibility to Work/Shopping Opportunities
  8. Accessibility to Parks (NEW in 2008)
  9. Gentrification and Displacement (NEW in 2012)
  11. Rail-Related Impacts (NEW in 2012)
• For the upcoming Plan, staff anticipate conducting more detailed analysis on a number of topics:
  • Active Transportation Safety
  • Gentrification and Affordable Housing
  • Accessibility to Parks and Shopping Facilities
  • Public Health
  • **Consideration of additional areas and topics is ongoing**

---

**Next Steps**

- SCAG has sought participation in this process from a number of stakeholder groups:
  - Social Justice Advocacy Groups
  - Active Transportation Advocates
  - Public Health Groups
  - Environmental Organizations
  - Housing Advocates
  - Partner Agencies (Local Jurisdictions, Subregional Organizations, ARB, SCAQMD, HCD, etc.)
Outreach for the 2012-2035 RTP/SCS Bottom-Up Development Process

- Cities met with to update and develop land use and SED forecasts: 178
- Data gathering sessions & planning workshops in 2011: 29
- Regional Council and Joint Policy Committee Meetings in 2011: 6
- Environmental Justice Stakeholder Workshops in 2010 and 2011: 2
- Policy Committee and Subcommittee Meetings in 2011, including CEHD, EEC, TC, RTP Subcommittee, High-Speed Rail Subcommittee: 30
- Technical Committee Meetings in 2011, including Aviation TAC, P&P TAC, Transit TAC, Subregional Coordinators, Transportation Conformity Working Group: 40

Next Steps

Questions?

EnvironmentalJustice@scag.ca.gov

Thanks!
Item 7 Attachment:

2016 RTP/SCS Program Environmental Impact Report
PROGRAM
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT (PEI R)

Technical Working Group
February 19, 2015

Lijin Sun, Senior Regional Planner
(213) 236-1882
sunl@scag.ca.gov
SCAG is a lead agency that has the principal responsibility for carrying out or approving the RTP/SCS (CEQA Guidelines Section 15367).

SCAG is responsible for preparing a PEIR for the RTP/SCS, in accordance with the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

It is SCAG’s goal and intent to ensure that the PEIR is a complete, legally defensible document that fulfills SCAG’s responsibility as lead agency for the 2016 RTP/SCS.
**PROGRAM ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT (PEIR)**

- PEIR provides a region-wide assessment of any potential effects of implementing projects, programs, and policies included in the RTP/SCS at a programmatic level.

- PEIR is a first-tier environmental analysis that could help local lead agency or project proponent evaluate and reduce environmental impacts of local projects.

- PEIR includes program-level mitigation measures.

- PEIR includes a range of reasonable alternatives to the RTP/SCS that would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives.
PROGRAM
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT (PEIR)

- Considerations for 2016 RTP/SCS PEIR
  - Court ruling on the SANDAG's 2011 RTP/SCS PEIR
    - GHG emissions impact analysis
    - Mitigation measures of GHG emissions
    - Project alternatives
    - Air quality impact analysis
    - Agricultural impact analysis

- CEQA legislation passed since certification of 2012 RTP/SCS PEIR
  - SB 743 and AB 52 (Tribal Resources/Consultation and CEQA, effective July 1, 2015)
PROGRAM
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT (PEIR)

- Public Health
  - Expand 2012 RTP/SCS PEIR Health Risk Assessment
  - Analyze PEIR topic areas from a public health lens, where applicable

- Active Transportation
  - Considers RTP/SCS (Plan) benefits in PEIR topic areas, where applicable

- Mitigation Measures
  - Mitigate, to the extent feasible, potential environmental impacts of the 2016 RTP/SCS
  - Lessons learned from the SANDAG appellate court decision
  - Consider strategies inherent in the Plan (2016 RTP/SCS)

- Alternatives
  - Synergy between 2016 Plan scenarios development with PEIR alternatives
PROGRAM
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT (PEIR)

- Notice of Preparation (NOP)
  - Prepared in accordance with the CEQA Guidelines Sections 15060(d), 15063(b)(1)(A), and 15082
  - An initial study is not required if a PEIR will be prepared

- Information Contained in NOP
  - A PEIR will be prepared for the 2016 RTP/SCS
  - NOP uses the certified 2012 RTP/SCS PEIR as the basis for determining the potential scope of environmental effects
  - NOP contains sufficient information to obtain input for preparing PEIR
Key Dates for the 2016 RTP/SCS PEIR Development

- Release NOP for public review – March 2015
- Release Draft PEIR for public review – October 2015
- Release Final PEIR for adoption and certification – April 2016
Thank You
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