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## 2016 RTP/SCS Adopted Goals (Looking back)

### a2016) Align plan investments and policies with improving regional economic development and competitiveness.

### b2016) Maximize mobility and accessibility for all people and goods in the region.

### c2016) Ensure travel safety and reliability for all people and goods in the region.

### d2016) Preserve and ensure a sustainable regional transportation system.

### e2016) Maximize the security of the regional transportation system through improved system monitoring, rapid recovery planning, and coordination with other security agencies.

### f2016) Maximize the productivity of our transportation system.

### g2016) Protect the environment and health of our residents by improving air quality and encouraging active transportation (e.g., bicycling and walking).

### h2016) Actively encourage and create incentives for energy efficiency, where possible.

### i2016) Encourage land use and growth patterns that facilitate transit and active transportation.

### j2016) Encourage conservation of natural and agricultural lands and restoration of critical habitats.

---

## 2020 RTP/SCS Draft Goals (Current Discussion)

### a2020) Encourage regional economic prosperity and global competitiveness.

### b2020) Improve mobility, accessibility, reliability, and travel safety for people and goods.

### c2020) Enhance the preservation, security, and resilience of the regional transportation system.

### d2020) Increase person and goods throughput and travel choices within the transportation system.

### e2020) Reduce greenhouse gas emissions and improve air quality.

### f2020) Create support healthy and equitable communities.

### g2020) Adapt to a changing climate by integrating a sustainable and support an integrated regional development pattern and transportation network.

### h2020) Leverage new transportation technologies and data-driven solutions that result in more efficient travel.

### i2020) Preserve existing housing while encouraging development of diverse housing types in areas well supported by multiple transportation options.

### j2020) Promote conservation of natural and agricultural lands and restoration of critical habitats.

---

## Rationale for Updates

Streamlining language.

Streamlining and consolidation of goals.

Streamlining and consolidation of goals. Incorporation of Resilience and related language (per the FAST Act - Improve the Resiliency and reliability of the transportation system...) and SCAG's Strategic Plan goal (Create plans that enhance the region's strength, economy, resilience, and adaptability by reducing greenhouse gas emissions and air pollution).

No Equivalent

Recognize that the RTP/SCS does not have explicit policies, strategies, or projects relating to energy efficiency.

---

## Examples of 2016 RTP/SCS Corresponding Performance Measures (Looking ahead)

1. New jobs supported by improved economic competitiveness
2. Rate of Fatalities per 100M Vehicle Miles Traveled
3. % of interstate system with reliable person-mile travel times
4. % of National Highway System pavement in ‘Good’ condition
5. % of National Highway System bridges in ‘Good’ condition
6. Mode share for work trips
7. Criteria air pollutant emissions
8. Greenhouse gas emissions (per capita)
9. Share of population growth in High Quality Transit Areas
10. Mean commute time
11. Home and rent affordability index
12. Acres of land developed
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>(Looking back)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Current Discussion</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A2016)</strong> Transportation investments shall be based on SCAG’s adopted regional Performance Indicators.</td>
<td><strong>A2020)</strong> Transportation investments shall be based on adopted regional performance indicators and MAP-21/FAST Act regional targets.</td>
<td>A key feature of MAP-21 is the establishment of a performance- and outcome-based program. State DOTs and MPOs are now required to set performance targets (e.g., safety targets, NHS bridges and pavements, etc.).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B2016)</strong> Ensuring safety, adequate maintenance and efficiency of operations on the existing multimodal transportation system should be the highest RTP/SCS priorities for any incremental funding in the region.</td>
<td><strong>B2020)</strong> The highest priorities Place high priority for transportation funding in the region on projects and programs that improve should be to ensure mobility, accessibility, reliability, and safety, and that preserve preservation of the existing transportation system.</td>
<td>Updated to align with revised goal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C2016)</strong> RTP/SCS land use and growth strategies in the RTP/SCS will respect local input and advance smart growth initiatives.</td>
<td><strong>C2020)</strong> Land use and growth strategies will respect local input, acknowledge existing disparities, promote sustainable transportation options, and support equitable and adaptable communities.</td>
<td>Updated to align with revised goals. Goals are updated to align with SCAG’s Strategic Plan goal (Create plans that enhance the region’s strength, economy, resilience, and adaptability by reducing greenhouse gas emissions and air pollution) and California’s equity goal included in the California Transportation Plan 2040 (Foster livable and healthy communities and promote social equity, and Integrate health and social equity in transportation planning and decision making).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D2016)</strong> Transportation demand management (TDM) and active transportation will be focus areas, subject to Policy 1.</td>
<td><strong>Not carried over. Addressed in other guiding policies (expanding travel choices).</strong></td>
<td>Moving away from mode specific guiding policies, now addressed more broadly in other guiding policy (D2020).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E2016)</strong> HOV gap closures that significantly increase transit and rideshare usage will be supported and encouraged, subject to Policy 1.</td>
<td><strong>Not carried over. Addressed in other guiding policies (expanding travel choices).</strong></td>
<td>Moving away from mode specific guiding policies, now addressed more broadly in other guiding policy (D2020).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F2016)</strong> The RTP/SCS will support investments and strategies to reduce non-recurrent congestion and demand for single occupancy vehicle use, by leveraging advanced technologies.</td>
<td><strong>D2020)</strong> Encourage RTP/SCS investments and strategies that collectively will result in reduced non-recurrent congestion and demand for single occupancy vehicle use by leveraging new transportation technologies and expanding travel choices.</td>
<td>Updated to more broadly incorporate all modes as a solution to meeting plan goals and targets (e.g., GHG target).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G2016)</strong> The RTP/SCS will encourage transportation investments that result in cleaner air, a better environment, a more efficient transportation system and sustainable outcomes in the long run.</td>
<td><strong>E2020)</strong> Encourage transportation investments that will be encouraged to result in improved air quality and public health, and reduced greenhouse gas emissions.</td>
<td>Revised to reflect goals regarding health and greenhouse gas emissions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H2016)</strong> Monitoring progress on all aspects of the Plan, including the timely implementation of projects, programs, and strategies, will be an important and integral component of the Plan.</td>
<td><strong>F2020)</strong> Monitoring progress on all aspects of the Plan, including the timely implementation of projects, programs, and strategies, will be an important and integral component of the Plan.</td>
<td>No change.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Guiding Policy/No Previous Equivalent</strong></td>
<td><strong>G2020)</strong> Regionally, transportation investments should reflect best known science regarding climate change vulnerability in order to design for long term resilience.</td>
<td>Incorporated climate change to reinforce focus on GHG targets, and resiliency to address a new federal planning factor (per the FAST Act - Improve the resiliency and reliability of the transportation system...) and to address FHWA Order 5520: Transportation System Preparedness and Resiliency to Climate Change and Extreme Weather Events.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Definition</td>
<td>Source (if applicable)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptable communities</td>
<td>Adaptable communities have plans, policies, and/or growth patterns that serve near-term needs and goals while also anticipating future changes in areas such as technology, climate, or demographics or other external forces.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptation</td>
<td>Adjustment in natural or human systems in anticipation of or response to a changing environment in a way that effectively uses beneficial opportunities or reduces negative effects.</td>
<td>Federal Highways Administration (FHWA): <a href="https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/legsregs/directives/orders/5520.cfm">https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/legsregs/directives/orders/5520.cfm</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data-driven solutions</td>
<td>A key feature of MAP-21 is the establishment of a performance- and outcome-based program. State DOTs and MPOs are expected to use information and data generated as a part of their target setting and monitoring efforts to help make better transportation planning and funding decisions (hence the reference to data-driven solutions).</td>
<td>FHWA safety example: <a href="https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/innovation/everydaycounts/edc_4/ddsa.cfm">https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/innovation/everydaycounts/edc_4/ddsa.cfm</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy and equitable communities</td>
<td>Healthy and equitable communities allow all residents to meet their basic needs and have access to opportunities in a clean and safe physical environment (e.g., ability to travel safely, ability to breathe clean air, etc.).</td>
<td>U.S. Environmental Protection Agency: <a href="https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2014-01/documents/equitable-development-report-508-011713b.pdf">https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2014-01/documents/equitable-development-report-508-011713b.pdf</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-recurrent congestion</td>
<td>Temporary disruptions or delay events such as incidents (e.g., car crashes), work zones, weather, and special events</td>
<td>FHWA: <a href="https://ops.fhwa.dot.gov/program_areas/reduce-non-cong.htm">https://ops.fhwa.dot.gov/program_areas/reduce-non-cong.htm</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resilience</td>
<td>Resilience or resiliency is the ability to anticipate, prepare for, and adapt to changing conditions and withstand, respond to, and recover rapidly from disruptions.</td>
<td>FHWA: <a href="https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/legsregs/directives/orders/5520.cfm">https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/legsregs/directives/orders/5520.cfm</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Transportation Options</td>
<td>Transportation option that results in fewer GHG and other criteria pollutants emissions such as Plug-in Electric Vehicles, Plug-in Hybrid Electric Vehicle, transit, bicycling, or walking.</td>
<td>California Air Resources Board: <a href="https://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/scopingplan/scoping_plan_2017.pdf">https://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/scopingplan/scoping_plan_2017.pdf</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targets</td>
<td>Desired level of performance for a specific performance indicator. A key feature of MAP-21 is the establishment of a performance- and outcome-based program. State DOTs and MPOs are now required to work together to set performance targets (e.g., for safety, NHS bridges and pavement, etc.).</td>
<td>FHWA: <a href="https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/map21/factsheets/pm.cfm">https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/map21/factsheets/pm.cfm</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## Attachment 1: Caltrans Statewide PM 2 Targets

### Statewide NHS Pavement & Bridge Performance Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pavement &amp; Bridge Performance Measures</th>
<th>Existing (2017)</th>
<th>2-Year NHS Targets (1/1/18 - 12/31/19)</th>
<th>4-Year NHS Targets (1/1/20 - 12/31/21)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHS Pavements (Total)</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate</td>
<td>47.9%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Interstate</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridges on the NHS</td>
<td>66.5%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>69.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SCAG Region Non-Interstate NHS Pavement & Bridge Performance Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pavement &amp; Bridge Performance Measures</th>
<th>Existing (2017)</th>
<th>2-Year NHS Targets (1/1/18 - 12/31/19)</th>
<th>4-Year NHS Targets (1/1/20 - 12/31/21)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Interstate Pavement</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridges on the NHS</td>
<td>36.1%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>37.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Measure</td>
<td>2017 Baseline Data</td>
<td>2-year Target</td>
<td>4-year Target</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Reliable Person-Miles Traveled on the Interstate</td>
<td>64.6%</td>
<td>65.1% (+0.5%)</td>
<td>65.6% (+1.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Reliable Person-Miles Traveled on the Non-Interstate NHS</td>
<td>73.0%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>74.0% (+1.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Interstate System Mileage Providing Reliable Truck Travel Time (Truck Travel Time Reliability Index)</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>1.68 (-0.01)</td>
<td>1.67 (-0.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Emissions Reductions by Applicable Pollutants Under the CMAQ Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOC (kg/day)</td>
<td>951.83</td>
<td>961.35 (+1.0%)</td>
<td>970.87 (+2.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO (kg/day)</td>
<td>6,863.26</td>
<td>6,931.90 (+1.0%)</td>
<td>7,000.54 (+2.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOx (kg/day)</td>
<td>1,753.36</td>
<td>1,770.89 (+1.0%)</td>
<td>1,788.43 (+2.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM10 (kg/day)</td>
<td>2,431.21</td>
<td>2,455.52 (+1.0%)</td>
<td>2,479.83 (+2.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM2.5 (kg/day)</td>
<td>904.25</td>
<td>913.29 (+1.0%)</td>
<td>922.34 (+2.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Hours of Peak Hour Excessive Delay per Capita</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento UA</td>
<td>14.9 Hours</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>14.7 (-1.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco-Oakland UA</td>
<td>31.3 Hours</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>30.0 (-4.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose UA</td>
<td>27.5 Hours</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>26.4 (-4.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles-Long Beach-Anaheim UA</td>
<td>51.7 Hours</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>51.2 (-1.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside-San Bernardino UA</td>
<td>16.3 Hours</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>16.1 (-1.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego UA</td>
<td>18.4 Hours</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>18.0 (-2.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Non-Single Occupancy Vehicle (SOV) Travel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento UA</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
<td>23.3% (+0.5%)</td>
<td>23.8% (+1.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco-Oakland UA</td>
<td>44.3%</td>
<td>45.3% (+1.0%)</td>
<td>46.3% (+2.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose UA</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>25.5% (+1.0%)</td>
<td>26.5% (+2.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles-Long Beach-Anaheim UA</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td>26.1% (+0.5%)</td>
<td>26.6% (+1.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside-San Bernardino UA</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>23.2% (+0.5%)</td>
<td>23.7% (+1.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego UA</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>24.8% (+1.0%)</td>
<td>25.2% (+1.4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Caltrans & SCAG must coordinate on a single, unified 4-year target

Caltrans & SCAG must coordinate on a single, unified 2-year & 4-year target
MAP-21 Performance Monitoring

• MAP-21 (2012) established a legislative foundation for a national performance-based transportation planning program.

• The FAST Act (2015) continued the performance monitoring requirements outlined in MAP-21.

• State DOTs & MPOs are required to establish performance targets supportive of national transportation goals.

• FHWA rule-making established a set of national performance measures & guidelines for the setting of statewide & regional performance targets.
Performance Measures & Targets

- Performance **measures** are quantitatively defined metrics used to assess progress toward designated performance objectives.

- MAP–21 performance measures were established by FHWA through Performance Management Groups (PM) 1, 2, & 3.

- Performance **targets** represent the performance level anticipated for each measure within a specified reporting period.

- Targets are developed by the State DOT (Caltrans) & by MPOs (SCAG).

- SCAG has been actively involved in the statewide MAP–21 target setting process in coordination with Caltrans & the other major California MPOs.
MAP–21 Performance Management

Final FHWA rule-making was promulgated in (3) separate Performance Management (PM) packages:

PM 1: Highway Safety (May, 2016). Statewide & regional PM 1 targets were set in May, 2017.


• Statewide PM 2 & PM 3 targets were set by Caltrans in May, 2018.

• SCAG will have until November 16, 2018 to elect either to adopt Caltrans’ statewide PM 2 & PM 3 targets, or develop a separate set of regional targets.
Pavement & Bridge Performance Management Final Rule (PM2)

- Effective May 20, 2017
- Statutory authority under MAP-21 (49 USC 490)
- Establishes performance measures for pavement and bridge conditions on the National Highway System (NHS) Interstate System and on remainder of the NHS (Non-Interstate)
  - Pavement
    - % of pavement in good conditions
    - % of pavement in poor conditions
    - Lane miles
  - Bridge
    - % of bridges in good conditions
    - % of bridges in poor conditions
    - Square feet (Deck Area)
Pavement Performance Measures

- Good/fair/poor measure determined based on 4 metrics
  - If all are good the combined measure is good
  - If >2 metrics are poor the combined measure is poor
- Need to report conditions and targets for % good and poor for Interstate and non-Interstate NHS
- Rule sets an additional goal of <5% poor for Interstates
Bridge Performance Measures

- Good/Fair/Poor measure based on National Bridge Inventory (NBI) ratings
  - Use minimum of deck, superstructure, and substructure
  - Report conditions and targets for % good and poor for NHS bridges
- Additional goal of <10% of the NHS bridge deck area structurally deficient
Performance Target Setting Requirements

FHWA 2 & 4-Year Targets

- Requirements set forth in 23 CFR 490
- 1st 4-year Performance Period (Jan 2018 – Dec 2021)
- 2-year Mid-Performance Point
- Pavement and bridge only
- NHS inventory
- Targets are fiscally constrained
- Caltrans set 2 & 4-yr targets on May 2018
- No penalties
PM 2 Pre-Target Setting

- Prior to setting targets, Caltrans asked MPOs to complete a PM 2 Condition Reporting Form.
- SCAG provided expected conditions for our region over the next 2 & 4 years.
- SCAG leveraged the Statewide Transportation Asset Management Plan (TAMP) which includes 10-year targets for pavement & bridges.
- Applied average annual growth rate to establish 2 & 4 year targets for the SCAG region.
PM 2 Statewide Targets

### Statewide NHS Pavement & Bridge Performance Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pavement &amp; Bridge</th>
<th>Existing (2017)</th>
<th>2 Year NHS Targets (1/1/18 - 12/31/19)</th>
<th>4 Year NHS Targets (1/1/20 - 12/31/21)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance Measures</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Good (%)</td>
<td>Poor (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHS Pavements (Total)</td>
<td>56,075 lane miles</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Interstate</td>
<td>41,917 lane miles</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate</td>
<td>14,159 lane miles</td>
<td>47.9%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridges on the NHS</td>
<td>234,285,883 sq. ft.</td>
<td>66.5%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SCAG Pavement & Bridge Performance Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pavement &amp; Bridge</th>
<th>Existing (2017)</th>
<th>2 Year NHS Targets (1/1/18 - 12/31/19)</th>
<th>4 Year NHS Targets (1/1/20 - 12/31/21)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance Measures</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Good (%)</td>
<td>Poor (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Interstate</td>
<td>11,658 lane miles</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridges on the NHS</td>
<td>13,766,178 sq. ft.</td>
<td>36.1%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Pavement: Over the 4 year period good pavement is expected to increase, while poor pavement will continue to increase but at a slower rate.
- Bridge: Over the 4 year period good bridge conditions are expected to increase, while poor bridge conditions will decrease at a slower rate.
PM 2 Performance Targets

• Statewide targets based on roll up of individual regional targets.

• Targets must be incorporated into the FTIP and RTP/SCS

• If Caltrans determines that targets are not being met after the 2-year target date (December, 2019), there is an opportunity to revise the 4-year condition target (i.e. repeal of SB-1).

• There are **no penalties** if targets are not met, however MPOs will need to report to Caltrans regarding steps for improvement.
Performance Management Group 3 (PM 3) consists of (3) categories of federal performance measures:

1) National Highway System Performance (2 measures)
2) Freight (1 measure)
3) CMAQ Program (3 measures)
The PM 3 National Highway System Performance category consists of (2) performance measures:

1) Percent of Reliable Person-Miles Traveled on the Interstate System.

2) Percent of Reliable Person-Miles Traveled on the Non-Interstate National Highway System.
The PM 3 ‘Freight’ performance category consists of (1) performance measure:

1) Percent of Interstate System Mileage Providing Reliable Truck Travel Times.

The PM 3 ‘CMAQ Program’ performance category features (3) performance measures:

1) Total Emissions Reductions by Applicable Pollutants (VOC, CO, NOx, PM 2.5, PM 10).
2) Annual Hours of Peak Hour Excessive Delay per Capita.
3) Percent Non-Single Occupancy Vehicle (SOV) Travel.
Statewide PM 3 NHS Performance Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>2017 Baseline</th>
<th>2-Year Target</th>
<th>4-Year Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Reliable Person–Miles Traveled on the Interstate System</td>
<td>64.6%</td>
<td>65.1% (+0.5%)</td>
<td>65.6% (+1.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Reliable Person–Miles Traveled on the Non–Interstate NHS</td>
<td>73.0%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>74.0% (+1.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Caltrans released its statewide PM 3 targets in May, 2018.
- For the Interstate System travel time reliability measure, Caltrans selected a 2-year target (65.1%) to provide for a 0.5% improvement over the 2017 baseline value of 64.6%.
- The 4-year Interstate System target continues the 2-year improvement trend to a full 1.0% over baseline to 65.6%.
- FHWA rulemaking requires only a 4-year target for the non–interstate NHS travel time reliability measure. Caltrans selected a statewide target of 1.0% improvement over the baseline value (73% to 74%).
PM 3: NHS Performance, Freight, & CMAQ

Statewide PM 3 Freight Travel Time Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>2017 Baseline</th>
<th>2-Year Target</th>
<th>4-Year Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Interstate System Mileage Providing Reliable Truck Travel Time</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>1.68 (-0.01)</td>
<td>1.67 (-0.02)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- For the Freight travel time reliability measure, Caltrans selected a 2-year target (1.68) for an improvement of 0.01 over the 2017 baseline value (1.69).

- The 4-year Freight travel time reliability target continues the moderate improvement trend down to 1.67, for an improvement of 0.02 over the baseline.

- Freight travel time reliability is evaluated using the ‘Truck Travel Time Index’ (TTTI).

- TTTI is calculated as the ratio of the 95th percentile (slowest) travel time on an interstate segment by the 50th percentile (normal) travel time on that segment.

- For example, if the normal travel time is 50 MPH and the 95th percentile travel time is 30 MPH, the TTTI for that segment would be 1.67.
## Statewide CMAQ Program Emissions Reduction Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Emissions Reductions by Applicable Pollutants</th>
<th>2017 Baseline</th>
<th>2-Year Target</th>
<th>4-Year Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VOC (kg/day)</td>
<td>951.83</td>
<td>961.35 (+1.0%)</td>
<td>970.87 (+2.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO (kg/day)</td>
<td>6,863.26</td>
<td>6,931.90 (+1.0%)</td>
<td>7,000.54 (+2.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOx (kg/day)</td>
<td>1,753.36</td>
<td>1,770.89 (+1.0%)</td>
<td>1,788.43 (+2.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM10 (kg/day)</td>
<td>2,431.21</td>
<td>2,455.52 (+1.0%)</td>
<td>2,479.83 (+2.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM2.5 (kg/day)</td>
<td>904.25</td>
<td>913.29 (+1.0%)</td>
<td>922.34 (+2.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Total emissions reduction is calculated by summing the 2-year & 4-year emissions reduction totals by applicable pollutant for CMAQ-funded projects.

- The 2-year statewide emissions reduction targets for all (5) applicable pollutants were set by Caltrans for a 1.0% increase over the 2017 baseline.

- The 4-year statewide emissions reduction targets for each of the (5) applicable pollutants was set by Caltrans for a 2.0% increase over the 2017 baseline.
CMAQ Program Congestion Targets

• The 2 remaining PM 3 CMAQ Program performance measures focus on the congestion relief aspects of the CMAQ program: ‘Annual Hours of Peak Hour Excessive Delay per Capita’ & ‘Percent Non-Single Occupancy Vehicle (Non-SOV) Travel’.

• These 2 congestion relief measures require a single, unified target be established for each US Census designated ‘Urban Area’ in the state with 2010 populations exceeding 1 million.

• There are 2 such Urban Areas in the SCAG region: Los Angeles/Long Beach/Anaheim & Riverside/San Bernardino.

• The ‘Annual Hours of Excessive Delay’ measure requires only a 4-year target for the initial performance reporting period for each Urban Area.
PM 3: NHS Performance, Freight, & CMAQ

Peak Hour Excessive Delay Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annual Hours of Peak Hour Excessive Delay per Capita</th>
<th>2017 Baseline</th>
<th>2-Year Target</th>
<th>4-Year Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles/Long Beach/Anaheim</td>
<td>51.7 Hours</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>51.2 (-1.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside/San Bernardino</td>
<td>16.3 Hours</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>16.1 (-1.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- In 2017, commuters in the Los Angeles/Long Beach/Anaheim Urban Area experienced 51.7 annual hours of excessive delay per capita.
- In Riverside/San Bernardino, the 2017 excessive delay value was 16.3 hours per capita.
- Caltrans & SCAG agreed upon a single, unified 4-year target for the Los Angeles/Long Beach/Anaheim Urban Area of 51.2 hours, a 1.0% improvement over 2017 baseline.
- For the Riverside/San Bernardino Urban Area, Caltrans & SCAG agreed upon a single, unified 4-year target of 16.1 hours, a 1.0% improvement over the 2017 baseline.
PM 3: NHS Performance, Freight, & CMAQ

Non-SOV Travel Mode Share Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent Non-SOV Travel</th>
<th>2017 Baseline</th>
<th>2-Year Target</th>
<th>4-Year Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles/Long Beach/Antaheim</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td>26.1% (+0.5%)</td>
<td>26.6% (+1.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside/San Bernardino</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>23.2% (+0.5%)</td>
<td>23.7% (+1.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- In 2017, 25.6% of commuters in the Los Angeles/Long Beach/Antaheim Urban Area travelled by a mode other than single occupancy vehicle (SOV).

- In the Riverside/San Bernardino Urban Area, 22.7% of commuters used a non-SOV transportation option in 2017.

- Caltrans & SCAG agreed upon unified 2-year Non-SOV mode share targets of 26.1% for the Los Angeles/Long Beach/Antaheim Urban Area; & 23.2% for Riverside/San Bernardino, each representing a 0.5% increase over the respective baseline values.

- Caltrans & SCAG agreed upon unified 4-year Non-SOV mode share targets of 26.6% for the Los Angeles/Long Beach/Antaheim Urban Area; & 23.7% for Riverside/San Bernardino, each representing a 1.0% increase over the respective baseline values.
MAP-21 Performance Reporting

- MAP-21 establishes a 4-year performance target setting & reporting cycle, beginning (for most performance reporting areas) in October, 2018.

- Caltrans is required to set statewide performance targets, however SCAG has option to establish regional targets for most measures within 180 days of Caltrans submittal.

- SCAG coordinates with Caltrans on establishment of statewide targets & on specific performance targets for our region.

- Caltrans’ initial ‘baseline’ performance period report (for most measures) is due to FHWA on October 1, 2018. The baseline report establishes existing conditions to be assessed over the first 4-year reporting period which ends on December 31, 2021.
MAP-21 Performance Reporting

• After 2 years, a mid-term progress evaluation is to be conducted, allowing Caltrans & SCAG to re-evaluate initial targets to ensure adequate progress is being made toward the 4-year performance goals.

• Caltrans’ initial 2-year ‘Mid-term Significant Progress Determination’ will be due to FHWA on October 1, 2020.

• During the mid-term progress evaluation, Caltrans & SCAG are permitted to adjust initial 4-year targets (if necessary).

• MAP-21 performance reporting information will be incorporated into the SCAG 2020 RTP/SCS & FTIP.
MAP-21 Performance Reporting

• At the conclusion of each 4-year performance period, Caltrans is required to submit a report to FHWA demonstrating that ‘significant progress’ has been made toward achievement of each of the statewide performance targets.

• ‘Significant progress’ is indicated when either the designated performance target is achieved, OR actual performance is improved over the baseline report (even if target is not actually achieved).

• If any of the performance target areas fail to demonstrate ‘significant progress’ in the 4-year performance report, Caltrans is required to submit an additional report explaining why progress has not occurred & what steps are being taken to achieve the targets.
Recommended Action:

**PM 2:** To support & adopt the statewide PM 2 targets as proposed by Caltrans for pavement & bridge condition on the National Highway System.

**PM 3:** No action requested at this time as options are still being explored in regard to whether to support the statewide targets or to develop a separate set of targets specific to the SCAG region.
Thank you!

Mike Gainor
gainor@scag.ca.gov
(213) 236-1822

Daniel Tran
tran@scag.ca.gov
(213) 236-1883
Technical Working Group

Agenda Item 4
Presentation on VMT Reduction Exchanges as a CEQA Mitigation Strategy
SB 743 Implementation Assistance Project: From Driving More to Driving Less

Thursday, June 14, 2:00 to 3:30 PM
Offices of the Southern California Association of Governments
900 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 1700, Los Angeles
Also with videoconferencing to SCAG Regional Offices

Program

2:00 PM Welcome by Host (Hasan Ikhrata)
2:05 PM Introductions, Project & Concept Background, Disclaimers (Robert Liberty)
2:10 PM Presentation of Illustrative VMT Reduction/Offset Exchanges
2:30 PM Legal and Administrative Precedents (Neil Peacock)
2:40 PM Comments from Workshop Participants
2:50 PM Questions, Answers, Comments from Audience (using cards)
3:25 PM Concluding Comments & Next Steps (Robert Liberty)
3:30 PM End of Program

Proposal Submitters & Expert Commentators

- Mike Bagheri – City of Pasadena
- Ping Chang – Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG)
- Devon Deming – Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (LA Metro)
- Chris Ganson – Governor’s Office of Planning & Research (OPR)
The VMT Reduction Exchange Concept

This event explores the feasibility of an exchange or brokerage to allow land development or transportation projects that generate additional VMT to offset/mitigate the added VMT through VMT reduction actions offered by third parties in exchange for money or some other benefit.

The idea is for new development projects to mitigate or offset their VMT increases by connecting with (or paying) entities that agree to reduce existing VMT. In some ways it resembles cap and trade but it would have elements of a fee program as well, since some entities may offer to implement transportation network changes or transportation demand management strategies with VMT reduction potential. It would be subject to the same substantial evidence standards as any other mitigation. The exchanges could be facilitated and monitored by existing third-party entities such as air quality management districts.

Here are some illustrations of VMT reduction projects or programs:

- A transit agency official could say that it would add evening bus service that would attract X new riders every day or year in exchange for a one-time payment of $Y.
- A city or neighborhood business district could offer to install parking meters over a broad area, charging at least $1/hour for parking if the third-party pays the capital cost.
- A city could offer to triple the allowable FAR within a 15-minute walk of all rail transit stops in that city in exchange for paying the capital costs of developing three new pocket parks to serve the higher densities.

- A major employer could state that it would be willing to institute a major parking buy-out program for its employees in exchange for $X worth of transit or ride-hailing services.

**Senate Bill 743 Context**

California Senate Bill 743 and its associated implementing Guidelines call for a new approach to measuring and mitigating transportation impacts under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

For land use projects requiring CEQA analysis, transportation impacts will no longer be measured in terms of added travel delay or congestion but by the additional amount of driving generated (measured in terms of vehicle miles traveled, or VMT). Required mitigation will shift from maintaining a target level of service (such as by adding lanes or installing interchanges and signals) to reducing the amount of driving itself below a threshold of significance.

It may be very difficult or impossible for projects to be modified sufficiently to offset or eliminate the increased traffic they will generate. It may also be impossible for a government to carry out an action in a project area within its boundaries that would reduce or offset the additional driving.

**Background on the SB 743 Implementation Assistance Project**

The SB 743 Implementation Assistance Project: From Driving More to Driving Less, is a collaboration among four California state agencies (OPR, CalSTA, Caltrans, CNRA), five MPOs (SACOG, SCAG, MTC, SANDAG, SJCOG), CALCOG, and others. The project has received financial support from participating entities and from TransitCenter of New York.

A team from Portland State University’s Urban Sustainability Accelerator was retained to organize and carry out a set of case studies of previously approved land use, transportation and planning projects in California in order to determine how those projects would be analyzed and mitigated under the new CEQA guidelines. In addition, the project is hosting a series of workshops on VMT (vehicle miles traveled) mitigation.

The SB 743 Project is directed by a Leadership Team with representatives from the major participants; is advised by a Technical Advisory Team comprised of staff from participating organizations; and is coordinated by a Management Team from Portland State University.

The research part of the project is expected to be completed this summer.
Notice of Public Availability of Modifications to Text of Proposed Regulation and Addendum to the Initial Statement of Reasons and Informative Digest
July 2, 2018


Pursuant to Government Code section 11346.8, 11347.1, and California Code of Regulations, title 1, section 44, the Agency provides notice of modification to Proposed Sections 15004, 15062, 15064, 15064.3, 15064.4, 15064.7, 15075, 15094, 15125, 15126.2, 15126.4, 15152, 15168, 15182, 15234, 15269, 15301, 15357, 15155, Appendix G, and Appendix N of Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations, set forth below, and attached to this notice with strikeout and underline. The Agency has also decided not to proceed with changes to Appendices C, D, or E.

The modifications to the originally-proposed changes to the Guidelines (“15-day language”) are identified in Attachment A to this notice. The 15-day language modifications identified in Attachment A to this Notice show the originally-proposed changes to the Guidelines marked in underline/strikeout format, and the additions and deletions pursuant to this notice in double underline/double strikeout format.

Additionally, pursuant to Government Code section 11347.1, the Agency has decided to supplement the Initial Statement of Reasons with an addendum, which is included as Attachment B to this notice. In some cases, additional background and explanatory text is included for further clarification of the Initial Statement of Reasons.

Copies of the proposed changes can be found at www.resources.ca.gov/CEQA. The proposed changes are being made in response to public comments received during the initial public comment period, and notice was mailed or provided by email list serve to all parties who provided written or oral comments and asked to receive notice. The changes are summarized as follows:

**Section 15004**

Section 15004 provides guidance on when a lead agency should conduct environmental review on a proposed activity. The Agency proposes to amend that section to address when a lead agency may enter into agreements prior to completing environmental review. In response to comments, the Agency proposes to clarify that the factors described in the proposed addition are not exclusive. The Agency also proposes to add that, among the listed characteristics, an agreement should not prevent an agency from deciding not to pursue or to reject the project.
Section 15063

Section 15063 describes the contents of an initial study. The Agency proposes to amend that section to clarify that lead agencies may contract with consultants to prepare the initial study, similar to other provisions allowing lead agencies to have other environmental documents prepared by contract. In response to comments, the Agency proposes to further clarify that documents prepared by consultants must reflect the lead agency’s independent judgment.

Section 15064

Section 15064 provides guidance on determining the significance of potential environmental impacts. The Agency proposes to add a new subdivision (b)(2) to state that lead agencies may use “thresholds of significance” to assist in that determination. The proposed addition included a provision suggesting that, when relying on a threshold of significance, a lead agency should describe the substantial evidence that supports the conclusion that compliance with the threshold ensures that the impact is less than significant. In response to stakeholder concerns that such description would be too burdensome, the Agency proposes to remove that provision from the proposed additions.

Section 15064.3

The Agency proposes adding, as directed in Senate Bill 743 (Steinberg, 2013), a new section 15064.3 to address the analysis of transportation impacts. The Agency proposes some changes to improve clarity. It also proposes to add “regional transportation plan EIR” as an example of programmatic analysis from which agencies may tier analysis of transportation projects. Finally, the Agency proposes to correct a typo in the proposed effective date, so that all agencies must apply the new provisions in Section 15064.3 by 2020, not 2019.

Section 15064.4

Section 15064.4 addresses the analysis of greenhouse gas emissions. The Agency proposes several updates to reflect recent case law. In response to comments on those changes, the Agency also proposes to clarify that a project’s incremental contribution to the impacts of climate change should not be compared to state, national or global emissions to determine whether the project’s emissions are cumulatively considerable. The Agency further proposes to clarify that, if relying on consistency with state goals and policies to determine significance, the lead agency should explain how the project’s emissions are consistent with those goals.

Section 15125

Section 15125 describes the requirement to identify baseline conditions against which a lead agency measures a project’s potential impacts. The Agency proposes to update that section to reflect recent case law describing when a lead agency may identify a baseline that is different from existing conditions. In response to comments received on the proposal, the Agency proposes to clarify that the procedural requirement to justify a baseline other than existing conditions does not apply to reliance on historic conditions. Rather, that requirement only applies only to use of future conditions as a sole baseline. Other changes are proposed for clarity.
Section 15126.2

Section 15126.2 describes the requirement to address certain significant effects in an environmental impact report. The Agency proposes to add energy impacts analysis to that section, consistent with recent case law and existing Appendix F. In response to comments, the Agency proposes to further clarify that both the unnecessary and wasteful use of energy resources should be analyzed.

Section 15126.4

Section 15126.4 describes requirements for mitigation measures. The Agency proposes to clarify, consistent with case law, when the details of mitigation measures may be identified after project approval. In response to comments, the Agency further clarifies that if details are deferred, a lead agency must identify at least the types of measures that are known to be feasible and that will achieve an adopted performance standard.

Section 15182

Section 15182 describes a CEQA exemption, contained in the Government Code, for certain residential projects that are consistent with a specific plan. The Agency proposes to update that section to include an exemption for residential, commercial or mixed-use projects that are transit oriented. In response to comments, the Agency proposes to add a cross-reference to the statutory definition of “transit priority areas.”

Section 15234

The Agency proposes to add a new Section 15234 to describe how a lead agency must respond following a successful court challenge to a project. In response to comments, the Agency proposes to further clarify two things. First, the Agency proposes to remove a provision suggesting that a court may only leave approvals in place if doing so would benefit the environment because that factor does not exist in statute. Second, the Agency proposes to clarify that, generally, additional review is limited to what a court might require.

Section 15301

Section 15301 describes one class of activities, changes to existing facilities, that normally would not have a significant effect on the environment, and therefore should be exempt from CEQA. The Agency proposes to clarify that the exemption that applies to changes to existing highways and streets also applies to changes for bicycle facilities, pedestrian crossings, street trees and similar changes. In addition to those clarifications, the Agency also proposes to clarify that transit improvements also fall within that class.

Appendix G

Appendix G contains a sample checklist of questions to assist a lead agency in determining whether a project may have a significant impact on the environment. The Agency proposes to update those questions to reflect recent case law and to improve clarity. In response to comments, the Agency proposes further revisions for clarity. Additionally, the Agency proposes to include a question asking
whether the lead agency has developed a plan for tribal consultation. The Agency also proposes to further clarify that certain aesthetic considerations apply differently in urban settings, and may not be a consideration for certain projects within transit priority areas.

Appendix N

Appendix N contains a sample environmental checklist intended to enable streamlined review for qualified infill projects. In response to comments, the Agency proposes to update Appendix N to reflect the changes being proposed for Appendix G.

Sections 15062, 15064.7, 15075, 15094, 15152, 15155, 15168, 15269, 15301, and 15357

In addition to the changes described above, the Agency proposes further non-substantive changes in sections 15062, 15064.7, 15075, 15094, 15152, 15155, 15168, 15269, 15301, and 15357, in response to comments to improve clarity.

Appendix C, Appendix D, and Appendix E

The Agency has decided to not proceed with changes to Appendix C, Appendix D, and Appendix E in this rulemaking because the Office of Planning and Research is currently updating its online document submission process. If needed, changes to the forms in those appendices will be made once the online forms have been developed.

Interested persons may provide written comments about the modifications on or before 5:00 PM (PST), July 20, 2018. Electronic submission of comments is preferred; however, written comments may also be delivered or mailed. Written comments should be addressed as follows:

Christopher Calfee, Deputy Secretary and General Counsel
California Natural Resources Agency
1416 Ninth Street, Suite 1311
Sacramento, CA 95814
(916) 653–5656
Email: CEQA.Guidelines@resources.ca.gov

All written comments received by July 20, 2018, which pertain to the indicated changes will be reviewed and responded to by the Agency’s staff as part of the compilation of the rulemaking file. Please limit your comments to the modifications of the text.
Technical Working Group

Agenda Item 5
SB 150 Progress Report: Update & Next Steps

Public workshops
June 2018
SB 150 Progress Report

Process

• Draft list of metrics and compile data
• Request input from MPOs and the public
• Interview MPOs, experts, and stakeholders
• Analyze data and identify themes
• **Public workshops (late June)**
• Report to legislature (September 1st)
• Refine recommendations and metrics for next report

Are We On Track to Meet Climate Goals?

Photo: San Joaquin RTD
California’s VMT May Be Diverging From National Average

Vehicle Miles Traveled Index: California vs. Nation
(2005 base year defined as 100 percent)

Source: FHWA & HPMS

Emissions and Travel Trends to Date Are Not on Track

SB 375 Vehicle Miles Traveled & Greenhouse Gas Emissions
(per capita reductions compared to 2005 base year)

Source: HPMS, EMFAC 2014
Macro Trends Are Also Impacting VMT

California Gas Prices
(All grades reformulated)

Household Vehicle Ownership
(Statewide)

Unemployment Rate
(Statewide annual average)

Job Opportunity Change
(Cumulative statewide)

Source: EIA
Source: ACS
Source: CA EDD
Source: CA EDD

Are We Making Progress on Key Strategies?

Photo: San Joaquin RTD
Californians Continue to Drive Alone as their Primary Mode of Travel

Vehicle Miles Traveled Index: California vs. Nation
(2005 base year defined as 100 percent)

Source: American Community Survey

Roadway Capacity Per Capita is Higher in Rural Places

2016 Lane Miles by Region
(per capita freeway & major arterial lane miles * 1000)

Source: HPMS
Transit Service Influences Ridership – But Ridership Has Begun to Fall

Per Capita Transit Service Hours

Source: National Transit Database

Per Capita Transit Boardings

Source: National Transit Database

RTPs Include Almost $1.2 Trillion in Spending Over 2-3 Decades

Percent of Overall Transportation Spending

Source: CARB analysis based on MPO submissions and RTPs. All dollar figures in Year of Expenditure.

- How has long-term spending by mode shifted?
- How has short-term spending by mode shifted?
Tracking Transportation Innovations
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Tracking Options in Low-Income Communities & Communities of Color

Photo: San Joaquin RTD
Homes for All

SB 150 Progress Report

Housing Construction Remains Below Pre-Recession Levels

New Homes in California By Type
(Single Family vs. Multifamily, 2001-2016)

Source: CA Department of Finance
More New Homes Are Being Permitted in the High-End Market

Housing Need Permitted, By Income Level

Percentage of total Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) for which building permits have been issued, reported by household income: Very Low Income (VLI), Low-Income (LI), Moderate (Mod), and Above Moderate (Above Mod).

- MTC: ~1 year into its 8-year cycle (12.5%)
- The other regions are ~3 years (~37.75%) into their 8-year cycles

Source: CA HCD, Annual Progress Report (2018). Data shown includes only jurisdictions with complete reporting.

Housing Cost Burden Continues to Increase

Change in Housing Cost Burden (2016 vs. 2010)

Burden shows the percentage of households paying over 35 percent of their income for housing.

Source: ACS
Low-Income People Are Not Moving Into Key Areas

These maps show the annual average move-in rate (per 1000 residents) between 2010 and 2016.

People earning below $25,000

People earning above $25,000

Regional Growth Patterns

Source: ACS

Photo: OregonMetro.gov
SB 150 Progress Report

Less Land Has Been Urbanized Per 1000 New Residents

Acres Urbanized
(per 1000 new residents)

Source: FMMP

SB 150 Progress Report

Total Land Urbanized Has Fluctuated

Acres Urbanized Statewide

Source: FMMP
Grocery Store Access Is Generally High and Rising

Percent of households with low access to grocery stores
(2010 vs. 2015)

Low access to store: living more than 1 mile from a supermarket, supercenter, or large grocery store if in an urban area, or more than 10 miles if in a rural area.

Source: USDA Food Atlas

Are Communities Getting Healthier?
Challenges and Opportunities

Areas of Challenge & Opportunity

- Supporting local jurisdictions to meet regional & state goals
- Addressing the affordability and displacement crisis
- Aligning transportation spending with regional & state goals
- Creating healthy neighborhoods & providing better travel options for low-income communities and communities of color
- Minimizing the risk that disruptive technologies pose to climate, communities, and landscapes
SB 150 Progress Report

Best Practices Received

- Received over 100 nominated best practices.
  - Selected: 53
  - Rejected: 26
  - Need Further Research: 23

- Including practices from each of these categories:
  - Transportation
  - Housing / displacement
  - Land use / regional growth
  - Planning process
  - New mobility & pricing

SB 150 Progress Report

Best Practice: SANDAG’s Smart Growth & Conservation Funding
SB 150 Progress Report

Best Practice: SCAG’s Go Human Campaign

Photos: SCAG

SB 150 Progress Report

Best Practice: Fresno’s Sustainable Infrastructure Planning Grants

Photo: Flickr User Thomas Hawk
SB 150 Progress Report

Best Practice: SACOG’s CivicLab

![CivicLab Image](Photo: SACOG via YouTube)

SB 150 Progress Report

Best Practice: MTC’s Housing Competition - 80k by 2020

![Housing Image]
SB 150 Progress Report

Discussion Questions

• Given the increasingly urgent need for transformative action, what regional best practices do you think the report should emphasize?

• Given the significant need to accelerate progress, what messages should the report bring to the attention of state legislators?

SB 150 Progress Report: Update & Next Steps

Public workshops
June 2018

Comments or questions?
Please email SustainableCommunities@arb.ca.gov
SCS Evaluation Guidelines

PUBLIC WORKSHOP
CALIFORNIA AIR RESOURCES BOARD
San Diego Los Angeles Fresno Sacramento
June 18, 2018 June 19, 2018 June 25, 2018 June 28, 2018

Overview

• Goals of SB 375 Program
• Program Updates, and Roles and Responsibilities
• CARB Board’s Direction
• New Approach to SCS Evaluations
• Other Elements of SCS Evaluation Guidelines
• Next Steps
Goals of SB 375

- Support the State’s climate goals to reduce GHG emissions
- Require MPOs to prepare a SCS to reduce GHG emissions through coordinated land use & transportation planning
- Promote healthier, more sustainable, and equitable communities

Progress of SB 375 Program

- **2010**
  - CARB established GHG Emission Reduction Targets by region
- **2017**
  - SB 150 (Allen) Tracking SCS Implementation
- **Early 2019**
  - All MPOs will be developing their 3rd SCSs

- **September 2008**
  - SB 375 was signed into law
- **March 2018**
  - CARB updated the targets
Roles & Responsibilities

**CARB**
- Set regional GHG reduction targets
- Review MPO’s technical methodology, provide comments on whether methodology is appropriate
- Review SCS & determine whether it would, if implemented, achieve target
- Monitor progress made by each MPO in meeting GHG emission reductions

**MPO**
- Develop an SCS or Alternative Planning Strategy (APS)
- Submit the technical methodology to demonstrate the process of estimating GHG reductions from the SCS/APS
- Provide supporting data/information necessary for the SCS/APS evaluation

CARB Board’s Direction

- Shift focus to SCS strategies and associated actions
- Increase transparency, understandability, and accountability of the SCS review process
- Engage partnerships and the important responsibilities of local, regional and state government
- Track on-the-ground progress & share lessons learned

Source: http://supplychain turnaround.com/blog/tag/focus-strategy/
New SCS Evaluation Approach

CARB staff propose performance-based evaluation as an approach that adheres to the Board’s updated direction.

Performance Measures
- Capture types of strategies considered for the region
- Improve CARB’s understanding of the challenges & constraints in SCS implementation
- Report progress & effectiveness of SCS strategies (data & information)

CARB’s Proposed SCS Evaluation
Strategy Evaluation

1. To increase transparency & understandability of SCS strategies

CARB will need the following data & information from MPOs:
- Planned land use & transportation changes (e.g., housing density, decreased headway, etc.)
- Location of a planned strategies (e.g., TPA)
- Expected performance outcomes (e.g., transit ridership, household VMT, etc.)

Example of Strategy Evaluation

Planned Changes within TPA
- Housing mix of new development: 68% multifamily; 30% small lot; and 2% large lot.
- Residential density changes from 10 to 12 DU/acre during plan period (2015-2035)
- 60% of new housing units in TPA
- 15% increase in transit frequency

Performance Outcomes Within TPA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2035</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle ownership (# of vehicles/HH)</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode share (SOV:Transit:NMT)</td>
<td>71:19:10</td>
<td>68:20:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average auto trip length (miles/day)</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Ridership (No. of boarding)</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>345,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HH VMT/capita (miles/day)</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Location – Transit Priority Areas (TPA) as defined in SCS
Example of Strategy Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>% change by 2035</th>
<th>Elasticity</th>
<th>% Change in VMT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential Density</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit frequency</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-1.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Performance Outcomes Within TPA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2035</th>
<th>% Change in VMT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HH VMT/capita</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>-2.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaluation of Key Actions

1. To increase transparency and accountability
   CARB would review & report
   - feasibility of policy achievement
   - important role of local, regional & state governments in successful SCS development & achieving GHG reductions
Example: Key Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Key Action</th>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Implementing Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase Residential Density in TPAs</td>
<td>Make available local planning and incentive funds to update zoning code in TPAs</td>
<td>$30 million (committed Discretionary Funding)</td>
<td>By 2020</td>
<td>MPO, local jurisdictions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaluating Lessons Learned from Implementation

1. To better understand how the region’s are learning and improving the success of SB 375

   MPOs would provide the following information & data:
   - tracking programs to monitor progress
   - identify barriers to implementation

   CARB would review & document:
   - how MPOs utilize on-the-ground performance outcomes from one plan to next & report how plans are improving with each cycle
   - create a clearinghouse for best practices (SB 150)
Other Elements in SCS Evaluation Guidelines

1. MPO Technical Methodology
   - Provide guidance on key components to include in the technical methodology submittal

2. Technical Assistance
   - Auto operating cost
   - Off-model strategies
   - Fleet mix data

CARB’s Determination

- Are changes in the performance measures (in magnitude & direction) supportive of the overall GHG reduction?
- Are the SCS policies & investments supportive of the plan changes & outcomes?
- Did MPO analysis demonstrate SCS target achievement?
- Does the MPO determination incorporate the appropriate guidance & adjustment methods from CARB?
Stakeholders Input

1. What performance indicators should be included in the SCS evaluation?
2. Does the proposed approach yield more strategy based evaluation? If not what other approaches should be considered?
3. What other information CARB should ask for?

Next Steps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Solicit Public Feedback on Workshop</td>
<td>July 13, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Release Draft SCS Evaluation Guidelines</td>
<td>August/September, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Workshop #2</td>
<td>September, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Release Final SCS Evaluation Guidelines</td>
<td>October 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thank you
Questions/Comments

PLEASE SEND YOUR COMMENTS TO
SustainableCommunities@arb.ca.gov
Technical Working Group

Agenda Item 6
Background

- Previous ATP cycles only used:
  - CalEnviro Screen
  - Median Household Income
  - Free or Reduced Priced School Meals
  - Other
- Per the 2019 ATP Statewide Guidelines, a Regional DAC could be used if the definition is in an adopted RTP/SCS.
- Regional definitions must document robust public outreach process that includes input of community stakeholders and be stratified based on severity.
- SCAG’s Regional DAC includes
  - Environmental Justice Areas
  - SB 535
  - Communities of Concern
Community-Based Analysis

- **Environmental Justice Areas** - *Transportation Analysis Zones (TAZs)*, which are similar to block groups, that have a *higher concentration of minority OR low income households* than is seen in the region as a whole. The inclusion of this geography helps to fulfill SCAG’s Title VI requirements, along with other state and federal environmental justice guidelines.

- **SB 535 Disadvantaged Areas** – *Census tracts* that have been identified by *Cal/EPA as Disadvantaged Communities* based on the requirements set forth in SB 535, which seek to identify areas disproportionately burdened by and vulnerable to multiple sources of pollution.

- **Communities of Concern** – *Census Designated Places (CDPs) and City of Los Angeles Community Planning Areas (CPAs)* that fall in the upper 1/3rd of all communities in the SCAG Region for having the *highest concentration of minority population AND low income households*. 
Minority Population: 12.4 Million People
65% of Region
6.2 Million People
32% of Region

SCAG Environmental Justice Areas

Census tracts that have been identified by Cal/EPA as Disadvantaged Communities based on the requirements set forth in SB 535, which seek to identify areas disproportionately burdened by and vulnerable to multiple sources of pollution.
Environmental Justice Communities of Concern in the SCAG Region

Note: Environmental Justice Communities of Concern are Census Designated Places (CDPs) or City of Los Angeles Community Planning Areas (CPAs) that have the highest concentration (top 1/3rd) of minority population AND households in poverty compared to all other CDPs or CPAs in the region as a whole.

Minority Population: 4.2 Million People
23% of Region

Households in Poverty: 91% vs. 40%