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AGENDA

Introductions
1. Agenda Outlook (Naresh Amatya) 15 min.

Discussion Items
2. Implementation/Monitoring Framework for the 2012-2035 RTP/SCS
   • Transportation Strategies/Programs/Projects (Naresh Amatya) 20 min.
   • Sustainable Communities Strategies (Ping Chang)
3. One-on-One Meetings with Local Jurisdictions to Update SCAG’s Socioeconomic Data
   for the 2016-2040 RTP/SCS and to Collect Additional Information to Assist us with
   Implementation (Kimberly Clark)
   • Local Implementation Survey (Ping Chang) 25 min.
4. Pavement and Bridge Condition Database/Management (Naresh Amatya) 15 min.

Technical Update Items
7. Comments/Around the Table Discussion 5 min.
Meeting Summary

Following is a summary of discussions of the Technical Working Group meeting of October 17, 2013.

Discussion Items

1. **State Agencies Comment Letter on MAP-21 Performance Measures**

   Ping Chang, SCAG staff, provided an update on the state agencies performance measures comment letter to the U.S. Department of Transportation. Mr. Chang reported in anticipation of the DOT’s rule-making on performance measures for Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century (MAP-21) a group of California State agencies recently provided a joint comment letter to the DOT. Mr. Chang noted the DOT is required to initiate rule making by April 2014 and to finalize it one year later. The letter proposes three performance measures for traffic congestion; average peak period travel time, annual vehicle hours of delay and annual person hours of delay. Additionally, two measures are proposed for the National Highway System Performance; travel time reliability and person throughput per lane mile. It was further noted the proposed performance measures are either already part of the 2012-2035 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy or generally consistent with the RTP/SCS framework. Staff will continue to monitor MAP-21 related activities at the state and national levels.

   Mr. Chang received questions and comments from the working group regarding the DOT letter.

2. **SB 743: Facilitating Transit-Oriented Development in Southern California**

   Ping Chang, SCAG staff, reported on SB 743 and its importance to transit oriented infill projects. Mr. Chang noted the bill refers to “Transit Priority Areas” which is defined as an area within half a mile of an existing or planned major transit stop. It was noted that the a “Transit Priority Area” identified under SB 743 is smaller than a “High Quality Transit Area”. Further, Mr. Chang noted in contrast to the regulatory approach of SB 375, SB 743 takes more of a planning approach. Additionally, projects may qualify for the CEQA exemption if it is consistent with a Sustainable Communities Strategy. Mr. Chang concluded by stating SB 743 does not take away any existing local jurisdiction
authority and power. Mr. Chang received comments and questions from the working group members regarding SB 743.

3. **Potential 2016 RTP/SCS Strategies**

Frank Wen, SCAG staff, reported on potential 2016 RTP/SCS strategies. Mr. Wen provided a list of broad topics which may be in the 2016 RTP/SCS. Some of the topics include land use, network, traffic demand management, non-motorized alternatives, goods movement/freight and regional aviation system. The working group discussed the possible framework for the 2016 RTP/SCS.
Item 1 Attachment: Agenda Outlook and 2016 RTP/SCS Schedule
Proposed Agenda Outlook for the Development of the 2016 RTP/SCS

Framework/Overarching Issues

- Potential approach/process, coordination between various technical working groups and policy committees, and updated overall schedule for the development of the 2016 RTP/SCS
- Performance Based Planning and implications of MAP-21
- Role of Technology in the 2016 RTP/SCS

General topic areas

- Growth Forecast/Land Use
  - Local Input Process
  - 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
- Sustainable Communities Strategy
  - Overview of SCS in the 2012 RTP/SCS
  - Current status of SCS implementation
  - Emerging issues/themes that could influence 2016 SCS
  - Updated SCS for 2016 RTP/SCS
- Transportation Finance
  - Overview of baseline and innovative funding sources adopted in the 2012 RTP/SCS including underlying technical assumptions/methodology/analysis
  - Overview of cost assumptions/cost modal for the 2012 RTP/SCS
  - Progress update on 2012 RTP/SCS revenue/cost
  - Potential changes/focus areas and emerging issues in the 2016 RTP/SCS
  - Finance Plan for 2016 RTP/SCS
- Model and Tools to be used in the 2016 RTP/SCS
- Transportation Conformity
- Program EIR
- Environmental Justice

Major Modal/Strategy Areas

- Goods Movement (GM) Strategy
  - Overview of 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
Updated GM Strategy for the 2016 RTP/SCS

Transit (HSR, Rail and Bus)
- 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
- Updated Transit Strategy for the 2016 RTP/SCS

Active Transportation
- 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
- Progress status of 1st Mile/Last Mile Study and its integration into the 2016 RTP/SCS
- Updated Active Transportation Strategy for the 2016 RTP/SCS

Highways/HOV/HOT/Express Lanes
- Overview of Highway/HOV/HOT/Express Lanes proposed in the 2012 RTP/SCS with a focus on technical assumptions/analysis
- System Preservation and system operation focus in the 2012 RTP/SCS and our current efforts on Pavement and Bridge condition database/management
- Progress update and emerging issues related to highways/HOV/HOT/Express Lanes
- Highways Improvement Element in the 2016 RTP/SCS

Aviation
- Overview of Aviation program in the 2012 RTP/SCS with a focus on ground transportation improvements
- 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
- Updated Aviation Element of the 2016 RTP/SCS

Transportation Demand Management and Transportation System Management (TDM/TSM)
- Overview of TDM/TSM in the 2012 RTP/SCS, including underlying assumptions
- Progress status of TDM/TSM and emerging issues
- Updated TDM/TSM Element for the 2016 RTP/SCS
Item 2: Implementation/Monitoring Framework for the 2012-2035 RTP/SCS
RTP/SCS Components/Segments

2012 RTP/SCS

Project Specific Multi-Modal Transportation Investments

Non-Project Specific Multi-Modal Transportation Investments

Enabling Strategies
Project Specific Multi-Modal Investments

- I405 HOV Lane Addition in Los Angeles
- High Desert Corridor
- 710 Truck Facility
- Metro Westside Subway Extension
- EW Corridor
- High Speed Rail
- Expo LRT Extension
- Other

Focus on:
- Relative Implementation Progress (e.g., EIR, ROW, Construction)
- Schedule and Budget Adherence
- Impact on Facility and System Performance
Non-Project Specific Multi-Modal Investments

- Preservation
- Operations
- Arterial Improvements
- Active Transportation
- Other

Focus on:
- Actual Expenditures
- Major Initiatives
- Impact on Overall and Initiative-Specific System Performance
Enabling Strategies

- Land Use Strategies
- Express Lane Network
- Mileage Based User Fees
- TDM
- Other

Focus on:
- Supporting Initiatives
- Relative Progress (e.g., increased carpooling or VMT/capita trends)
- Impact on System Performance
2012 RTP/SCS Implementation Monitoring Framework

- Do we have a reasonable segmentation framework?
- Are the focus areas for each RTP/SCS segment reasonable?
- For project-specific investments, where should we cut off the monitoring?

Next Steps:
- Get your feedback
- Develop templates
- Start collecting information needed.
Introduction and Summary

Through an extensive bottom-up collaborative process, the 2012-2035 RTP/SCS establishes regional goals and performance measures through which the performance of the plan could be monitored and assessed. For each performance measure, the plan also includes the desired outcome.

This paper outlines the scope of activities to monitor and assess the implementation of the 2012-2035 RTP/SCS. The paper first addresses key considerations for regional monitoring and assessment. It then highlights the two different levels of regional monitoring: implementation actions vs. performance outcomes. An important challenge of regional monitoring is to assess the performance outcomes in relation to implementation actions and other factors such as demographic changes and business cycles.

Key Considerations

Plan development, implementation, and monitoring/assessment are three interrelated components of the regional planning process. Historically, regional planning agencies have focused predominantly on only the plan development component. There has been increasing awareness of the interrelatedness among the three components and the need to take a more holistic approach.

The 2012 RTP/SCS contains two sets of performance measures. The first set is intended to be used for evaluating different plan alternatives during the plan development process. The second set is intended to be used to monitor the plan performance. While the two sets overlap in some areas, they are not exactly the same.

The proposed scope of regional monitoring takes into considerations the following development after the adoption of the 2012-2035 RTP/SCS. First, MAP-21 (recent federal transportation reauthorization) passed in July 2012 which establishes requirements of performance-based planning. In addition, MPOs in California has worked together and identified a draft set of performance monitoring indicators.

Levels of Monitoring

There are two levels of monitoring focus. The first level focuses on the implementation actions while the other focuses on the performance outcomes.

The term “implementation actions” is used in a broad way relative to the adoption of the regional RTP/SCS. It includes downstream activities which contribute to the RTP/SCS goals and desired outcomes. Implementation actions may include activities ranging from local general plan update, open space acquisition, TOD ordinance, rideshare program, transit projects and HOV lane construction. Implementation actions generally would take place at the local or regional levels.
The term “performance outcomes” is used to describe the impacts of the implementation actions on the sustainability of and qualities of life in the region. They are in the areas of, for example, location efficiency, accessibility and mobility, safety and health, environmental quality, etc.

In regional planning, there is generally a time lag between the execution of implementation actions and the realization of performance outcomes. This is particularly the case in land use-related implementation actions. For example, after the completion of a TOD specific plan, it may take several years until the first TOD project is built. Outcomes are also evolving over time and are not static in nature. Given the 2012-2035 RTP/SCS was adopted only in April 2012, the initial focus of regional monitoring is proposed to be on implementation actions while beginning to establish the basis of outcome-based monitoring.

**Monitoring of Implementation Actions**

Most implementation actions for the RTP/SCS will be taken by the cities, counties, county transportation commissions and SCAG.

**Types of Implementation Actions**

It should be noted that there are different types of implementation actions as the following:

- **Plan/Policy:**
  - Studies, plans (e.g. general plan updates, specific plans, community plans), research and evaluation of options, demonstration projects, inventories (e.g. sidewalk conditions)
- **Program:**
  - For example, rideshare program, recycling program
- **Process:**
  - For example, streamlined development review process for infill projects
- **Regulation:**
  - For example, zoning codes
- **Development:**
  - Land development projects, transportation projects, other major infrastructure projects
- **Public Participation and Outreach:**
  - Educating, promoting, and marketing initiatives
- **Funding and Financing:**
  - Public funding and financing opportunities: e.g. cap & trade proceeds, mileage-based user fees, affordable housing trust funds
  - Joint private-public funding and financing opportunities
- **Others**

While each implementation action has its own process, for the purpose of RTP/SCS, the focus is on monitoring the initiation and completion of key actions.
Categories of Implementation Actions

To monitor the implementation of the RTP/SCS, the following categories of actions are proposed:

- Local general plan related actions
- Active transportation and travel demand management
- Transportation network related action
- Safety and health
- Environmental sustainability and Environmental Justice
- Environmental review process
- Funding
- Other

Mechanisms

Mechanisms to collect information of implementation actions may include the following:

- RTP/SCS local input process
- Survey of local jurisdictions and CTCs
- On-going research of best practices for implementation
- IGR process/database for developments
- FTIP database for transportation projects
- Implementation progress report (from subregions taking the delegation for the 2016 RTP/SCS)

Attachment 1 includes the categories and examples of specific implementation actions that SCAG staff plans to collect relevant information. Attachment 1 could also be used as a reference and guide for subregions that take the delegation for developing the subregional SCS for the 2016-2040 RTP/SCS.

Monitoring of Outcomes

In addition to monitoring the implementation actions, staff will also begin to establish the basis to monitor the associated performance outcomes. While implementation actions may be taken, for example, by a city or county, the performance outcomes will focus primarily at the regional level. SCAG is currently pursuing the development of tools to facilitate the monitoring and assessment of performance outcomes across geographic scales. Finally, subregions that take delegation to development the subregional SCS for the 2016-2040 are not be expected to conduct monitoring of performance outcomes at the subregional level.

Attachment 2 was developed through updating the list of performance monitoring indicators in the 2012-2035 RTP/SCS. The updates consider primarily the upcoming MAP-21 requirements, and the collective work of California MPOs in identifying common performance monitoring indicators.
## ATTACHMENT 1 - MONITORING OF IMPLEMENTATION ACTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Actions</th>
<th>Specific Implementation Actions</th>
<th>How</th>
<th>Who</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local General Plan/Zoning</strong></td>
<td>General Plan updates to support RTP/SCS (e.g., TOD, infill, concentrating destinations &amp; complete communities)</td>
<td>Survey/IGR</td>
<td>Monitoring Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zoning update to support RTP/SCS</td>
<td>Survey/IGR</td>
<td>Monitoring Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Specific plans overlapping with the Transit Priority Area per SB 743</td>
<td>Survey/IGR</td>
<td>Monitoring Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Housing element compliance</td>
<td>On-going</td>
<td>Housing Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Active Transportation and TDM</strong></td>
<td>Complete streets policy/Bike or pedestrian plan/</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>AT Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TDM programs/ordinances (e.g., rideshare and telecommuting )</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Transit Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parking management plan/ordinance</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Monitoring Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transportation Network and TSM</strong></td>
<td>Timely implementation of FTIP Projects</td>
<td>FTIP database</td>
<td>FTIP staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Planning to support high speed rail</td>
<td></td>
<td>Transportation Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Update of regional and county ITS architecture</td>
<td></td>
<td>Transportation Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Express lane implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Transportation Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Safety and Health</strong></td>
<td>Safe Routes to School Plan/Program</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>AT Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Traffic calming plans/projects</td>
<td></td>
<td>AT Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Active design guidelines</td>
<td></td>
<td>AT Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environmental Sustainability</strong></td>
<td>Climate action plans</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Sustainability Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plans to protect open space and park lands</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Sustainability Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Programs/policies/ordinances for energy efficiency, renewable energy, green building, electric vehicle, water consumption efficiency</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Sustainability Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop Regional PEV Readiness Plan (e.g., charging infrastructure)</td>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Sustainability Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environmental Justice</strong></td>
<td>Mitigation (e.g., air filter installation) for housing within the 500’ buffer</td>
<td></td>
<td>Monitoring Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funding</strong></td>
<td>Planning funds received for the region supportive of SCS</td>
<td></td>
<td>Monitoring Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development/impact fee ordinance</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Monitoring Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dedicated federal funding for freight</td>
<td></td>
<td>Trans. Finance Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Affordable housing trust fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environmental Review Process</strong></td>
<td>CEQA streamlining cases</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Monitoring Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Others</strong></td>
<td>SCAG Joint Work Programs with CTCs</td>
<td>On-going</td>
<td>SCAG/CTC Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>Performance Measures</td>
<td>Definition</td>
<td>Data Sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location Efficiency</strong></td>
<td>Land consumption</td>
<td>Additional land developed</td>
<td>CA Farmland Monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Share of growth in HQTA</td>
<td></td>
<td>ACS, Info Group, EDD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Household transportation cost</td>
<td></td>
<td>CNT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Housing &amp; transportation costs</td>
<td></td>
<td>CNT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acres of parks/1,000 residents</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCAG GIS database</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mobility &amp; Accessibility</strong></td>
<td>Average commute time</td>
<td>Average travel time for work trips</td>
<td>ACS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mode share (work trips)</td>
<td></td>
<td>ACS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Congested freeway VMT</td>
<td></td>
<td>Caltrans PeMS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Person hours of delay</td>
<td></td>
<td>Caltrans PeMS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reliability (auto vs. truck)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Caltrans PeMS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health and Safety</strong></td>
<td>Fatalities</td>
<td>Number and per VMT of fatalities</td>
<td>Caltrans safety database</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Serious injuries</td>
<td>Number and per VMT of serious injuries</td>
<td>Caltrans safety database</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asthma incidences</td>
<td>The share of population who are ever diagnosed with asthma</td>
<td>CA Health Interview Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% households living within 500 feet buffer</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCAG GIS database</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-mature death due to PM2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>ARB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environmental Quality</strong></td>
<td>Ambient air quality conditions</td>
<td>Number of days exceeding federal standards</td>
<td>Transportation model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GHG</td>
<td>CO2 emissions/capita</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>percent change of VMT/capita (as proxy)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Preservation</strong></td>
<td>State of Good Repair</td>
<td>Pending MAP-21 rule-making by U.S. DOT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environmental Justice</strong></td>
<td>Share of growth for 500 feet buffer area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Italic: Proposed additional measures for monitoring subject to further input*

*Note: Per MAP-21, after the U.S. DOT establishes the performance measures by April 2015, additional measures may be further proposed for monitoring*
Item 3 Attachment: One-on-One Meetings with Local Jurisdictions to Update SCAG’s Socioeconomic Data for the 2016-2040 RTP/SCS
One-on-One Meetings with Local Jurisdictions to Provide Assistance for a Bottom-up Local Input Process

December 19, 2013

At the October 3, 2013 CEHD meeting, staff presented the sample package for local input on SCAG’s growth forecast and land use datasets for the 2016 RTP/SCS. Starting in November, all 197 local jurisdictions in the SCAG region have been contacted and were requested to provide input on their current and anticipated population, households, and employment figures for 2012, 2020, 2035, and 2040.

This is in accordance with Stage 2 of the Bottom-up Local Input Process for the 2016 RTP/SCS, as outlined in previous communication with local jurisdictions:

- Stage 1 - Preliminary General Plan, Zoning, Existing Land Use, and Resource Data Collection and Review (March 2013 - September 13, 2013)
- Stage 2 - Review of Base Year 2012 Socioeconomic Data and Future Years’ (2020, 2035, and 2040) Growth Forecast, Green Region Initiative Survey, and Open Space Conservation Activity – Local Government Questionnaire (November 2013 - May 2014); and
- Stage 3 - Land Use Scenario Planning Exercises (May 2014 –September 2014)

SCAG’s socioeconomic data was made available for local review at both the jurisdictional and sub-jurisdictional Transportation Analysis Zone (TAZ) levels. It was transmitted along with SCAG’s Map Book, which has been updated based upon local input and represents the product of Stage 1 of the Local Input Process. Also included in the package was a survey to jurisdictions requesting information on the details of any recently adopted sustainability plans (“Green Region Initiative Survey”) and a questionnaire on local openspace plans; policies; and approaches (“Local Government Questionnaire”).

In order to facilitate the review of this data, SCAG will be presenting at each subregion’s regularly scheduled planning directors’ sessions and will be meeting individually with each local jurisdiction to collect data changes, answer questions, and provide individual assistance. SCAG staff will also conduct a survey on each jurisdiction’s progress in implementing the 2012 RTP/SCS, and will gather data on local policies that have been adopted or are in process to be adopted that support the principles of development outlined in the 2012 RTP/SCS. The local implementation survey includes:

- Active Transportation
- Complete Streets/Safe Routes to School
- General Plan Updates
- TDMs/TSMs
- TODs/Infills
- Transportation Infrastructure Investment
- Openspace
- Green Region Initiatives
Work will begin in January 2014, with the first round of one-on-one meetings continuing through March 2014. By April and May 2014, SCAG staff will be available to meet for a second time with each local jurisdiction, if requested.

Involved in this effort will be staff from SCAG’s Research & Analysis Department; Modeling & Forecasting Department; Sustainability Department; Compliance & Performance Monitoring Department; Transportation Department; and the Regional Affairs Department. Serving as the main point of contact will be Frank Wen, Manager of the Research & Analysis Department, and can be reached at RTPLocalInput@scag.ca.gov or 213-236-1854.
SCAG would like to collect information related to the initial implementation of the 2012-2035 RTP/SCS from local jurisdictions in the region. While participating in the survey is voluntary, it would be beneficial to the region to have each jurisdiction complete the survey. Please provide responses to the questions as they pertain to your jurisdiction.

Jurisdiction Name: ________________________________ Date Completed: ______________________

Survey Respondent Name: __________________________ e-mail: _____________________________

Title: ____________________________________________ phone: _____________________________

General Plan-related Questions

1. Please enter the year of the most recent General Plan Element update. Add information for any additional Elements contained in the General Plan but not listed:
   a) Land use _____________
   b) Circulation ___________
   c) Housing ______________
   d) Conservation __________
   e) Open space ___________
   f) Noise _____________
   g) Safety ______________
   h) Additional Element name & year updated: __________________________
   i) Additional Element name & year updated: __________________________
   j) Additional Element name & year updated: __________________________
   k) Additional Element name & year updated: __________________________
   l) Additional Element name & year updated: __________________________
   m) Additional Element name & year updated: __________________________

2. Is your jurisdiction currently in the process of updating the General Plan? Yes__, No__
   If yes, when do you expect to complete the update? ______

3. Does the most recently adopted general plan update support the following SCS strategies?
   a) TOD Yes__, No__
   b) Infill Yes__, No__
   c) Concentrating destinations Yes__, No__
   d) Complete communities Yes__, No__
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4. If you specified that your jurisdiction is currently developing a new general plan update, does the update intend to support the following SCS strategies?
   a) TOD                                            Yes ___,  No ___
   b) Infill                                          Yes___,   No ___
   c) Concentrating destinations                     Yes ___,  No ___
   d) Complete communities                           Yes ___,  No ___

5. When the zoning code was last updated? _______

6. What were the primary policy objectives of the recent zoning code updates since 2008?
   a) TOD                                            Yes ___,  No ___
   b) Infill                                          Yes___,   No ___
   c) Concentrating destinations                     Yes ___,  No ___
   d) Complete communities                           Yes ___,  No ___
   e) Others:  ___________________________________________________________________

7. Is your jurisdiction currently in the process of updating the zoning code? Yes__, No__
   If yes, when do you expect to complete the update? ______

8. If your jurisdiction overlaps with the High Quality Transit Area (HQTA) as included in the 2012 RTP/SCS, does your jurisdiction have policy incentives to encourage development within the HQTA?  (Please refer to the HQTA Map included in the Draft SCAG Data/Map Book, November 2013, for each local jurisdiction as applicable.)
   Yes ___, No ___

9. For the adopted specific plans overlapping with the existing Transit Priority Areas (TPAs)\footnote{An existing “Transit Priority Area (TPA)”, as defined in SB 743, means an area within one-half mile of an existing major transit stop. (A “major transit stop” means a site containing an existing rail transit station, a ferry terminal served by either a bus or rail transit service, or the intersection of two or more major bus routes with a frequency of service interval of 15 minutes or less during the morning and afternoon peak commute periods.) (Please refer to the existing TPA Map included in the Draft SCAG Data/Map Book, November 2013, for each local jurisdiction as applicable.)} and with certified EIRs, please list their names and years of adoption below. Please use another page if you have more than five.
   a)                                                                                     
   b)                                                                                     
   c)                                                                                     
   d)                                                                                     
   e)                                                                                     


10. For any proposed specific plans overlapping with the existing Transit Priority Areas (TPAs), please list their names and anticipated years of adoption below. Please use another page if you have more than five.

a) ______________________________________________________________________

b) ______________________________________________________________________

c) ______________________________________________________________________

d) ______________________________________________________________________

e) ______________________________________________________________________

11. For any other adopted specific plans not overlapping with the existing Transit Priority Areas (TPAs), please list their names and years of adoption below. Please use another page if you have more than five.

a) ______________________________________________________________________

b) ______________________________________________________________________

c) ______________________________________________________________________

d) ______________________________________________________________________

e) ______________________________________________________________________

12. For General Plan-related questions, please provide:

a) A primary web link to local jurisdiction’s documents
________________________________________________________________________

b) An additional staff contact, if different from the primary contact for this survey, for any follow-up questions as needed.

Name: __________________________ e-mail: _____________________________

Title: ___________________________ phone: _____________________________
Transportation-related Questions

13. Has your jurisdiction adopted the following (if “Yes,” please include the year adopted):
   a) Complete Streets Policy
      Yes__ Year _____, / No__
   b) Safe Routes to School Plan/Program
      Yes__ Year _____, / No__
   c) Bike plan/program
      Yes__ Year _____, / No__
   d) Pedestrian plan/program
      Yes__ Year _____, / No__
   e) Transportation Demand Management program/ordinance
      Yes__ Year _____, / No__
   f) Parking management plan/ordinance
      Yes__ Year _____, / No__
   g) Development/impact fee ordinance
      Yes__ Year _____, / No__

14. Is your jurisdiction currently engaged in developing the following (if “Yes,” please include the anticipated completion year):
   a) Complete Streets Policy
      Yes__ Year _____, / No__
   b) Safe Routes to School Plan/Program
      Yes__ Year _____, / No__
   c) Bike plan/program
      Yes__ Year _____, / No__
   d) Pedestrian plan/program
      Yes__ Year _____, / No__
   e) Transportation Demand Management Program/ordinance
      Yes__ Year _____, / No__
   f) Parking management plan/ordinance
      Yes__ Year _____, / No__
   g) Development/impact fee ordinance
      Yes__ Year _____, / No__

15. For Transportation-related questions, please provide:
   a) A primary web link to local jurisdiction’s documents

   ________________________________________________________________

   b) An additional staff contact, if different from the primary contact for this survey, for any follow-up questions as needed.
      Name: ___________________________ e-mail: ___________________________
      Title: ___________________________ phone: ___________________________
Environmental Sustainability-related Questions (SCAG Green Region Initiative)

16. Please enter the year of adoption if your local jurisdiction has adopted any of the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Plan / Year</th>
<th>Policy / Year</th>
<th>Ordinance / Year</th>
<th>Comments (Please note if work is underway)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Energy Efficiency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solar Energy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Building</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electric Vehicle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Efficiency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid Waste</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate Action Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. For Environmental Sustainability -related questions, please provide:
   a) A primary web link to local jurisdiction’s documents
      __________________________________________________________
   b) An additional staff contact, if different from the primary contact for this survey, for any follow-up questions as needed.
      Name: __________________________ e-mail: _____________________________
      Title: ___________________________ phone: _____________________________

Public Health-related Questions

18. Has your jurisdiction adopted plans, policies, or programs focusing on public health (if “Yes,” please include the year adopted):
   Yes__ Year _____, / No__

19. Is your jurisdiction currently engaged in developing plans, policies, or programs focusing on public health (if “Yes,” please include the anticipated completion year):
   Yes__ Year _____, / No__

CEQA Streamlining-related Questions

20. Does your jurisdiction have potential projects for CEQA streamlining (under SB 743, SB 375, or SB226)?
    Yes ___, No ___

21. In your opinion, what are the barriers, if any, to use CEQA streamlining in your jurisdiction?
    ________________________________________________________________
    ________________________________________________________________
SCAG is compiling an inventory of existing and future open space plans, programs, policies, mitigation and other activities related to open space conservation, preservation, and restoration that are currently occurring in the region. For the purposes of this effort, open space is defined as natural areas, habitat lands, parks or conservation easement areas used for passive recreation (like hiking, biking or equestrian uses).

As part of the 2012-2035 RTP/SCS, SCAG made a commitment to develop a conservation strategy as mitigation activity. The purpose of the strategy is to create a comprehensive database for the SCAG region as well as develop planning resources on wildlife and natural lands that County Transportation Commissions (CTCs) and local jurisdictions could voluntarily use to supplement its own planning activities, as appropriate. The strategy would initiate an information exchange process among the CTCs and other stakeholders. The strategy will build off of existing local plans and can be tailored to meet individual stakeholders’ needs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction:</th>
<th>Date:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contact Person:</td>
<td>Email:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position:</td>
<td>Phone:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Does your jurisdiction have any open space plans, a greenprint, programs, policies, mitigation, mitigation ratios, easements, or other tools and activities related to open space conservation, preservation, and restoration activities?

   *If any of your answers are yes, please answer Q2 – Q6, otherwise skip to Q7.*

2. Please provide a list of open space conservation, restoration, mitigation or similar plans, programs, and/or policies (such as HCPs, NCCPs, TDR, mitigation banking, conservation or agricultural easements, etc.) that have been adopted by your jurisdiction.

3. We have developed an online, web application called MapCollaborator for collecting open space-related data. We are collecting two types of associated data, described below.

   Please go to [http://www.mapcollaborator.org/scag/](http://www.mapcollaborator.org/scag/) to edit our map data. Detailed instructions are available on the webpage.

   a. Open space plans, programs, and/or policies –

   b. California Protected Areas Database (CPAD) Data –

   CPAD is a GIS inventory of all parks and other open space lands that are owned in fee by agencies or NGO groups for conservation purposes. [See attached flyer for more information.](#)

4. Are mitigation activities developed on a project-by-project basis or are there mitigation approaches, plans, policies, and/or procedures for comprehensively mitigating impacts to open space/natural lands in your jurisdiction?
5. If you have an HCP or NCCP or other conservation tool/mechanism in your county, describe how (if) it is related to current plans, programs, or policies in your agency.

[ ] NO. There is no relation between our conservation plans, programs, or policies and any HCPs/NCCPs.

6. What kinds of existing or historic funds (from your general fund, special allocations, or voter-approved taxes/bonds) or other funding mechanisms are available to implement open space conservation plans, greenprints, programs, and policies and/or mitigation activities?

[ ] NO. There are no funds or funding mechanisms available for implementing open space conservation / mitigation activities.

7. Do you have any pending or plans to develop open space conservation plans, programs, or polices in your jurisdiction in the near future? If yes, please list and describe them.

[ ] NO. We do not plan on developing, conservation plans, programs, or policies in the near future.

8. What data resources, tools, examples, or information do you need for considering open space conservation planning or mitigation? What types of data would be useful to have?

9. What other agencies, non-profits, private entities are particularly active in open space planning, mitigation, and conservation in your jurisdiction? Who else should we talk to?

For more information or to return this questionnaire, please contact Jacob Lieb, Manager of Sustainability at (213)236-1921, lieb@scag.ca.gov or Chris Tzeng, Regional Planner at (213) 236-1913, tzeng@scag.ca.gov. Please return this completed questionnaire by Friday, February 14, 2013.
Item 4 Attachment: Pavement and Bridge Condition Database/Management
Potential Preservation Framework
The 2012 RTP/SCS emphasized the importance of preservation

- Unmet needs through 2035 were estimated for transportation infrastructure and equipment:
  - SHOPP Plan for State Highway System (Roads and Bridges)
  - Statewide Needs Assessment for Transit
  - Statewide Needs Assessment for Local Roads

- This time around, SCAG is trying to get more detailed data to better inform decision makers and allow for scenario analysis:
  - Building on the update of the statewide needs assessment
  - Building on the recently developed statewide pavement management system
  - Potentially focusing on specific routes (on the SHS and on local roads)
1. SHS Pavement Conditions
SR-55 Corridor
2008
Pavement Condition

International Roughness Index (IRI)

- Good Ride Quality (IRI Score Less than 55)
- Acceptable Ride Quality (IRI Score Between 55 - 170)
- Unacceptable Ride Quality (IRI Score = 170 or more)
The recently developed State pavement management system would help with scenario analysis

- We already have access to all SHS data from 2011
- Data has been updated recently for some of the SHS
- Funding scenarios would have to be run by Caltrans (they have indicated that they would help)
2. Current Summary
Pavement Conditions for Local Roads
We developed some examples using the 2012 statewide survey

- Summary conditions can be displayed by jurisdiction
- Some data (about 1/3) is missing and had to be estimated in 2012
- This can improve this time around by combining SCAG and State initiatives
- Analytics (i.e., scenario analysis) are possible with summary data
Los Angeles County
Orange County

98 Aliso Viejo
99 Anaheim
100 Brea
101 Buena Park
102 Costa Mesa
103 Cypress
104 Dana Point
105 Fountain Valley
106 Fullerton
107 Garden Grove
108 Huntington Beach
109 Irvine
110 La Habra
111 La Palma
112 Laguna Beach
113 Laguna Hills
114 Laguna Niguel
115 Laguna Woods
116 Lake Forest
117 Los Alamitos
118 Mission Viejo
119 Newport Beach
120 Orange
121 Orange County
122 Placentia
123 Rancho Santa Margarita
124 San Clemente
125 San Juan Capistrano
126 Santa Ana
127 Seal Beach
128 Stanton
129 Tustin
130 Villa Park
131 Westminster
132 Yorba Linda

PCI
- Very Poor/Failed
- Poor
- At Risk
- Good/Excellent
Riverside County
San Bernardino County
Imperial County

PCI
- Red: Very Poor/Failed
- Orange: Poor
- Blue: At Risk
- Green: Good/Excellent

1. Brawley
2. Calexico
3. Calipatria
4. El Centro
5. Holtville
6. Imperial
8. Westmorland
3. Local Bridge Needs Projections
SCAG can rely on FHWA’s bridge conditions data for local bridges to perform what-if analyses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Annual Budget: $0M</strong></td>
<td>Needs (SM)</td>
<td>878</td>
<td>1,150</td>
<td>1,371</td>
<td>1,636</td>
<td>1,894</td>
<td>2,104</td>
<td>2,598</td>
<td>3,099</td>
<td>3,650</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cumulative Work Done (SM)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Avg. Health Index</td>
<td>91.09</td>
<td>90.19</td>
<td>89.28</td>
<td>88.36</td>
<td>87.45</td>
<td>86.53</td>
<td>85.60</td>
<td>84.68</td>
<td>83.76</td>
<td>82.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Avg. Sufficiency Rating</td>
<td>82.64</td>
<td>81.68</td>
<td>80.76</td>
<td>79.47</td>
<td>78.55</td>
<td>77.68</td>
<td>76.25</td>
<td>73.98</td>
<td>71.62</td>
<td>69.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% Structurally Deficient</td>
<td>23.52</td>
<td>28.47</td>
<td>32.10</td>
<td>37.64</td>
<td>41.82</td>
<td>47.58</td>
<td>53.25</td>
<td>57.06</td>
<td>60.35</td>
<td>63.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Annual Budget: $20M</strong></td>
<td>Needs (SM)</td>
<td>878</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>1,331</td>
<td>1,575</td>
<td>1,642</td>
<td>1,793</td>
<td>1,966</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>2,736</td>
<td>3,171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cumulative Work Done (SM)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Avg. Health Index</td>
<td>91.09</td>
<td>90.21</td>
<td>89.38</td>
<td>88.52</td>
<td>87.68</td>
<td>86.83</td>
<td>86.04</td>
<td>85.27</td>
<td>84.43</td>
<td>83.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Avg. Sufficiency Rating</td>
<td>82.64</td>
<td>81.74</td>
<td>80.91</td>
<td>79.76</td>
<td>78.95</td>
<td>78.21</td>
<td>76.95</td>
<td>74.92</td>
<td>72.81</td>
<td>70.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% Structurally Deficient</td>
<td>23.52</td>
<td>28.41</td>
<td>31.71</td>
<td>37.08</td>
<td>40.83</td>
<td>46.69</td>
<td>51.51</td>
<td>54.73</td>
<td>57.95</td>
<td>60.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Annual Budget: $40M</strong></td>
<td>Needs (SM)</td>
<td>878</td>
<td>1,061</td>
<td>1,451</td>
<td>1,642</td>
<td>1,785</td>
<td>1,928</td>
<td>1,996</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>2,736</td>
<td>3,171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cumulative Work Done (SM)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Avg. Health Index</td>
<td>91.09</td>
<td>90.32</td>
<td>89.54</td>
<td>88.85</td>
<td>88.12</td>
<td>87.81</td>
<td>87.41</td>
<td>87.02</td>
<td>86.62</td>
<td>85.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Avg. Sufficiency Rating</td>
<td>82.64</td>
<td>81.83</td>
<td>81.01</td>
<td>79.44</td>
<td>78.92</td>
<td>77.80</td>
<td>76.22</td>
<td>74.92</td>
<td>72.81</td>
<td>70.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% Structurally Deficient</td>
<td>23.52</td>
<td>28.07</td>
<td>30.77</td>
<td>33.75</td>
<td>35.10</td>
<td>38.72</td>
<td>40.55</td>
<td>41.00</td>
<td>41.77</td>
<td>43.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Annual Budget: $50M</strong></td>
<td>Needs (SM)</td>
<td>878</td>
<td>1,051</td>
<td>1,222</td>
<td>1,388</td>
<td>1,422</td>
<td>1,466</td>
<td>1,539</td>
<td>1,793</td>
<td>1,940</td>
<td>2,014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cumulative Work Done (SM)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Avg. Health Index</td>
<td>91.09</td>
<td>90.34</td>
<td>89.67</td>
<td>89.00</td>
<td>88.56</td>
<td>88.12</td>
<td>87.81</td>
<td>87.41</td>
<td>87.02</td>
<td>86.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Avg. Sufficiency Rating</td>
<td>82.64</td>
<td>81.88</td>
<td>81.16</td>
<td>80.47</td>
<td>79.96</td>
<td>79.33</td>
<td>78.72</td>
<td>77.47</td>
<td>75.62</td>
<td>73.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% Structurally Deficient</td>
<td>23.52</td>
<td>28.03</td>
<td>31.31</td>
<td>35.01</td>
<td>36.98</td>
<td>38.72</td>
<td>40.55</td>
<td>41.00</td>
<td>41.77</td>
<td>43.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Annual Budget: $60M</strong></td>
<td>Needs (SM)</td>
<td>878</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>1,202</td>
<td>1,326</td>
<td>1,351</td>
<td>1,412</td>
<td>1,435</td>
<td>1,677</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>1,861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cumulative Work Done (SM)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Avg. Health Index</td>
<td>91.09</td>
<td>90.34</td>
<td>89.67</td>
<td>89.21</td>
<td>88.81</td>
<td>88.80</td>
<td>88.56</td>
<td>88.02</td>
<td>87.80</td>
<td>87.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Avg. Sufficiency Rating</td>
<td>82.64</td>
<td>81.88</td>
<td>81.16</td>
<td>80.47</td>
<td>79.96</td>
<td>79.33</td>
<td>78.72</td>
<td>77.47</td>
<td>75.65</td>
<td>73.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% Structurally Deficient</td>
<td>23.52</td>
<td>28.03</td>
<td>31.77</td>
<td>35.35</td>
<td>35.10</td>
<td>33.39</td>
<td>34.91</td>
<td>36.88</td>
<td>36.00</td>
<td>40.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Annual Budget: $80M</strong></td>
<td>Needs (SM)</td>
<td>878</td>
<td>1,020</td>
<td>1,124</td>
<td>1,267</td>
<td>1,282</td>
<td>1,345</td>
<td>1,385</td>
<td>1,793</td>
<td>1,940</td>
<td>1,911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cumulative Work Done (SM)</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Avg. Health Index</td>
<td>91.09</td>
<td>90.36</td>
<td>89.98</td>
<td>89.70</td>
<td>90.06</td>
<td>89.76</td>
<td>89.95</td>
<td>90.48</td>
<td>91.03</td>
<td>92.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Avg. Sufficiency Rating</td>
<td>82.64</td>
<td>81.93</td>
<td>81.47</td>
<td>80.92</td>
<td>80.95</td>
<td>80.74</td>
<td>80.32</td>
<td>79.87</td>
<td>79.58</td>
<td>79.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% Structurally Deficient</td>
<td>23.52</td>
<td>27.95</td>
<td>29.16</td>
<td>30.20</td>
<td>26.35</td>
<td>27.41</td>
<td>27.11</td>
<td>24.09</td>
<td>23.03</td>
<td>22.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Annual Budget: $100M</strong></td>
<td>Needs (SM)</td>
<td>878</td>
<td>998</td>
<td>1,052</td>
<td>1,135</td>
<td>1,099</td>
<td>1,096</td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>932</td>
<td>898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cumulative Work Done (SM)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>899</td>
<td>998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Avg. Health Index</td>
<td>91.09</td>
<td>90.44</td>
<td>90.29</td>
<td>90.95</td>
<td>91.00</td>
<td>91.59</td>
<td>93.34</td>
<td>94.47</td>
<td>94.62</td>
<td>94.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Avg. Sufficiency Rating</td>
<td>82.64</td>
<td>82.01</td>
<td>81.68</td>
<td>81.71</td>
<td>81.69</td>
<td>81.81</td>
<td>82.34</td>
<td>82.40</td>
<td>82.34</td>
<td>82.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% Structurally Deficient</td>
<td>23.52</td>
<td>27.77</td>
<td>26.61</td>
<td>21.52</td>
<td>21.60</td>
<td>18.95</td>
<td>17.36</td>
<td>14.89</td>
<td>14.05</td>
<td>15.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Transit Needs
We can build on statewide needs assessment and direct discussions with local agencies

- Metro is developing an asset management tool we can likely use for updated data and what-if analysis

- We will use updated Metro numbers when they become available and build on previous statewide efforts

- It is unlikely that we can conduct significant what-if analyses with transit preservation.
Discussion
Item 5 Attachment: Pilot testing of Reliability Tools funded by SHRP-2
Testing of Travel Time Reliability Tools

DEVELOPED UNDER THE
TRANSPORTATION RESEARCH BOARD
STRATEGIC HIGHWAY RESEARCH PROGRAM (SHRP 2)

Naresh Amatya
Ryan Kuo
Margaret Lin
December 19, 2013
2012–2035 RTP/SCS
Focus on performance-based planning

- Built on years of performance-based RTPs
- Travel Time Reliability is one of the metrics considered
Looking beyond the 2012–2035 RTP/SCS

- Lack of data and measurement/forecasting tools were identified as major challenges to performance-based planning during the 2012–2035 RTP/SCS process.
- MAP-21 calls for an enhanced focus on performance-based planning – travel time reliability is one of the 7 areas identified for performance monitoring.
- SCAG continues to seek ways to enhance our ability to support performance-based planning by developing new tools, pursuing data collection, and improving applications and monitoring.
Great partnership opportunity with the TRB

- TRB recently sought pilot sites to test highway **travel time reliability forecasting tools** developed through the SHRP 2 grant program.

- Historical travel time reliability can be readily quantified for corridors for which a rich data source such as PeMS is available.

- The challenge is to forecast travel time reliability and link them to specific investments.

- SCAG applied for and won a TRB SHRP 2 grant to test the newly developed tools.
Great partnership opportunity with the TRB

**SCAG**

Opportunity to experiment with new tools that could enhance our performance-based planning capabilities

**TRB**

Opportunity to have planning agencies ground-test newly developed tools for usability and technical validity
What has our work involved?

- Assess the usability and validity of tools
- Identify corridors to test the tools

Urbanized I-210 in Los Angeles County

I-5 in Orange County
Ease of use of the tools

User interfaces vary in ease of use

SIMPLE & QUICK    COMPLEX & TIME-CONSUMING

Project C11

Project L07

Project L08
Ease of use of the tools

- **C11 Tool**: Quick to run, but offers a limited number of treatments
- **L07 Tool**: Requires more time to prepare, but offers a greater number of treatments, most of which are applicable to our region:
  - Accessible shoulder
  - Alternating shoulder
  - Anti-icing systems
  - Blowing sand
  - Control (gated) turnarounds
  - Crash investigation site
  - Drivable shoulder
  - Emergency access
  - Emergency crossovers
  - Emergency pull-off
  - Extra high median barrier
  - Incident screen
  - Moveable cable barrier
  - Runaway truck ramp
  - Snow fence
  - Wildlife crash reduction
  - Custom treatment flow
  - Custom raw treatment
  - Custom treatment incidents
- **L08 Tool**: Extremely time-consuming to prepare, but offers the ability to test very specific operational improvements
Technical validity of the tools

Tools may be overly simplistic or challenging to use
The tools have a limited ability to be calibrated to PeMS conditions

C11 Tool

L07 Tool

L08 Tool

Mean Travel Time Index (TTI)

Time of Day

Tool results
Real-world conditions (PeMS)
Tools may have the potential to be used by SCAG for planning purposes if several issues can be addressed:

- More guidance on how to calibrate tools for baseline conditions
- Modifications to support modeling particular types of operational projects (i.e. advanced ramp metering, auxiliary lanes, ramp modifications)
- Improvements to method for importing and saving data
- Better support for adjustment of analysis periods
Questions for discussion

- Are you interested in including a consideration of reliability during project planning?
- Do you anticipate travel time reliability impacting project selection and prioritization?
Is this a useful graph for understanding the factors that contribute to unreliable travel?
Would seeing an improvement such as this affect your project selection?
For more information:

Ryan Kuo
kuo@scag.ca.gov

Chris Williges
chris_williges@sysmetgroup.com
Item 6 Attachment: No Attachment