

flipchart notes from all workshops

California Interregional Blueprint Workshop

February 16, 2010—Sacramento, CA

Summary of Comments

Are there any fatal flaws?

- Data – correct? Melds?
- Need plan to take down to local and community level
- SHSP (safety plan) not included
- Caltrans could mediate at MPO boundaries
- RTAC learning – more development needed within regions. Caltrans leadership needed here.
- Data often conflicts! How do we reconcile?

What is your role in this project?

- Sharing data and planning info

Do you have concerns with the modeling framework?

- Concerned with rural areas, how they are represented in models
- How do you reconcile regional plans with interregional approach?
- Sea level rise?
- Are different fuel types accounted for?
- “Moving Cooler” report being used?
- Can model do scenario planning for disasters?
- What role will environmental data play? Level of detail? Cost-benefit analysis?
- Current recession real estate value impacts?
- Jobs-housing balance – this model will help understand the statewide costs. New scenarios are needed, based on regional plans.
- Will the statewide model be vetted with regional models?

Are interregional demand forecasts valuable?

- Yes! (clicker vote)
- But the definition of interregional trips is critical
 - Caltrans policy?
 - Who is your partner?
 - Depends on follow-up, if state is committed, for example with funding it

Is the package of tools in line with leadership you expect from Caltrans? (asked about the Household Travel Survey)

- How do you account for ground transportation to airports?
- Will new U.S. Census results be integrated?
- Chart is missing financial constraint
- What is the criterion of success?

- Use Internet surveys, focus groups for input
- Want my vote to count! For example, online participants from outlying areas can't participate in this meeting

Is Caltrans on track with Interregional Blueprint?

- Freight/economic modeling – where are the private sector today?
- Need more information

Comments and Questions

- How can we stay engaged?

California Interregional Blueprint Workshop

March 2, 2010—Los Angeles, CA

Summary of Comments

Support for Interregional Blueprint?

- 57% strongly support
- Why?
 - Efficiency
 - Consistency between regions
 - The future generations!
- Why not?
 - Rhetoric? Commitment
 - Additional funding for Blueprint forthcoming?
- Project list development?
- Geodata base structure?
- Region and state: consistency in data critical!

Do you see a role for yourself in project?

- Yes – 57%
- Depends – 34%
- Yes!
 - All of us do!
 - Districts share corridors and services
 - Engage/invite partners to consolidate vision and implement plan
 - Matches our mission
 - Finding the gaps!
 - Combine resources
 - Connection between regional measures and CIB?
 - City involvement key!
 - Strengthening regional transportation
 - Public health—transportation connection: education
 - Design at local level that enforces/supports interregional goals
- Depends
 - If efforts are model-based – who verifies accuracy?
 - District facilitate better communication
 - Demonstration projects help build local-regional connections
 - Role of HOT lanes?
 - SB 375 at state level?
 - How does this work?
 - How does plan protect airports?
 - Consolidated regional plan – how/who to assess goals met?
 - Will state propose new projects to regions?

Gaps or concerns with modeling framework?

- Yes – 57%
 - How to encourage interregional cooperation?
 - Solid economic projections?
 - Transparency in data analysis and modeling key – share data!
 - Social equity and disease burden part of data
 - Analysis?
 - Consider age differentiated groups
 - How will bike/pedestrian be represented in state model?
 - SIIM relation to SB 375 and interregional trips?
 - Would/where toll be integrated in model?
 - How will lack of freight data be dealt with?
 - Consistency in data definition
 - Web interface – disputing D.O.F. forecasts
 - State model – high speed rail to be included as mode choice?
 - Effort underway to bring more funds? Contingency in place?
 - Model too complicated? – less accurate results
 - How to account for atypical trips?
 - Ways to assess/identify areas of potentially high amount of bike/pedestrian activity
 - HH travel survey accuracy?
 - New technology to improve?
 - Model to address/integrate economic impacts of various transit modes (e.g., BRT)
 - How will models compare Air Resources Board standards?

How valuable for your region to have economic forecasts that assess...

- Yes – 90%

Consistent Interregional Forecasts

- Very valuable or valuable – 90%
 - Targets to be integrated in this cycle of planning?

Impacts of state poll on H.H.

- Valuable – 52%
- Very valuable – 37%

Tools from Caltrans in line with needs?

- Yes – 50%
- Depends – 30%
 - Hardware/software support
 - How will models be maintained and updated?
 - Create specs to be shared
 - Need more face-time (real relationships and engagement) to create a successful process and product

California Interregional Blueprint Workshop

March 1, 2010—San Diego, CA

Summary of Comments

Why Support Blueprint?

- Address climate change
- Link the regions
 - i.e., goods movement
- Avoid losing sight of local trips!
- Impact of AB 32 suspension? (potential)
 - Still important!
 - Partnerships are critical!

Integrating Plans

- Assumptions re: aeronautics capacity?
 - F.A.A. data
- Impact gas tax decline?
 - Tracking long range projections
 - Consider models from Netherlands! Technology trends!
- Smart Mobility and Complete Streets
 - Smart Mobility: new data available
 - Complete Streets: new implementation plan
- Addressing local transit needs?
 - Identify local capacities, link to congestion, V.M.T.; new data!

Roles and Links:

- Regional transportation plans: link to state and interregion
- Goods movement in Imperial County
- Consultant support

Modeling

Concerns/Gaps:

- Bike/walk included?
 - In SANDAG model
 - State model less effective
- Technical effects on travel costs?
 - Will be explored
- Pricing: driving, parking assumptions?
 - Many opportunities and strategies
- Need good social and economic data and trends
- Consider new MPO/regional boundaries for trip studies

- Include non-transportation models? (Video-conferencing, etc.)
 - Little data and guidance
- Web-based model accessibility?
 - Plans for agency-level
 - MPO data uploads
 - Shift controls to MPOs
 - Broader access

Economic Forecasts—Public Infrastructure:

- Identify unfunded mandates
 - State role?
- Credible models help to build consensus

Interregional Demand Forecasts:

- Important to San Diego
- Needs to be “right and complete”
 - Integrity in the process

Forecasts: Households with Income and Class

- Assess policy effects
 - e.g., pricing, transit funding
- Pricing can be adjusted to income levels
- Valuable to Imperial County

Tools and Leadership

- Partner agencies (state-level) in related/affected areas
- Need to pursue pricing
 - Potentially one of many solutions

Moving Forward...

- How do NGOs contribute?
 - Monitor; coordinate at local level
 - Expand public involvement when tools are in place
 - Regional transportation plans
- Need strong strategies, including pricing; it’s necessary!
- Model updates?
 - Need maintenance
- Could local control limit interregional improvement?
- Concern: losing “statewide” system perspective
- Impact on project delivery?
 - Planning feeds projects

California Interregional Blueprint Workshop

March 17, 2010—Redding, CA

Summary of Comments

What are the Missing Issues? (Looking at the list of rural issues)

- Impact of recreational traffic on rural roads
- Property rights
- Limited funds
- Pristine environment
- Maintenance
- Emergency services
- Lack of healthcare
- Employment - education

What would it take to support the Interregional Blueprint concept?

- What is the final product? A compilation? Scenarios?
- Concerned about cross-border impacts (e.g. Del Norte County and Oregon)
- Transit connectivity

Why is this an important effort?

- It's the future
- Employment

What would have to change for you to say "yes"?

- Caltrans policy?
- Who is your partner?
- Depends on follow-up, if state is committed, for example with funding it

Other comments?

- Chart is missing financial constraint
- What is the criterion of success?
- Use Internet surveys, focus groups for input
- Want my vote to count! For example, online participants from outlying areas can't participate in this meeting

Gaps or Concens with Modeling Framework

- Sample size in rural area for household travel survey is too small. May need a supplement.
- Weekends? Travel increases on weekends! Holidays too.
- Will the goods movement component consider the value of goods?
- How do RTPAs fit in? (versus MPOs)
- The maps are inaccurate. Locals need to be more involved in the process, making updates to the data
- UCD is exceptional to work with!

- Shasta MPO is improving its model now. How does the timing and funding coordinate with the state's effort?
- SR 199 is not on the maps! It's a key roadway for Del Norte County.

Comments on Tools and Caltrans Leadership

- How will this initiative affect construction of projects?
- Tools are important but how it's presented to decisionmakers is important. It needs to be simple.
- Criteria assessment is important for rural Northern California
- I question the completeness and accuracy of the information

California Interregional Blueprint Workshop

March 22, 2010—Fresno, CA

Summary of Comments

Why is it important to support this Blueprint?

- To get federal funds!
- Can't plan in a vacume
- Got to make changes – greenhouse gases!
- Don't duplicate efforts
- Will it help with interregional and internal state departments coordination?
- Freeways create sprawl – need a balance economically. Farm-to-market roads. Not using assets efficiently.
- Need a multi-modal, holistic perspective!

What do you see as your role in Interregional Blueprint?

- Applying political pressure to try to get it done
- Making sure that local/regional information goes to the State
- Coordinating this region's blueprint activities with others
- Local agencies will have staffing resource issues
- Health needs must be addressed
- It depends – there is the issue of implementation

Gaps or concens with modeling framework

- MPO data consistency? Greenhouse gas measures?
- Water data
- Sampling on Household Travel Survey – should include the entire week, not just weekdays
- Rural California should be oversampled in the survey
- What about interstate trips?
- What about air quality, other than greenhouse gases?
- We have funding constraints – funding is decreasing!
- How are public health concerns handled in modeling?
- What about the jobs/housing balance?

Value of economic forecasts?

- Fresno has developed around the auto. It is very sensitive to changes in gas prices.
- Could put higher gas revenues back into transit, for example could model that scenario
- It's good the state is doing this modeling – smaller agencies can't do it
- Will the model compare the regional impacts of alternative mode investments? For example an 8-lane freeway versus transit?
- Economic forecasts are notoriously unreliable!

Value of economic forecasts?

- Can no longer meet every demand for local facilities (supply). Need to better utilize the supply.

Value of income class forecasts?

- These are input for running the models at the regional level
- Investment equity issues
- To know the impacts on lower income people

California Interregional Blueprint Workshop

April 6, 2010—Oakland, CA

Summary of Comments

Support for Blueprint

- Did you critique 3 state laws?
- Can we move faster and achieve goals earlier?
- Will grassroots leaders be involved in data collection?
- Will this be coordinated with national household travel survey?
- Supports concept – cited examples of dysfunctions
 - High speed rail
 - Funding focused on highways and hot lanes
 - Concerns about HSR modeling
- Concern about use of data – politicians not concerned with data
- Project emphasizes highest capacity mode – need to include local connection (incl. sidewalks)
- Coordination of data processes will be useful
- How does this interact with local zoning and land use planning? Is there enforcement?

Integrating Statewide Plans

- Concerns about HOV lanes and their impact on climate change
- Failure to analyze greenhouse gas impacts
- Need for goals at state level to force change in the RTP
- Caltrans is most important agency to impact greenhouse gas impacts – but it's not happening yet
- Can there be an incentive to use Complete Streets/SMF?
- How will Caltrans control sprawl and include in VMT as plan is completed?
- How will SMF apply to Caltrans oversight projects?
- Will there be discussion of diesel generating vehicles through communities?
- How can California provide leadership through pricing solutions?
- How do plans link to budgeting process?
- How will SMF be implemented?
- Look at people Caltrans has to implement good planning
- Habitat connectivity – need trunk overlay
- Inter-regional transit – framework doesn't help you to get on or off at “stations”
- Key issues are political – not planning. Need to bring in political support to get resolution. Can't be done solely with technical/planning skills.

New Transportation Era

- How will California process better represent bike/ped trips?
- Cycletrack – FSCITA – is Caltrans aware of this effort?
- Activity based model – very data hungry – will Caltrans have enough data?
- Concerns about MPO questioning validity of data – is Caltrans going out in advance?
- Models applied in Latin American countries – request for example
- Are population projections being adjusted in response to economic conditions?

- Timeline – will base case be 2010 or will it be the “do nothing scenario?”

Concerns/Gaps

- Will we have projects where sole purpose is to reduce greenhouse gases?
- Advice – bring “non-believers” on modeling into process
- How do you address influence of politicians on process?
- Exercise is very valuable – highlight best practices of regions with less resources
- Raise bar for modeling
- Can modeling percolate political essence out of it?
- Surprised by competition!