
From: Corley, Gabriel P@DOT
Sent: Tuesday, March 15, 2016 9:57 AM
To: ~~Corley, Gabriel P@DOT~~ & G€@DOT
Cc: Record, Patrick@DOT
Subject: FW: Question on Table 13 Final Draft CTP

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Please add this to our comments. Thanks.

Gabriel Corley
Office of State Planning
Caltrans
ph: 916.653.1305
e: gabriel.corley@dot.ca.gov
www.californiatransportationplan2040.org

From: Jack Lucero Fleck [mailto:luceroofleck@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, March 14, 2016 5:31 PM
To: Taylor, Jonathan@ARB
Cc: Korte, Pamela J@DOT; Cunningham, Joshua@ARB; Vanderspek, Sylvia@ARB; Mallory, David@ARB; Clegern, David@ARB; Ratekin, Chris E@DOT; Corley, Gabriel P@DOT
Subject: Re: Question on Table 13 Final Draft CTP

Thanks, Jonathan. I also received basically this same explanation from Patrick Record. Below is my response to Patrick.

Thank you Patrick!

My understanding, then, is that the reductions shown in Table 13 are the percentages below the VMT that are projected for 2040 in Scenario 1. Since Scenario 1 has a 34% increase in VMT compared to 2010, and Scenario 2 has a 4% increase in VMT compared to 2010, the strategies in Table 13 result in 30% decrease in VMT for Scenario 2 compared to Scenario 1.

I appreciate the clarification. I do think the table and/or text should also make that clear.

Unfortunately, the fact remains that, under scenario 2, since total VMT increases compared to the present, there is no reduction of GHGs due to the strategies in Table 13 compared to the current level of GHGs. I think we can agree that cutting GHGs to 80% below the level of 1990 requires not just stopping the increase in GHGs, but reducing the absolute levels. And this is where Scenario 3 comes to the rescue. Of course, I do support all the strategies in Scenarios 1 and 2, and ~~feel they are essential as well.~~

Thanks again for your explanation and all the excellent work for the CTP.

Jack Lucero Fleck

So thanks, Jonathan, for your response and explanation. I do hope this can be clarified in the final CTP (i.e. that the reductions in table 13 are in comparison to the projected VMT in Scenario 1, not current VMT).

I'm looking forward to working with all of you to support implementation of the CTP!

Jack Lucero Fleck

On Mon, Mar 14, 2016 at 11:55 AM, Taylor, Jonathan@ARB <jonathan.taylor@arb.ca.gov> wrote:

Mr. Fleck,

The calendar year 2040 GHG reductions shown in Table 3 of the ARB letter in Appendix 7 and also shown in Table 16 of the CTP 2040 document are due to reducing the calendar year 2040 total daily VMT from 929 million to 719 million as shown in Table 14. The reduction in total VMT is due to the strategies listed in Table 13, where the percent reductions are in terms of VMT, *not* per capita.

Hope this is helpful.

Best,

Jon

Jonathan Taylor, P.E.

Assistant Chief,

Air Quality Planning and Science Division

California Air Resources Board

jonathan.taylor@arb.ca.gov

Ph. [916-445-8699](tel:916-445-8699)

FAX: [916-322-3646](tel:916-322-3646)

From: Jack Lucero Fleck [mailto:lucero@fleck@gmail.com]

Sent: Thursday, March 10, 2016 7:38 AM

To: Korte, Pamela J@DOT; Cunningham, Joshua@ARB; Taylor, Jonathan@ARB; Vanderspek, Sylvia@ARB; Mallory, David@ARB; Clegern, David@ARB; Ratekin, Chris E@DOT; Corley, Gabriel P@DOT

Subject: Question on Table 13 Final Draft CTP

Pam Korte

Joshua Cunningham

Jonathan Taylor

Sylvia Vanderspek

David Mallory

Dave Clegern

Chris Ratekin

Gabriel Corley

Dear CTP and CARB planners & engineers,

Could you please confirm that the percent reductions in VMT for Scenarios 2/3 in Table 13 are per capita? I had thought in the first draft of the plan that these were absolute values; however, I see in Table 2 in Appendix 7 that the absolute level of VMT in Scenario 2 is 4% higher in 2040 than in 2010. Therefore, I assume these reductions must be per capita.

Is that correct?

If so, are the reductions in GHGs in Scenario 2, Table 16, mostly from fuel efficiency improvements for LDVs (as shown in Table 3 of the CARB letter in Appendix 7)?

Thanks for answering these questions, and for your very good work on the CTP.

--Jack Lucero Fleck

PE, Traffic (retired)
