	****FINAL**** **california interregional blueprint** **Sacramento Stakeholder Workshop Meeting Notes**	**November 4, 2011** **9:00 am – 11:30 am** **Sacramento Convention Center**

Workshop Participants

For a list of workshop participants, please see Appendix A.

Agenda Review and Introductions

- Traci Stevens, Acting Secretary of the Business, Transportation and Housing Agency, and Malcolm Dougherty, Acting Director of Caltrans, welcomed attendees to the conference.
- Martin Tuttle highlighted Caltrans efforts that are underway such as:
    - The various modal plans: Highway, Freight, Rail, Transit, and Aviation
    - Smart Mobility Framework – Approach with a focus on the integration of transportation and land use.
    - Complete Streets – Policy that ensures the consideration of transportation choices and safe access for all users in the design of transportation facilities.
- Martin Tuttle then introduced the CIB video, which emphasized that the Interregional Blueprint incorporates all modes and uses data to help determine which transportation investments will be best for the state.
- Answers to the first two polling questions revealed that people from MPOs made up the majority of the audience – both in person and on the web.

Polling Results

- Please see the Appendix B for detailed polling results.
- Please see Appendix C for a summary of comments emailed by webcast participants during the workshop.

California Interregional Blueprint and California Transportation Plan Overview

- Sharon Scherzinger gave an overview of the CIB, the California Transportation Plan (CTP), and the I-580 video.
- Highlights include:
    - Hope that the economic crisis doesn't hold us back and that we can envision a better transportation system in the future.
    - SB 391 tasks Caltrans with the responsibility to assess how SCSs will affect statewide travel demand and transportation needs.
    - Sharon briefly described the modal plans, which will be integrated during preparation of the CTP.
    - Regarding technical items, Caltrans is administering a household travel survey; developing a statewide travel demand model and a statewide freight model; and

has developed CT Earth, a “library of layers”, which allows one to see the entire transportation system and other key pieces related to the environment, etc.
    - The I-580 video exemplifies the kind of interregional travel issues that Caltrans and its partners face across the state.
- Andrew Chesley, Executive Director of the San Joaquin Council of Governments (SJCOG) described the I-580 project, which addressed the congestion problem on I-580 between the Bay Area and the San Joaquin Valley. Partners included Caltrans, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC), San Joaquin Council of Governments (SJCOG), Stanislaus Council of Governments (STANCOG), and the Alameda County Transportation Commission (ACTC).

Panel and Audience Participation: Statewide Modal Plans

- Pam Korte introduced the modal plans as well as panel members Derek Kantar (Aviation), Bruce de Terra (Freight), Jila Priebe (Transit) and Nathan Smith (Rail). Highlights from Pam’s presentation include:
    - The Highway Plan discusses ten focus routes, some of which cover rural areas; goals include improving interregional goods movement and urban mobility.
    - The Freight Mobility Plan aims to improve movements with less negative economic impact on communities and incorporates priority corridors defined in 2007.
    - The Rail Plan includes passenger and freight rail and addresses the large number of passengers who use the system (5.58 million in the past year).
    - The Transit Plan aims to improve mobility and create transit vision for California.
    - The Aviation Plan promotes airports as business and community hubs.
- Chuck Anders led audience participation exercises that included five polling questions and follow-up discussion. The discussion is summarized below by question. Detailed polling responses are provided in the Appendix B.
- **Modal Question 1: What would be the most important criterion for Caltrans to consider when deciding the priority for project implementation on “focus routes”? (Select up to two responses)**
    - Traffic volume, safety, and trucking freight needs were popular responses.
    - In response to a question from Humboldt County related to the timing of RTP updates and how they will fit into the ITSP, Caltrans responded that it will review and include all work done on the RTP at the point that the ITSP is being updated, regardless of whether the latest RTP is finalized.(?)
    - Caltrans Complete Streets document will ensure that alternative modes such as bicycle and pedestrian are included.
- **Modal Question 2: Which of the following aspects of Freight Mobility would be most useful to you? (Select up to two responses)**
    - The prioritized list of good movement projects ranked high.
- **Modal Question 3: How can we make the Rail Plan more useful to you? (Select up to two responses)**
    - Corridor plans ranked high (almost 50% of responses).
    - Competition between passenger and freight rail is an issue. Why?

        - Corridor plans allow you to look at various alternatives.
        - The broad understanding that comes from corridor plans is valuable.
    - "Other" responses included the desire to match the statewide and regional priorities.
- **Modal Question 4: What are the main challenges to achieving regional coordination in transit planning? (Select up to two responses)**
    - Policy differences between local transit providers and between land use agencies are a challenge.
    - In response to a question about private transit providers, Jila Priebe responded that both public and private transit providers are included in the transit plan, but the working group for the Statewide Transit Strategic Plan is largely composed of public providers.
    - Comment: The recently released California High Speed Rail Authority's Business Plan focuses a lot on connectivity and one system.
    - Comment: We should focus on the rider's experience and provide an integrated payment system.
    - Jila Priebe responded that Caltrans is working with researchers to find the best payment system.
    - The land use pattern has a great impact on ridership.
- **Modal Question 5: Do you agree or disagree with this statement: "Airports play an important role in stimulating economic activity in my region"?**
    - Over 70% of participants either "agreed" or "strongly agreed" with this statement.
    - Derek Kantar mentioned an increase in mixed-use developments at airports.
    - Comment: I disagree with the statement. What about rural airports?
    - Comment: Our goal is for air travel to increase economic activity, so how will this modal information feed into the Blueprint? The value is in thinking about them together.
    - As a response to that comment, Pam Korte pointed out that the workshop next April is about bringing everything together.
    - Comment: It is hard for some of us that don't have expertise in particular modes to speak about these topics.
    - Bruce de Terra explained that Caltrans understands that point and that they are trying to link to the broader picture.
    - Comment: The ITSP is going in the right direction. Additionally, consider the focus and emphasis. Think about "reliever routes of regional significance". These can help relieve congestion (e.g. Route 132).
    - Question: Is Caltrans investing in Transportation Demand Management (TDM)?
    - Bruce de Terra: We are supporting data collection that helps TDM (e.g. estimated driving times), but we are not involved in programs such as ride share matching.

Panel and Audience Participation: California Interregional Blueprint Interim Report

- Sharon Scherzinger provided an overview of the Interim Report (IR).

- SB 391 requires that the IR:
    - Provides a list and overview of Sustainable Communities Strategies (SCS) and Alternative Planning Strategies (APS) from across the state; and
    - Assesses how the SCS and APS will influence the configuration of the statewide integrated multimodal transportation system.
- Data will be gathered using the following methods:
    - Consult MPOs for the best available data;
    - Work closely with the Interim Report Working Group that includes members of the largest California MPOs as well as state agencies and tribal governments; and
    - Describe trends that could impact ability to achieve GHG reduction targets.
- The IR will also lay the groundwork for Greenhouse Gas (GHG) analysis in the California Transportation Plan.
- Sharon Scherzinger introduced the Interim Report panelists.
- Highlights from Matt Carpenter (SACOG) overview:
    - SACOG is trying to be more performance-oriented and established greenhouse gas (GHG) reduction targets.
    - There are 2 areas of focus: mixed-use and TDM/ITS/Complete Streets
    - SACOG is moving toward the adoption of its SCS
    - The California Interregional Blueprint is valuable because it provides coordination, which is critical for good mobility and it will show the impacts of policies such as pricing across the state.
- Highlights from Andy Chesley (SJCOG) overview:
    - The Valley wide Blueprint effort will guide joint investments
    - Building on the recently adopted [2010] San Joaquin Blueprint.
    - Target adoption date for next RTP is 2013.
    - Details include moving toward an activity-based model, with help from the state, which will lead into SCS strategy development.
    - Regarding strategy development, should we work as an eight-county group or a two- or three-county group?
- Highlights from Dave Ory (MTC) overview:
    - MTC is currently developing scenarios, will review them with the public this winter, and will come out with a preferred alternative in the spring.
    - This RTP Planning effort is different from the past in two ways:
        - MTC is working with new partners: cities and CARB. In the past, had relationships mostly with the nine counties.
        - Greater emphasis on efficiency and ITS, pricing strategies, and GHG investments.
    - Highlights from Doug Ito (ARB) overview:
        - Have been working on SB 375 for three years.
        - One result of this work has been the amazing communication between MPOs and local governments.
        - Caltrans is trying to encourage and continue that collaboration.

        - Looking forward to seeing how the strategies play out; each area is unique.
- Chuck Anders led audience participation exercises that included four polling questions and follow-up discussion. The discussion is summarized below by question. Detailed polling responses are provided in Appendix B.
- **Interim Report Question 1: What do you think will be the biggest influence of SCSs on the "configuration of the statewide integrated multimodal transportation system"? (select one response)**
    - "Change the types of projects needed in interregional corridors" had the most responses.
    - An audience member commented that we should think outside the box when deciding what to put in corridors.
    - The jobs/housing balance was discussed as an important factor.
- **Interim Report Question 2: How should the Interim Report address integrated transportation and land use in rural areas? (select all that apply)**
    - The top three answers (in order) were "discuss influence of interregional travel from urban areas on rural transportation needs", "discuss jobs/housing balance between rural and urban areas", and "discuss transportation and economic vitality for rural areas".
    - For the "Other" answers, natural resources conservation was mentioned.
    - Matt Carpenter mentioned the importance of safety investments.
    - Comment: Land use and housing are driving transportation needs.
    - Dave Ory responded that the MTC/ABAG OneBayArea grant program is a positive step toward integrating transportation with land use and housing.
- **Interim Report Question 3: Which of the following topics should be top priorities for the Interim Report?**
    - "Interaction between regional and statewide projects" and "demand for interregional passenger travel" ranked high.
    - Matt Carpenter was surprised by the jobs/housing and freight responses (lower than expected) since SACOG think they are important.
- **Interim Report Question 4: In which of the following areas can the Interim Report make its greatest contribution for your agency's planning needs (select up to two responses)?**
    - The relationship and shared responsibility between interregional travels was mentioned in the "Other" category.
    - Dave Ory: The responsibility is a tricky thing; we're all responsible and sometimes it is difficult to account for. For example, how can cities reduce GHG emissions? We could say "don't build more houses", but that could be detrimental in some cases.
    - Sharon: An interregional model would help; I'm optimistic about what we can achieve.
    - Andy Chesley: You could just say regions can divide the GHG emissions in half (e.g. between SJCOG and MTC) but that isn't satisfying.

    - Comment: Encouraged by your answers; Caltrans has become kinder and gentler.
- Pam Korte closed this portion of the workshop by noting that next steps are to draft the Interim Report by next April, with a final draft complete in the summer of 2012 to meet the December 2012 legislation deadline.

Closing Remarks

- Ron West remarked that we are dealing with complex issues and thanked everyone for their participation.
- Marty Tuttle summarized that Caltrans' goal is to be relevant and reiterated that Caltrans and the audience are in it together.
    - Caltrans is working to figure out how to effectively link the regions.
    - We need to be multimodal and pull all the pieces together with limited funding.
    - We have to deliver it, especially with limited funding.
    - We have the data and the political support.
- The workshop adjourned at 11:30 AM.

Appendix A. Workshop Participants

Table A1. In-Person Participant List*

Number	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Organization Type
1	Pitto	Mary	RCRC	City or County Government
2	Philley	Paul	Sacramento Air Quality Management District	City or County Government
3	Roberts	Caelum	Sacramento County Planning	City or County Government
4	Hobbs	Wade	Federal Highway Administration	Federal Agency
5	Vaughn	Joseph	Federal Highway Administration	Federal Agency
6	Bettis	Rick	Breathe CA and Sierra Club	Nonprofit/Advocacy
7	Higgins	Bill	CALCOG	Nonprofit/Advocacy
8	Baker	DeAnn	CSAC	Nonprofit/Advocacy
9	Gonzalez	Jessica	PECG	Nonprofit/Advocacy
10	Teranishi	Sue	Sacramento TMA	Nonprofit/Advocacy
11	Khalhn	Alex	Amtrak	Other
12	Britt	Chester	Arellano Associates	Other
13	Bardet	Maria	Assemblymember Bob Blumenfield	Other
14	Chan	Daryl	Capitol Corridor	Other
15	Fassinger	Paul	CTP Planning & Economics	Other
16	Damkowitch	Jim	Dowling Associates	Other
17	dowling	richard	Dowling Associates	Other
18	Kiattikomol	Vasin	Dowling Associates	Other
19	Lee	Richard	Fehr & Peers	Other
20	Weatherford	Brian	Legislative Analyst's Office	Other
21	Hubbard	Don	Parsons Brinckerhoff	Other
22	Cederoth	Margaret	Parsons Brinckerhoff	Other
23	Schimpp	Tricia	RCH Group	Other

Number	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Organization Type
24	Canfield	Traci	Sacramento Regional Transit	Other
25	Pair	Chris	Sacramento Regional Transit	Other
26	Guzman	Pedro	Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority	Other
27	McHenry	Jennifer	UC Davis	Other
28	Grassi	Elizabeth	ULTRANS, ITS-Davis	Other
29	Herbel	Susan	Cambridge Systematics	Other
30	Allison	James	Capitol Corridor JPA	Regional Planning Agency
31	Deloria	Woodrow	El Dorado County Transportation Commission	Regional Planning Agency
32	Chesley	Andrew	San Joaquin Council of Governments	Regional Planning Agency
33	Swearingen	Michael	San Joaquin Council of Governments	Regional Planning Agency
34	Wayne	Daniel	Shasta County RTPA	Regional Planning Agency
35	Taylor	Tanisha	SJCOG	Regional Planning Agency
36	De Leon Park	Rosa	Stanislaus Council of Governments	Regional Planning Agency
37	Yamzon	Carlos	Stanislaus Council of Governments	Regional Planning Agency
38	Hansen	Adam	Tehama County Transportation Commission	Regional Planning Agency
39	Harrasser	Sean	Tehama County Transportation Commission	Regional Planning Agency
40	O'Keeffe	Barbara	Tehama County Transportation Commission	Regional Planning Agency
41	Jelicich	John	Trinity County Transportation Commission	Regional Planning Agency
42	Gress	Jennifer	Air Resources Board	State Agency
43	Henshaw	Jake	Air Resources Board	State Agency
44	Ito	Doug	Air Resources Board	State Agency
45	Mason	John	CA High Speed Rail Authority	State Agency
46	Albright	R. Gregg	California High Speed Rail, Program Management Team	State Agency
47	Gilbertson	Annette	California Transportation Commission	State Agency

Number	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Organization Type
48	Dillon	lianne	CDPH	State Agency
49	Peters	Jessica	LAO	State Agency
50	Ganson	Chris	OPR	State Agency
51	Allison	Joe	OPR	State Agency
52	Annis	Brian	Senate Budget Committee	State Agency
53	Cronin	Tamara		Unknown
54	Lagomarsino	Bob		Unknown
55	Stringer	Walt		Unknown

*****Caltrans attendees are not included in this list.

Table A3. Webcast Participant List*

Number	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Organization Type
1	Hall	Jack	CCTA	City or County Government
2	Lamas	Angelo	County of Merced	City or County Government
3	Green	Angel	Placer County	City or County Government
4	Selling	Michael	San Joaquin County Public Works	City or County Government
5	Muck	Todd	TAMC	City or County Government
6	Flores	David	Casa Familiar	Nonprofit/Advocacy
7	Hall	Kevin	Central Valley Air Quality Coalition	Nonprofit/Advocacy
8	Gleichman	Greg	AECOM	Other
9	Hutchison	Jonathan	Amtrak	Other
10	Malta	Scott	Castle Airport - Merced Co	Other
11	Persons	Terri	Dow Associates	Other
12	Erickson	Mark	Port of Oakland	Other
13	Beardsley	Karen	UC Davis	Other
14	VonBerg	Eric	URS	Other
15	Leighton	Tamera	Del Norte Local Transportation Commission	Regional Planning Agency
16	Barton	Jerry	EDCTC	Regional Planning Agency

Number	Last Name	First Name	Organization	Organization Type
17	Steck	Barbara	Fresno COG	Regional Planning Agency
18	Thomas	Mardy	Glenn County TC	Regional Planning Agency
19	Clem	Marcella	HCAOG	Regional Planning Agency
20	A	B	KCAG	Regional Planning Agency
21	Napier	Becky	Kern Council of Governments	Regional Planning Agency
22	Napier	Becky	Kern Council of Governments	Regional Planning Agency
23	Kao	Kenneth	Metropolitan Transportation Commission	Regional Planning Agency
24	Moriconi	Rachel	Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission	Regional Planning Agency
25	Friedman	Matt	Caltrans	State Agency
26	Hu	Ronaldo	Caltrans	State Agency
27	Srivastava	Rahul	Caltrans	State Agency
28	Thompson	Pamela	Caltrans	State Agency
29	Berggren	David	Caltrans D06 (Fresno)	State Agency
30	Arango	Mylissa		Unknown
31	Couch	Pam		Unknown
32	Davey-Bates	Lisa		Unknown
33	De la Fuente	Rita		Unknown
34	Fiore	C		Unknown
35	Gallippi	Connie		Unknown
36	Grant	David		Unknown
37	Landstrom	Anne		Unknown
38	Loe	Aileen		Unknown
39	Miller	Seth		Unknown
40	Norton	Chelsey		Unknown
41	Planthold	Bob		Unknown
42	Pogue	Thomas		Unknown
43	Roth	Nathaniel		Unknown
44	S	S		Unknown
45	Saadatnejadi	Lan		Unknown

*Note: There were 14 anonymous webcast participants.

Table A4. Summary Table

Number of in-person participants (not including Caltrans staff)	55
Number of webcast participants who identified themselves	*45*
Number of anonymous webcast participants	*14*
Total Number of Webcast Participants	59
Total Number of Participants	**114**

Appendix B. Sacramento Workshop Polling Results

1.) What type of organization do you represent today? (select one) (multiple choice)

Answer Choices	Responses
Municipal Government	0.0%
County Government	3.9%
MPO or RTPA (within MPO region)	20.2%
Rural RTPA	7.7%
State Agency	31.7%
Transit Agency	7.7%
Tribal Government	0.0%
Nongovernmental Organization	10.6%
Other	18.3%
Totals	100.0%

2.) How are you participating in today's workshop? (select one) (multiple choice)

Answer Choices	Responses
In-person at the workshop	63%
Remote via Webcast	37%
Totals	100%

3.) What would be the most important criteria for Caltrans to consider when deciding the priority for project implementation on focus routes? (Select up to two responses) (multiple choice)*

Answer Choices	Responses
Traffic Volume	28.9%
Safety	22.1%
Trucking/Freight Needs	24.8%
Alternate Route Availability	11.4%
Potential Funding Partnerships	12.1%
Other	6.0%

*Note: The results were calculated as they were during the workshop, as follows:
(number participants selecting an individual choice / total number of participants responding)*100

4.) Which of the following aspects of the Freight Mobility Plan would be most useful to you? (select up to two responses) (multiple choice)*

Answer Choices	Responses
Statewide freight policies	11.4%
A prioritized list of goods movement projects	28.2%
Funding sources and strategies	24.8%
Mitigation measures for environmental/community impacts	
Updated freight and GIS products	8.1%
Analysis of regional freight issues, trends and projects	26.8%
Other	2.7%

*Note: The results were calculated as they were during the workshop, as follows:
(number participants selecting an individual choice / total number of participants responding)*100

5.) How can we make the Rail Plan more useful to you? (select up to two responses) (multiple choice)*

Answer Choices	Responses
Statewide priorities	18.1%
Corridor plans	36.2%
Project lists	14.1%
Passenger projections	26.8%
Freight projections	18.1%
New GIS and mapping resources	6.0%
Other	2.7%

*Note: The results were calculated as they were during the workshop, as follows:
(number participants selecting an individual choice / total number of participants responding)*100

6.) What are the main challenge towards achieving regional coordination in transit planning? (select up to two responses) (multiple choice)*

Answer Choices	Responses
Communication between agencies	29.5%
Policy differences between agencies	28.2%
Funding	
Resources	18.8%
Other challenges	8.1%
No challenges	0.0%

*Note: The results were calculated as they were during the workshop, as follows:
(number participants selecting an individual choice / total number of participants responding)*100

7.) Do you agree or disagree with this statement: "Airports play an important role in stimulating economic activity in my region?" (select one response) (multiple choice)

Answer Choices	Responses
Strongly disagree	7.1%
Disagree	
Neutral	
Agree	
Strongly agree	37.4%
No opinion	3.0%

8.) What do you think will be the biggest influence of SCSs on the "configuration of the statewide integrated multimodal transportation system?" (select one response) (multiple choice)

Answer Choices	Responses
Change the demand for interregional travel	14.44%
Change the types of projects that will be needed in interregional corridors	57.78%
Change the need for system management or pricing in interregional corridors	17.78%
Will not have any influence	8.89%
Other	1.11%

6.1%

11.1%

35.4%

9.) How should the Interim Report address integrated transportation and land use in rural areas? (select all that apply) (multiple choice)*

Answer Choices	Responses
Discuss influence of interregional travel from urban areas on rural transportation needs	44.3%
Discuss jobs/housing balance between rural and urban areas	39.6%
Discuss transportation and economic vitality for rural areas	47.0%
Discuss Blueprint planning efforts	18.1%
Other	5.4%

*Note: The results were calculated as they were during the workshop, as follows:
(number participants selecting an individual choice / total number of participants responding)*100

10.) Which of the following topics should be top priorities for the Interim Report? (select up to two responses) (multiple choice)*

Answer Choices	Responses
Extent of economic growth	11.4%
Location of economic growth	18.8%
Demand for interregional passenger travel	28.9%
Demand for freight travel	12.8%
Interaction between regional and statewide projects	33.6%
Other topic	4.0%
Don't address what we don't know	0.7%

*Note: The results were calculated as they were during the workshop, as follows:
(number participants selecting an individual choice / total number of participants responding)*100

11.) In which of the following areas can the Interim Report make its greatest contribution for your agency's planning needs? (select up to two responses) (multiple choice)*

Answer Choices	Responses
Travel within rural areas	6.7%
Travel between regions	29.5%
Integrating local, regional and state strategies	42.3%
Identifying ways to improve of SB 375 and SB 391 implementation	24.2%
Other	2.0%
Don't know	2.7%

*Note: The results were calculated as they were during the workshop, as follows:
(number participants selecting an individual choice / total number of participants responding)*100

Appendix C. Webcast Email Comments

Comment	Source
We are just starting on our RTP update, as we hope to have adoption June 2013, will that be too late for inclusion in this statewide plan?	Humboldt County
The selection of a statewide goods movement prioritized list should actually come from an analysis of the regional freight issues, trends and projects.	Kings County Association of Governments
The biggest issue with rail development/expansion is capacity and competition between passenger and freight.	Caltrans (Matt Friedman, Senior Transportation Planner Operations Planning Branch- Division of Traffic Operations)
As regional planners we would use corridor plans to coordinate with our streets and highways corridor plans, e.g. look at the needs for grade separation projects.	Kings County Association of Governments
Take a look at 580 - WHY are there all those trucks needing extra lanes? Because the port of Oakland decided to reduce GHG emissions - and railroads shifted freight facilities out to Tracy - with the result that 50,000 extra truck trips each year occur - an millions of public expenditure.	David Grant
why choose other - the real issues would seem to be 1) coordinating fare payment systems - such as clipper 2) coordinating scheduling - so time is not wasted hugely	David Grant
For this question: emphasise that transit includes bus AND rail.	
Re: SCS influence - Ideally-they'll reduce need for interregional travel/keep them local.	
In our region, SCS is setting RHNA goals tied to funding of transportation projects. Therefore, land use/housing will drive much of transportation projects in the MTC area.	Celeste Fiore, Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority | CMA
It is important that CIB recognize the importance of rural areas in the economic vitality of the major urban areas.	UC Davis
Duh, State hwys are the primary corridors in our regional transportation network! (Re: Interaction issues - statewide vis a vis regional)	Modoc County Transportation Commission
SANDAG just approved its 2050 Regional Transportation Plan. Many organizations feel the projection models used were questionable, therefore, barely meeting SB 375 GHG requirements. Will this CIB use its models to refine this to better implement projects?	David Flores Community Design & Development Officer The FRONT - Casa Familiar, Inc.

What do you think will be the biggest influence of SCSs on the "configuration of the statewide integrated multimodal transportation system? The SANDAG RTP really did not change much – too political. I reiterate this point already submitted: SANDAG just approved its 2050 Regional Transportation Plan. Many organizations feel the projection models used were questionable, therefore, barely meeting SB 375 GHG requirements. Will this CIB use its models to refine this to better implement projects?	See above
SANDAG just approved its 2050 Regional Transportation Plan. Many organizations feel the projection models used were questionable, therefore, barely meeting SB 375 GHG requirements. Will this CIB use its models to refine this to better implement projects?	See above
Casa Familiar, a nonprofit on the San Diego border, along with San Diego State University's Graduate School of Public Health, currently completed analysis of Social and Environmental Effects of the U.S.-Mexico Border Crossings on the San Diego-Tijuana region, with particular focus on the San Ysidro Land Port of Entry prior to the re-construction of the LPOE as master planned by the U.S. General Services Administration. The project met its goal of analyzing pre-construction air quality analyzing vehicular impacts as a baseline that the team hopes to re-analyze in the future as GSA completes the reconstruction to ensure that the project does in fact improve vehicular flow, minimizes wait times (to the 30 minute goal set by the Department of Homeland Security's U.S. Customs and Border Protection). Results found: · People who cross the border through the San Ysidro Port of Entry are exposed to relatively high concentrations such as Carbon Monoxide and Ultrafine Particulate Matter · At the POE location where pedestrians cross, Ultrafine Particulate Matter concentrations were 3-4 times higher than in San Ysidro and up to 10 times higher than in Imperial Beach Green House Gas Study - Calculate greenhouse gas emissions from Northbound idling vehicles at ALL San Diego County – Baja California border crossings. Northbound wait times from October 2008- March 2009. The border crossings included were:	See above

¤ San Ysidro Regular and Sentri ¤ Otay Mesa Regular and Sentri ¤ Tecate Regular Utilizing the Environmental Protection Agency's online web calculator for greenhouse gas emissions, the estimated emissions were between 74,737 and 82,664 Metric Tons of Carbon Dioxide. How will the State address GHG/C02 emissions be reduced in San Ysidro? At the San Ysidro Land Port of Entry (SYLPOE)?	
Bi-National airport opportunities exist along the U.S. Mexico border – Again, the San Diego-Tijuana Node can be an important alternative to link to other State air ports.	
Public participation at the community level is only seen as a check off list item from the community to the planners of transportation.	See above
One of every 10 persons entering the U.S. through all of its land ports enters through the San Ysidro Land Port of Entry. 60-80,000 vehicles, 30,000 Pedestrians DAILY enter/exit through the SY LPOE, Yet the SANDAG 2050 RTP has only projected 2.5% of capital improvements to meet this demand. Current border wait times of 3-4 hours to cross generate The San Ysidro Community sees NO planned investment by SANDAG/Caltrans to provide alternatives that considers the border as an urgent Bi-National NODE that can potentially provide. We feel this is an important node to connect to.	See above