October 12, 2016
RTP Guidelines Workgroup Meeting
Fresno State Foundation Boardroom – 4910 N Chestnut Avenue Fresno, CA

The Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Guidelines Workgroup met in Fresno on October 12th to discuss Chapters 5 and 6 of the RTP Guidelines for Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs). Click [here] for the agenda. The meeting was attended by various representatives of Federal, State, and Regional agencies as well as Advocacy Organizations. A list of in-person attendees is attached. A teleconference and WebEx option was provided for workgroup members to participate remotely. It is estimated that over 40 individuals participated in the workgroup meeting either in-person or remotely.

California Transportation Commission (CTC) staff began the meeting with introductions and a brief overview of the process to date to update the MPO RTP Guidelines. This workgroup meeting is one of 10 that is being held to allow stakeholders an opportunity to meet, discuss, and reach consensus on various topic areas within the MPO RTP Guidelines. The October 12th meeting will focus on Chapters 5 and 6 of the MPO RTP Guidelines. Click here for a copy of the most recent version of the MPO RTP Guidelines.

Chapter 5 – Environmental Considerations

High-Level Chapter 5 Comments

The discussion began with staff requesting any high-level comments on Chapter 5 before the group went into detailed comments.

SJCOG requested that references to mitigation activities in Chapter 5 be clear with respect to the fact that mitigation activities are developed as part of the Environmental Document and would be specific to the environmental analysis completed for the RTP.

Sequoia Riverlands Trust thanked staff for the language included in Chapter 5 but respectfully requested that the planning practice examples aggregated in Appendix M be reinserted into the body of the document. They also expressed concern with the description of planning practice examples in Appendix M.

SJCOG, KernCOG, CALCOG and TCAG expressed that Chapters 5 and 6 and throughout the document, “should”, “shalls”, and planning practice examples need to be clearly delineated. They support the aggregation of planning practices in the Appendix for ease of use and ease of maintenance of the document. SJCOG also expressed that consensus was reached [in a prior workgroup meeting] with regard to the terminology decided upon, i.e., planning practice examples. TCAG supported the terminology because one-size does not fit all.

The Nature Conservancy expressed that they would like to see Planning Practice Examples renamed to Best Practices and woven throughout the document and that the examples/practices could be framed in a different way. They also suggested a better way to visually display and reference examples/practices in the document.

The group as a whole then discussed the advocacy organizations request to restore planning practice examples into the body of the document. Staff explained that the aggregation of examples into Appendix M was undertaken based on practitioner request to promote usability and to facilitate the

DISCLAIMER: This is not a verbatim transcript or summary of the RTP Guidelines workgroup meeting and is based upon the written notes of staff. To ensure staff is able to adequately compile and address stakeholder feedback, written comments are kindly requested.

ease of updating examples in the document. Practitioners and advocates discussed the format and MPOs explained that planners generally read the guidelines in their entirety initially and then use them as reference document during the development of the RTP. For this reason, the aggregated examples in Appendix M were suggested to enhance access to the examples.

The Nature Conservancy expressed concern that removing planning examples from the body of the document reduced its informational value to the public and other stakeholders.

Staff explained that Appendix M will be enhanced with context language to frame the planning examples and that context can also be added to the body of the document as well. To facilitate achieving consensus on this issue, a smaller sub-working group consisting of practitioners and advocates will meet to discuss and report back to the full workgroup group on November 3rd.

Specific Chapter 5 Comments and Consensus Edits

There are some references to California Fish and Game throughout the chapter. Staff will replace these with the correct agency title.

Page 115 - SJCOG commented that the last paragraph on this page was redundant and didn't add value to the section. The Nature Conservancy disagreed with this observation. Based on the lack of consensus, the workgroup retained the paragraph.

Pages 115 and 117 - Minor clarifications and edits on these pages were agreed to by the workgroup.

Page 119 - USEPA commented that Sections 5.3 and 5.4 would benefit from some revisions to better describe their purpose and use in the RTP environmental process. Caltrans staff will work with USEPA and CALCOG staff to make these revisions.

Page 120 - the Nature Conservancy suggested that a reference to AB 2087 (Levine, 2016) be provided. This bill was recently passed and provides a potential tool for regional mitigation planning. Staff will add a reference.

Page 124 - there was substantial workgroup discussion on the new language included on this page related to Climate Change/GHG Emissions and Air Quality Impacts at the request of advocacy organizations. Practitioners requested statutory references and clarification regarding the applicability to the RTP process. To facilitate consensus on this language, a smaller sub-working group consisting of practitioners and advocates will meet to discuss and report back to the full workgroup group on November 3rd.

Page 126 - minor technical revisions were proposed to Section 5.7 by FresnoCOG and agreed to by the workgroup.

DISCLAIMER: This is not a verbatim transcript or summary of the RTP Guidelines workgroup meeting and is based upon the written notes of staff. To ensure staff is able to adequately compile and address stakeholder feedback, written comments are kindly requested.

Chapter 6 – Regional Transportation Plan Contents

Specific Chapter 6 Comments and Consensus Edits:

Page 135 – Section 6.1 (Policy Element) MPO practitioners commented that the paragraph at the bottom of the page and suggested that it be edited to be consistent with Government Code Section 65080(b)(2)(B) and clarify how land use is addressed in the RTP/SCS. Staff will work on making these requested edits.

Page 136 – the workgroup agreed to replace the bulleted list of performance measurement areas at the top of the page with a reference to Chapter 7 which provides a more comprehensive and detailed description of performance measurement.

Page 138 – just below Other RTP Contents, under Recommendations, Public Utilities Code Section 740.12 is referenced as a recommendation. The workgroup discussed the need to clarify the applicability of SB 350 and transportation electrification in Chapter 6 and elsewhere in the RTP Guidelines. A subset of workgroup members expressed interest in participating in this discussion including CALCOG, the Cleaner Freight Coalition, the Central California Asthma Collaborative, SANDAG, SCAG, and any others that would like to engage. To facilitate consensus on this language, a smaller sub-working group consisting of practitioners and advocates will meet to discuss and report back to the full workgroup group on November 3rd.

Page 151 – SANDAG requested a clarifying citation be provided for new language added regarding the California Coastal Trail. Staff will contact the Coastal Commission to obtain a citation.

Page 153 – CALCOG observed that a number of items have been added to RTP Contents Sections 6.8, 6.9, 6.10 and 6.11. MPO practitioner workgroup members requested a discussion of these additions to clarify and better understand the suggested scope. Staff offered to coordinate a call with MPOs and advocacy organizations that had suggested the additions.

Page 173 – Under Sections 6.20 (Safety) and 6.21 (Security), practitioners requested that these sections properly reference the MAP-21/FAST Act rulemakings and the phase-in of new requirements. Staff commented that similar clarifications are being made in Chapter 7 and can be included in these sections as well. Staff will work with MPOs and FHWA on clarifying language.

Page 188 – Considering Rural Communities in the Sustainable Communities Strategy, Leadership Counsel for Justice and Accountability thanked staff for including the language in this paragraph and also suggested acknowledging somewhere in the Guidelines the limitation of the rural electric grid to accommodate transportation electrification. They also requested clarification on the language referring to the provision of investments for rural communities as well as a definition of rural communities. TCAG, CALCOG, and Leadership Council staff agreed to discuss this issue further and propose clarifying language if needed.

Page 196-197 in Section 6.30 (Adaptation of the Regional Transportation System to Climate Change), SANDAG requested that consistent with the workgroup consensus in Chapters 1, 2, and 7, reference to Executive Orders and certain pieces of legislation should clearly articulate the applicability of these

requirements to state agencies and not regional agencies. Staff will work with a subset of stakeholders on development of this language for Sections 2.2 and 6.30.

Wrap-Up and Next Steps

Staff will coordinate sub-working group meetings on the following topic areas: Planning Practice Examples, GHG Emissions/Air Quality Environmental Analysis Considerations, Transportation Electrification, and Addressing Climate Change in the RTP.

Staff will also coordinate a call between advocacy organizations that requested additions to Sections 6.8, 6.9, 6.10, and 6.11 and MPO representatives that requested clarification regarding these recommendations.

Sub-working groups will meet to discuss issues and concerns and make consensus-based edits to specific sections of the RTP Guidelines. Sub-working group discussions and any resulting revisions will be reported to the full workgroup at the November 2nd and 3rd workgroup meetings.

Staff reminded workgroup members that written comments on the second drafts of the RTP and CTP Guidelines are requested on October 14th. Please visit the Caltrans RTP Guidelines website and the CTP Guidelines website for links to the draft Guidelines, information on providing comments and upcoming workgroup meeting information.

The next CTP Guidelines workgroup meeting will be held October 26th from 1:00 – 4:30pm in Sacramento and the next RTP Guidelines workgroup meeting will be held October 27th from 9:30am – 4pm also in Sacramento.

DISCLAIMER: This is not a verbatim transcript or summary of the RTP Guidelines workgroup meeting and is based upon the written notes of staff. To ensure staff is able to adequately compile and address stakeholder feedback, written comments are kindly requested.

Regional Transportation Plan and California Transportation Plan Guidelines Workgroup Meeting Sign-In

Wednesday October 12, 2016 9:30pm -4:00pm Fresno Foundation Board Room 4910 N Chestnut Avenue Fresno, CA

Name	Organization	Email
Amelia Davies	Madera Co. Trans. Commission	amelia@maderactc.org
~~Dylan Stone~~	~~Madera Co. Trans. Commission~~	
JEFF FINDLEY	MADERA CTC	JEFF@maderactc.org
Ryan Niblock	SJCOG	niblock@sjcog.org
Melody Lin	"	Lin@sjcog.org
Kim Anderson	"	Anderson@sjcog.org
Ted Smalley	TCAG	tsmalley@tularecog.org
Ben Kimball	TCAG	bkimball@tularecog.org
Lauren Dawson	Fresno COG	ldawson@fresnocog.org
Chelsea Gonzales	Fresno COG	cgonzales@fresnocog.org
Becky Napier	Kern COG	bnapier@kerncog.org
Nikita Daryanani	Leadership Counsel for Justice + Accountability	ndaryanani@leadershipcounsel.org
Sean Vienna	AMBAG	svienna@ambag.org
Brenda Veenendaal	Fresno COG	brendav@fresnocog.org
Dylan Stone	MCTC	dylan@madurctc.org
Bill Higgins	CALCOG	bhiggins@calcog.org
Kevin Hamilton	Central CA Asthma Collaborative	kevin.hamilton@centralcalasthma.org