TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TAC)

Tuesday, December 9, 2014

9:30 –11:30 am

Caltrans Headquarters

1120 N Street, Room 3442, 3rd Floor

Sacramento, CA 95814

Ron West

- There are 15 Strategies that are being analyzed via the CSTDM or Off-Model
- The CSTDM outputs are inputs into ARB's Vision and Caltrans' TREDIS models
- 560 Comments were received for this round of review on the CTP
- Most commenters were clear about what we were modeling, but some were unclear whether something was a policy or objective
- High Speed Rail fares were separated from transit improvements
- We used one metric to compare strategies (VMT)
- Off-model strategies came from a number of sources (CAPCOA and Moving Cooler were looked at, but the main source are the SCSs)
- Joshua Cunnigham mentioned that the off-model calculations represent a small portion of the overall VMT reductions
- Ron West reiterated that these strategies are a draft version, and they can be adjusted before the final model runs
- The Road User Charge has the largest VMT reduction
- With the Road User Charge (RUC), the cost of driving was increased by 73%
- During the equity analysis that was done, the RUC was analyzed by itself, as well as improvements in transit, then they were looked at together
- Three income groups were looked at during the equity analysis
- When the RUC is implemented, the share of travelers driving greatly decreases
- An increase in transit, when implemented in the CSTDM, decreases driving alone significantly as well

- The strategies being combined reduces VMT & shifts travelers into other modes
- One of the strengths of the new CSTDM is the ability to analyze each household in the state
- Further equity analysis can be done by individual households
- Chris Ganson clarified that a RUC wouldn't be an independent policy, but would be another way to fund transit. A study from (he believes USC) showed that low income group were helped by replacing transit funding sources with money collected from RUCs (Ron requested the report from Chris Ganson)
- Joshua stated that impacts of different income groups should be looked at in the context of other tax reform issues
- The CSTDM is divided into 5 components:
    - Personal trips greater than 100 miles
    - Personal trips less than 100 miles
    - Commercial trips greater than 50 miles
    - Commercial trips less than 50 miles
    - Out of State Travel
- Alternative 2 for 2020 is currently a placeholder and uses the assumption that 5% of the strategies will be implemented by 2020
- Some commentors may push back on an aggressive RUC, but Chris Ganson framed the question of whether we need to completely ground every scenario, or if we use the document as a vision to showcase apparitional goals
- Joshua agreed with showing aggressive scenarios, but clarified that we want to show incremental growth with our years. This is an explorative process.
- Some comments on Ch.7 said that certain strategies were too aggressive, but Ron stated that these comments are missing the point of the CTP, which is to show where we need to be by law, and how we can get there
- A question was posed about how we came up with the specific amount for the RUC, and Ron responded that multiple prices were looked at, but 16 cents was chosen as an aggressive number
- Bruce Detera mentioned that without a proper economic analysis, he believed that the CTP will fall flat
- Barry Padilla clarified that his group is doing the economic assessment, although it is limited to the transportation sector
- Barry also stated that this CTP is the first of its kind to have economic analytics, and their economic analysis will go deeper in future iterations of the CTP
- It was clarified after Bruce's comments, that the CTP has never had an implementation element, and this iteration of it is taking the first steps by including alternatives
- Joshua mentioned that ARB uses scenario planning as a "what if?" and not to champion a specific path
- Individual documents and programs that follow the CTP will explore costs for implementation

- Chris Ganson stated that it is important to illustrate what we don't know, in the CTP
- Joshua suggested that recommendations in the CTP can include where to further analyze strategies and their impacts
- We are moving forward by moving a lot of very technical information from Chapter 7 to a technical appendix
- The next draft of the CTP will clarify that no capacity is being added to the roadway network
- Ron clarified that some strategies only increase speed, and do not reduce VMT, but are adjusted to show VMT change for comparison purposes
- Joshua wants the CTP team to explore other methods of adding off-model strategies to show a possible symbiotic relationship among the strategies if there is one
- In terms of freight for the CSTDM, the freight model was not ready for this iteration of the CTP
- All VMT reduction strategies were targeted towards personal travel, but calculations show inclusion of truck numbers
- Commercial truck travel will see benefits from fuel and vehicle tech in the Vision model mostly
- Our recommendations should be in part, what is needed for the next plan (ie, PECAS, etc)

ARB

- Joshua Cunningham presented examples of how their Vision model data can be presented in the CTP
- Joshua is concerned that if we only show tailpipe emissions, numbers will be over inflated as tailpipe emissions go towards zero in later years, but a larger fraction of emissions will be upstream
- Chris Ratekin wants to see pie charts for Chapter 7, as she believes they will be easiest for the public to read and understand
- Steven Cliff informed the group to go above and beyond AB 32 GHG reduction goals if we can
- Joshua clarified that for the charts that show fuels, later years have a built in assumption of certain fuels being replaced by renewable versions (this is for the examples provided)
- Joshua believes that many of the more detailed charts may not fit into Chapter 7, but would be used for our CTP technical appendix
- Joshua will attempt to keep the language and graphics simple for his first draft of Vision model data analysis
- Tailpipe emissions make up about 33% of total GHG emissions
- Chris Ratekin specified that we need to show the big picture in our analysis, showing that transportation is only one portion of the overall GHG picture

ACTION ITEMS

1. Doug provide Ron with TRB study looking at Mode Shift
2. Chris Ganson will share with Ron a study (USC) that shows RUC not affecting low income groups as much as other tax structures
3. Add ARB deliverables