# TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TAC)

## Thursday, February 27, 2014

Key to colors:
Blue: Items that are clearly Action Items

**Attendees**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Pam Korte | Ron West | Chris Ganson |
| Jesse Gage | Austin Hicks | Bruce de Terra |
| Laurie Waters | Rose Agacer | Frances Dea-Sanchez |
| Nesamani Kalandiyur | Ryan Ong | Doug MacIvor |
| Aniss Bahreinian | Scott Sauer | Kimberly Johnston-Dodds |

**By Phone:**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Homer Zarzuela | Sean Tiedgen | Bob McBride |
| Rex Jackman | Steve McDonald | |
| Dave Vautin | Jeff Berkman | |

**Welcome, Action Items and Agenda Review – Pam/Austin**

- Finalized UCB study was emailed to all TAC members
- Updated CTP 2040 strategy chart to include new strategies from UCB study

**PAC Recommendations on Strategies and Implementation – Pam/Austin**

- Bottleneck Relief - Based on PAC input this strategy has been removed
- Strategies are now all on one sheet and we've added implementation language
- Reviewed RTP/SCSs again. Most of them used these strategies in some way
    - For example, telecommuting. SCAG has a telecommute program that they claim can reduce VMT by 1%

**Discussion on Strategies**

***VMT Fee***

- Bruce suggests changing the wording under the VMT Fee Implementation section on the chart because it currently implies that it is a revenue generating strategy – not VMT reduction.
  Bruce suggests phrasing the VMT fee as a method of absorbing the real costs of operating an auto.
- Q: Does the CSTDM have an algorithm that shows how VMT relates to cost?
    - A: Yes, but need to run model to see how this will work
- **MTC ran some modeling tests to see what would happen with pricing (VMT fee). They didn't include these results in the RTP. David will follow up with Austin.**
- Suggestion to also look at New York for congestion pricing results
- There is also pricing on the Bay Bridge. MTC or Caltrans should have data
- Congestion pricing will be looked at outside the model. The model can't do dynamic pricing
- **Currently VMT pricing is incorporated as raising the cost of travel. Could we go further and test something that is right in front of your face as opposed to a more "hidden" cost?**
    - **A: Good idea but don't have enough resources to explore this idea in this CTP. This would be good to incorporate into the CTP 2040 at the end of Chapter 5 titled, "Next Steps."**

# TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TAC)

## Thursday, February 27, 2014

- The best method is actually to survey people, but this is not typically done. More likely to use gas prices as a proxy for "pay as you drive".
- A bill was just introduced for California to conduct a mileage based user fee study. DMV would be responsible

***Telecommuting***

- **David will supply information on how MTC handled telecommuting**
- **The last sentence is awkward – Austin will work on the wording**
- There is an effect with telecommuting that more energy is used at home and telecommuters take more non-commute trips. The GHG emission reduction gains are not as much as expected. We may need to broaden the outlook on this strategy and talk about it more qualitatively
- We will capture this kind of issue in the narrative. But we'll need the TAC's help.
- Susan Handy looked at this issue by reviewing peer reviewed publications, but she didn't do any analysis
- Someone could analyze the CHTS data to look at the travel patterns of telecommuters
- Telecommuting combined with a VMT fee could get more reduction
- We'll talk to Leonard about examining the CHTS data

***Park and Ride Lots***

- Austin can't find anything on this in the RTPs so we're struggling on how to handle this strategy. Also the state is relinquishing Park and Ride Lots
- From a modeling aspect this strategy doesn't reduce VMT very much
- David hasn't seen this used as a GHG reduction strategy - it should be rolled into transit
- Park and Ride is more of a regional strategy – not really a state strategy
- **We should discuss this strategy with the PAC**
- **TAC recommendations rolling this strategy in with Expanding Transit and Passenger Rail**

***Carpooling***

- SANDAG was aggressively promoting carpooling but we don't know if this strategy is appropriate statewide
- Carpooling continues to be difficult to get people to do. It's on the decline in the Bay Area
- Research has shown that most transit riders are former carpoolers
- This might be more of a regional strategy – not really appropriate for statewide
- In the Bay Area, carpool lanes may go up to 3+ over the next few years
- We're focusing on strategies that will only have a marginal effect. We should designate which strategies have Big Effect, Moderate, and Marginal. **Ron will provide some input on this**

***Carsharing***

- MTC aggressively pursuing this strategy but we haven't seen it much in the other regions
- Since it will be difficult to get to the 2050 goal maybe we should use this strategy more as future potential
- We could set some kind of density threshold and show where it makes sense to do it
- Carsharing could be useful in rural areas for the disabled

***Mode Shift***

- Expanding bike and ped is not a perfect fit as a statewide strategy, but we need to include it
- SANDAG has bike/ped model to they are trying to capture the benefits. Right now it's hard to quantify
- There might be some strategies that have benefits other than GHG reductions
- BRT handbook has strategies to use and how they correspond to ridership

# TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TAC)

## Thursday, February 27, 2014

- BRT would have to be done off-model. We should look at not just doubling services but also increasing the quality
- We're assuming that expansion of transit includes BRT. **Austin to capture this on the chart**
- BRT is almost like a separate mode
- This becomes expand and enhance transit and passenger rail

***Operational Efficiency***

- We have some questions for the PAC on this but maybe not this group. Example would be, should we change HOV from 2+ to 3+
- Q: Would MTC look at changing general purpose lanes to HOV?HOT
    - A: Many people would like this but this strategy isn't state supported
- This strategy has not been popular in the past
- This document might be perfect for asking this question
- On Van Ness they are taking a lane to make it a bus lane – in both directions
- All of these strategies relate to vehicles, what about trucks? Trucks are a big portion of GHG emissions
- We could model some strategies where you moves goods to non-truck modes
- What about truck only lanes
- Bruce is dealing with this in the Freight Mobility Plan. He'll tell us which ones to include
- At the March 19 California Freight Mobility Plan Committee meeting they'll be discussing strategies
- Some of the strategies will be modeled and some will be off-model
- Ron needs to know what strategies to model very soon
- **This needs more discussion off-line**
- Will the CFAC be discussing the full freight network at the March 19 meeting? Will taking trucks off the road induce more demand by adding capacity on the highway?
- In rural areas, there is really no discussion about issues like HOV/HOT lanes. They care more about adding capacity,ex. Red Bluff to Shasta Lake. There is also emphasis on ITS. How can rural areas use ITS to better manage their system.
- Regional agencies are really looking at system management. System management will have to be done outside the model
- SACOG focused heavily on ramp metering and incident management

**TREDIS Discussion**

- Q: How was the feedback between the VMT fee and VHT congestion done?
    - A: It didn't feedback to congestion
    - The concern is that we are only looking at one side of the equation. It will be critical to the document to include all the factors
- Q: Are the assumptions the same in the CSTDM and in TREDIS?
    - A: This is worth investigating. Could do some testing, also could leverage some of the HSR work
- Q: How long does it take to run?
    - A: It only takes minutes
- TREDIS can address other modes – bike, ped, transit
- TREDIS can do interregional comparisons – county to county
- There is some concern that TREDIS will show that a VMT fee will have a negative economic impact