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AGENDA HIGHLIGHTS

- OVERVIEW OF CALIFORNIA AIR RESOURCES BOARD ACTIVITIES RELATED TO SB 375
- SB 375 IMPLEMENTATION: CHALLENGES AND NEXT STEPS

PLEASE TURN OFF CELL PHONES DURING THE MEETING

YOU CAN LISTEN TO THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING BY VISITING OUR WEB SITE AT WWW.SANDAG.ORG

MISSION STATEMENT
The 18 cities and county government are SANDAG serving as the forum for regional decision-making. SANDAG builds consensus, makes strategic plans, obtains and allocates resources, plans, engineers, and builds public transit, and provides information on a broad range of topics pertinent to the region's quality of life.

San Diego Association of Governments · 401 B Street, Suite 800, San Diego, CA 92101-4231
(619) 699-1900 · Fax (619) 699-1905 · www.sandag.org
Welcome to SANDAG. Members of the public may speak to the Board of Directors on any item at the time the Board is considering the item. Please complete a Speaker’s Slip, which is located in the rear of the room, and then present the slip to the Clerk of the Board seated at the front table. Also, members of the public are invited to address the Board on any issue under the agenda item entitled Public Comments/Communications/Member Comments. Speakers are limited to three minutes. The Board of Directors may take action on any item appearing on the agenda.

This agenda and related staff reports can be accessed at www.sandag.org under Meetings on the SANDAG Web site. Public comments regarding the agenda can be forwarded to SANDAG via the e-mail comment form also available on the Web site. E-mail comments should be received no later than 12 noon, two working days prior to the Board of Directors meeting. Any handouts, presentations, or other materials from the public intended for distribution at the Board of Directors meeting should be received by the Clerk of the Board no later than 12 noon, two working days prior to the meeting.

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), SANDAG will accommodate persons who require assistance in order to participate in SANDAG meetings. If such assistance is required, please contact SANDAG at (619) 699-1900 at least 72 hours in advance of the meeting. To request this document or related reports in an alternative format, please call (619) 699-1900, (619) 699-1904 (TTY), or fax (619) 699-1905.

SANDAG offices are accessible by public transit. Phone 511 or see 511sd.com for route information.
1. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS

Members of the public shall have the opportunity to address the Board on any issue within the jurisdiction of SANDAG that is not on this agenda. Anyone desiring to speak shall reserve time by completing a “Request to Speak” form and giving it to the Clerk of the Board prior to speaking. Speakers are limited to three minutes. Board members also may provide information and announcements under this agenda item.

REPORTS (2 through 3)

2. OVERVIEW OF CALIFORNIA AIR RESOURCES BOARD ACTIVITIES RELATED TO SENATE BILL 375 (Lynn Terry, California Air Resources Board)

California Air Resources Board staff will provide an overview of statewide activities underway to address the implementation of Senate Bill 375 (Steinberg, 2008), and will be available to answer questions from the Board of Directors.

3. SENATE BILL 375 IMPLEMENTATION: CHALLENGES AND NEXT STEPS (Rob Rundle, Bob Leiter)

SANDAG is in the process of developing its first Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) subject to the provisions of Senate Bill 375 (Steinberg, 2008). At the same time, staff has been coordinating with the state’s other major Metropolitan Planning Organizations and the California Air Resources Board to develop a greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions target that will be used to develop the 2050 RTP, including its Sustainable Communities Strategy. SANDAG staff will provide the Board of Directors with an overview of the progress made to date and the approach to develop a GHG reduction target for the San Diego region.

4. UPCOMING MEETINGS

The next Business meeting is scheduled for Friday, March 26, 2010, at 9 a.m.

5. ADJOURNMENT

+next to an agenda item indicates an attachment
SENATE BILL 375 IMPLEMENTATION: CHALLENGES AND NEXT STEPS

Introduction

SANDAG is in the process of developing its first Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) subject to the provisions of Senate Bill 375 (SB 375) (Steinberg, 2008). The 2050 RTP is scheduled for Board adoption in July 2011.

Discussion

Overview of New SB 375 Mandates

SB 375 requires that Metropolitan Planning Organizations prepare a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) as a new element of their RTPs, along with the traditional Policy, Action, and Financial elements.

The SCS must demonstrate how the development patterns and the transportation network, policies, and programs can work together to achieve the greenhouse gas (GHG) emission reduction targets for cars and light trucks that will be established by the California Air Resources Board (CARB), if there is a feasible way to do so. If an MPO cannot meet the targets through the SCS, then the region is required to develop an Alternative Planning Strategy (APS) that demonstrates how the emission reduction targets could be achieved.

In essence, the SCS includes four building blocks:

1. Land use component that accommodates regional housing needs and includes protection of habitat and farmland;
2. Transportation networks including highways, transit, and local streets and roads;
3. Transportation demand management strategies; and
4. Transportation system management programs and policies.

GHG emissions estimates from the RTP SCS will be compared to the reduction targets to be established by CARB for the years 2020 and 2035.
The enacted legislation also requires broader public outreach efforts to a variety of stakeholders during the preparation and review period of the SCS, including additional workshops and public hearings.

**SB 375 Implementation Status**

As stated above, SB 375 requires that CARB set GHG emission targets for cars and light trucks for 2020 and 2035 for all 18 MPOs in the state. MPOs also can recommend their own targets to CARB. As part of the target-setting process, CARB appointed the Regional Targets Advisory Committee (RTAC) to make recommendations on the factors to be considered and methodologies to be used in setting the targets. The RTAC report was submitted to CARB on September 30, 2009, and was accepted by CARB at a public meeting in Sacramento on November 19, 2009.

Collaboration among MPOs has continued following the completion of the RTAC report. MPO Executive Directors met on November 3, 2009, to discuss technical, policy, and legal issues such as data collection, scenario development and evaluation, analytical tool needs, California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requirements, and the need for ongoing coordination with respect to implementation of SB 375. As a result of the first meeting, four work groups were formed: Planning, Modeling, Legislation, and Legal. SANDAG staff is participating in the meetings of all work groups. CARB staff also is collaborating in the Planning work group.

A second meeting of the MPO Executive Directors was held on February 26, 2010, to discuss progress made to date on the GHG target-setting process and funding issues associated with the increased costs of preparing an RTP pursuant to SB 375. As a result of the second meeting, there was agreement on common assumptions that should be included in the model inputs for all the large MPOs in the state to ensure some consistency among the agencies (i.e., future gasoline prices).

The RTAC report recommended a seven-step target-setting process that centers on collaboration among MPOs and CARB with support from Caltrans and the California Transportation Commission regarding modeling and regional transportation plan guidance. It also recommends a “bottom-up” and transparent process, with all data, analyses, and documents made available for public review at every step of the process.

The seven-step process is intended to ensure effective and efficient communication between CARB and the MPOs during the target-setting process to help identify the most ambitious, yet achievable GHG emission reduction strategies for 2020 and 2035. This process is ongoing and will culminate with CARB establishing draft GHG emission reduction targets by June 30, 2010, and final targets by September 30, 2010. The schedule of activities is shown below.

**Schedule for SB 375 Target-setting Activities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prepare analysis of alternative scenarios</td>
<td>MPOs</td>
<td>April 30, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submit proposed regional target*</td>
<td>MPOs</td>
<td>April 30, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommend draft targets to ARB Board</td>
<td>ARB staff</td>
<td>June 30, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide comments on draft targets</td>
<td>MPOs</td>
<td>July – September, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approve final targets</td>
<td>ARB Board</td>
<td>September 30, 2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* This is optional for each MPO.

Source: Regional Targets Advisory Committee Report, pp. 10 – 12.
SANDAG Implementation Activities - Scenario Planning

SANDAG staff, in coordination with the other MPOs in the state and the staff from the CARB, has prepared an analysis of adopted RTPs to determine the base year (2005) per capita GHG emissions from the transportation sector, as well as projected GHG per capita emissions in the years 2020 and 2035. For SANDAG, the 2030 RTP, adopted in November 2007, is being used to evaluate this “base case” scenario. In addition, staffs at SANDAG and the other MPOs have begun to develop potential alternative scenarios for evaluation that would include new and expanded strategies that could lead to reduced per capita GHG emissions as compared to the base case. Ultimately, any analysis performed will be provided to CARB staff for its consideration in recommending GHG emission targets for the transportation sector later this year.

The four large MPOs in the state (Metropolitan Transportation Commission/Association of Bay Area Governments, Sacramento Area Council of Governments, Southern California Association of Governments, and SANDAG) have proposed to evaluate three scenarios in their respective regions. While the particular elements of each scenario may differ from region to region, and while some MPOs may evaluate more than three scenarios, the three scenarios would provide CARB with a general indication of how effective GHG reduction measures are throughout the state, and which measures will enable the MPOs to meet the “ambitious and achievable” goal outlined in SB 375. SANDAG staff is presenting the following three scenarios for the Board of Directors consideration and input prior to undertaking the analysis of the proposed strategies.

Scenario A
Scenario A would focus on system efficiency through the implementation of Transportation Demand Management and Systems Management measures. Such measures could include congestion relief at identified traffic bottlenecks, telecommuting, expanding the vanpool program, and implementing Safe Routes to Schools strategies.

Scenario B
Scenario B would focus on transit improvements and Smart Growth development to reduce vehicle trips in the San Diego region. This scenario would maximize transit investments near smart growth opportunity areas and identify strategies to improve pedestrian and bicycle connections to transit.

Scenario C
Scenario C would focus primarily on pricing as a strategy to reduce the demand on the transportation system. This scenario would evaluate the effect of adding additional high occupancy toll (HOT) lanes to the regional transportation system. In addition, this scenario would evaluate the effectiveness of implementing a vehicle miles traveled (VMT) fee, which would likely have a similar impact as an increased gas tax.

It is expected that some elements of any of the scenarios could be used in the development of the Sustainable Communities Strategy required by SB 375. While the scenario testing process is being completed to determine the impact on GHG reduction, further analysis would be required if any of these measures were to be adopted as part of the 2050 RTP. The Board of Directors will be presented with options for achieving the GHG reduction target as the development of the RTP proceeds. To be consistent among all the MPOs in the state, it is proposed that the scenario testing process be based on the revenue constrained transportation network. For SANDAG, this was the network that was included in the 2030 RTP. SANDAG is coordinating with the other MPOs to ensure
consistency in how “revenue constrained” is defined. The RTP guidelines developed by the California Transportation Commission state that the Sustainable Communities Strategy must be based on the revenue constrained transportation network.

**Next Steps**

Over the next few months, SANDAG staff will continue to participate in the SB 375 GHG target-setting process with CARB, Caltrans, and other MPOs in the state and will regularly report on progress to the Board of Directors and appropriate Policy Advisory Committees. Staff also will seek direction from elected officials and input from the public on this process and the development of the 2050 RTP and its SCS through regular meetings and outreach activities. In addition, the May 14, 2010, Board Policy meeting will focus on the RTP transportation network options and the RTP Environmental Impact Report, including the implications of CEQA provisions outlined in SB 375.

GARY L. GALLEGOS  
Executive Director

Key Staff Contact: Rob Rundle, (619) 699-6949, rru@sandag.org
Good Morning SANDAG Board,

I’m Mike Bullock from Oceanside, a retired Satellite Systems Engineer.

CARB will not give you SB375 targets that do not have to be met. At an earlier meeting you adopted goals for your next RTP. One goal that you did NOT adopt was to have an RTP that had no need for an Alternative Planning Strategy, or APS. The APS is only needed if the SCS strategies cannot meet the CARB targets. The APS strategies do not get implemented because they are infeasible. We should all be very troubled that you are content to not even have a goal of meeting the CARB reductions with the implementation of your RTP.

As I told you in December 2008, the June 2008 *Scientific American* had an article titled the Ethics and Economics of Climate Change, by Dr. John Broome. It states that the warming caused by the level of equivalent CO2, expected within a few decades, will result in a 5% chance of an increase of 14 Degrees Fahrenheit and that this poses a risk of “a devastating collapse of the human population, perhaps even to extinction.”

AB32 was based on the false notion that it was reasonably safe to allow GHG levels to go to 450 PPM. We now know that any value beyond 350 is unsafe. We are at 390 right now. We are accelerating towards a cliff. The problem is that we don’t know the precise location of that cliff. The cliff, also called a tipping point, is the point where the warming feeds on itself and we are then powerless to stop it.

Your staff will do better work if they are given a goal of not having an APS. It is effectively asking them to focus on meaningful strategies and how they can be make politically acceptable. The task is difficult, but it is not impossible.

Thank you.  
mike_bullock@earthlink.net
Good Morning SANDAG Board,

I'm Mike Bullock from Oceanside, a retired Satellite Systems Engineer.

CARB and SANDAG are both failing to provide leadership in Sacramento. EPIC’s Dr. Silva-Send described how San Diego County could reduce driving 10% below “Business as Usual” levels, by 2020. She assumed that all employers with over 100 employees would adopt car-parking cash-out programs, reducing commute driving by 12%. This shows that we are going to have to figure out a way to widely price parking, if we are going to have a chance of meeting SB375 goals. The strategy will have to be feasible. This is not a problem that should be solved in the private sector, or even at the city level. We need a new system, requiring new hardware and new software.

We MUST price parking, as follows: full cost, congestion priced, but give the earnings back to those that paid for the parking, are losing money because of the parking, or are the group that were given use of the parking, such as, employees, train riders, renters, consumers, and students. Technology makes this easy. Email me. I will tell you about the planned Carlsbad HS, which has agreed to consider unbundling its parking costs, for students and employees. It could be a model and so it needs immediate SANDAG support.

Similarly, we need a comprehensive and variable road-use fee pricing system, like will be implemented in the Netherlands by 2014 and in Denmark by 2016 by Skymeter, a Canadian company. Skymeter would love to do California. Secretary Ray La Hood had it right when he said we needed a new system of road-use fees to replace the gas tax. President Obama got it wrong when he pushed back. The fact is, as we burn less and less gas, the gas tax accounts are going to go down and they are way too low already.

Is CARB working to alert legislators that these things must be addressed? Is SANDAG?

Thank you.  mike_bullock@earthlink.net
Tighter Emission Standards Necessary But Not Sufficient from MTC's Executive Director

Above plot, from [http://www.nrdc.org/globalwarming/sb375/files/sb375.pdf](http://www.nrdc.org/globalwarming/sb375/files/sb375.pdf), leads to:

### Driving Reductions Required

**California, Assuming Figure 1 & AB32 Targets**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>With Respect to Now</th>
<th>With Respect to BAU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>-8%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2035</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

1. AB32 is based on 450 PPM, instead of 350 PPM. 
2. July 1, 2009
3. Business As Usual for the year (Caltrans)

The .78 value suggests 2020 GHG should be down 22% from 1990. *We need to drive even less than this table indicates.*
Good Morning SANDAG Board,

I’m Mike Bullock from Oceanside, a retired Satellite Systems Engineer.

EPIC’s GHG Inventory informs us that 42% of our GHG emissions are from cars and light-duty trucks. Therefore, the SB375, CARB targets will need to be in line with AB32 reductions.

The top Figure is from Steve Heminger, MTC’s Executive Director (the Bay Area’s Gary Gallego). The brown line is the baseline GHG. The black line shows the reduction we will get from accounting for our getting a cleaner California fleet of cars and light duty trucks. As shown, it is not enough. The orange line is where we need to be. We need to drive significantly less. The other plot and table should be familiar to you.

Your staff’s scenarios A, B, and C are all needed but they are not enough. Widespread pricing of parking is the least costly documented tool to reduce VMT. New technologies can efficiently bill drivers for parking and alert law enforcement if unauthorized cars trespass. Reformed parking policies can increase fairness, so that people who take transit or walk do not have to pay higher prices or suffer a reduced wage to support parking lots.

EPIC’s Dr. Silva-Send described how we could reduce driving 10% below “Business as Usual” levels, by 2020. She assumed that all employers with over 100 employees would adopt car-parking cashout programs, reducing commute driving by 12%.

We MUST price parking, as follows: full cost, congestion priced, but give the earnings back to those that paid for the parking, are losing money because of the parking, or are the group that were given use of the parking, such as, employees, train riders, renters, consumers, and students. Technology makes this easy.

RTP2030 increases freeway-lane miles by 38%. Yet the table shows that in 2030 we need to drive 11% less than we drive now. SANDAG owes the voters a new ballot measure that reconfigures the TransNet. Freeway expansion while we destabilize our climate is not a reasonable course of action.

There is no study that shows that building HOV or HOT lanes will do anything except increase VMTs.

Email me. I will tell you about the planned Carlsbad HS, which has agreed to consider unbundling its parking costs, for students and employees. It will be a model and so it needs SANDAG support.

Thank you. mike_bullock@earthlink.net
Below, comments for SANDAG Directors for the March 12 public meeting regarding SB 375 Implementation.

Walt Brewer
catcar38@verizon.net
716 433 3347

COMMENTS TO SANDAG REGARDING SENATE BILL 375 IMPLEMENTATION. March 9, 2010

1), Perhaps there is need for Scenario D. It would focus on feasible and planned GHG generating reductions by light personal vehicles, as well as mass transit. Examples: the national 2016 mpg standards, hybrids both autos and mass transit, electric vehicles and more efficient power generating stations.

2), Is there a uniform set of criteria to evaluate the impact of the Scenarios’ measures and facilities on community function, economic productivity, and lifestyles? Mention of such as walk/bike paths, safe routes, transit closeness to low income. etc, suggest a few ancillary elements are recognized, but total community function needs to be defined as a result of new facilities and measures added.

3), Leading up to decisions to make Scenarios’ detailed evaluations, how will scoping of magnitudes be accomplished to discard unlikely measures? Examples of “leverage “ under new Scenario D compared to current San Diego transportation:
   Fully implemented the 2016 auto mpg standards, a 30% improvement, will reduce CO2 40% without mobility sacrifice. Extensive use of hybrids and electric vehicles could extend the reduction beyond 50%.
   Increasing mass transit rideshare by a factor of 10, (900%), will reduce CO2 5%.
   50% transit rideshare, and the same 30% mpg improvement would achieve 20% CO2 reduction.
   50%+ rideshare is required to accomplish the first step 15% reduction.
   Ditto to prevent auto use from increasing in a community after a 50% density increase.

4), None of the measures in Scenarios A & C especially compare to the above in magnitude of CO2 reduction. HOT lanes reduce freeway throughput, but increase congestion. All lane pricing may smooth flow, but not much reduce. Intelligent interactive ramp metering, most likely to improve freeway throughput, is not mentioned.
   All the above are not likely adequate for an 80% reduction goal. Considering the 2050 time scale, effort is needed to investigate even more efficient measures probably involving automated person vehicle systems.

5), At whatever level of travel, and community density shakes out of the evaluations, positive steps, probably from Scenario D, provide significant improvement leverage especially compared to Scenario C which in many cases calls for restrictions without regard to traveler and community impacts.

Walt Brewer
SB 375

Key Provisions:
- Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Targets
- Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS)
- Alternative Planning Strategy (APS)
- Sensitive resource lands
- Regional Housing Needs Assessment
- Public involvement
- California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)

Smart Growth Concept Map
**Transportation System Development**

- expanded Park & Ride
- transit system enhancements
- managed lanes

**Transportation Demand Management**

- carpool/vanpool
- telecommuting
Transportation System Management

- Freeway Service Patrol
- driver education
- improvements to reduce bottlenecks

SB 375 Implementation Status

- Regional Targets Advisory Committee (RTAC)
  - Recommendations to CARB September 2009
- Analyze adopted RTP
- Establish 2005 Greenhouse Gas baseline for analysis
- Estimate GHG emissions in 2020 and 2035
- Develop planning scenarios to test GHG emission reduction potential
SB 375 Implementation Activities

financial assumptions

model inputs
SB 375 Implementation Activities

performance measures

SB 375 Implementation Activities

scenario development
Scenario A – Demand Management and System Efficiency

Scenario B – System Development and Land Use
Scenario C - Pricing

Target Setting Timeline

- Prepare analysis of alternative scenarios
  - April 30, 2010
- Submit proposed regional targets
  - April – June, 2010
- Draft GHG targets from ARB
  - June 30, 2010
- Provide comments on draft targets
  - July – Sept. 2010
- Final GHG targets from ARB
  - Sept. 30, 2010