



**Kern Climate Change Task Force (KCCTF)  
And  
Kern Regional Transportation Modeling Committee (KRTMC)  
DRAFT MEETING NOTES**

KERN COG CONFERENCE ROOM  
1401 19<sup>TH</sup> STREET, THIRD FLOOR  
BAKERSFIELD, CA

Wednesday  
April 28, 2010  
10:30 A.M.

**1. INTRODUCTIONS:**

David Berggren	Caltrans
Eddie Quintero	City of Taft
Ed Murphy	City of Bakersfield
Mike McCabe	City of Delano
Brian Blacklock	Kern County Roads
Barry Niemke	Kern County Roads
Warren Maxwell	Kern County Roads
Patty Poire	Western Properties
Issac George	City of Arvin
David Crowder	Tejon Mountain Village
Heather Ellison	Parsons/TRIP
Walt Allen	Parsons
Dave Dmohowski	Premier Planning Group
Bud Rice	City of Taft

<b>STAFF:</b>	Robert Ball	Kern COG
	Troy Hightower	Kern COG
	Ed Flickinger	Kern COG
	Ben Raymond	Kern COG

**2. Approve Meeting Notes**

Mr. Ball asked if there were any comments or concerns regarding the March 17, 2010 meeting notes for the Kern Climate Change Task Force (KCCTF) and Kern Regional Transportation Modeling Committee (KRTMC) meeting.

Action: Approved by Informed Consent.

**3. Kern SB375 Climate Change Target Proposal –Status Report - Information**

Mr. Ball stated that he would start with an update on the Target adoption by the Kern COG Board. He went on to explain that after the Kern Climate Change Task Force reviewed it; it then went to the Transportation Technical Advisory Committee (TTAC). The TTAC then recommended the Target to the Board. Mr. Ball stated that he had added a conclusion statement to the document based on feedback from the TTAC. He stated that in the conclusion they summarized the discussion about what the Target was and why Kern was unusual for California.

Mr. Ball provided a handout to the group of a summary comparison of all 18 MPO's in the State that are subject to SB375 and what direction their emissions are going. He noted that this is a first look of how Kern compares to the other regions throughout the State. He noted that they were baseline numbers only.

Mr. Ball went on to provide a handout that had the four largest MPO's and the eight Valley MPO's. A note explains that Kern County is very unusual because of their size. He went on to explain that XX or pass through trips account for about 30% of the passenger vehicle travel, for which we have no local control over. Because of that it makes sense to remove XX vehicle travel. He explained that another factor is two thirds of the population and employment reside in just 5% of our model, however half of our employment growth is in the outlying areas outside of metro Bakersfield (95% of the are of the County). Mr. Ball stated that it is a very unusual model.

Mr. Ball advised that numbers are slightly different than how they are being reported by the statewide MPO compilation. It is baseline information.

Mr. Ball provided the group the cover letter that was sent with the Staff Report to the Air Resources Board (ARB). He noted that it is important to make clear to the rest of the State and the environmental groups that our Region is really unusual and because of that we are asking for certain exemptions in our target setting process.

Someone asked if the same assumptions would carry forward to the other valleys such as Tulare County. Mr. Ball responded that it would not. Mr. Ball stated that Tulare's urban areas are spread out.

Mr. Ball stated that the Kern COG Board asked that they look at solar employment exemptions. He explained that the major reason that they did not include solar exemptions is because while during the initial building of the plant the employment may be high, but after construction is finished and the plant is operation, it employees are very few people. However wind energy plants have a greater number of permanent employees. Mr. Maxwell estimated that there may be 150 new permanent employees at solar plants around the County. Exempting solar employment would not likely register in the percapita target number. Existing modeling shows exempting 1500 new permanent wind energy employees resulted in less than 1/10<sup>th</sup> of a pound per capita reduction. An additional exemption 50% of travel to solar employment areas would likely not be measureable.

Mr. Ball presented a new model run that excluded solar, hydrogen, agriculture, oil, recreation and all other employment and housing areas outlying Metro Bakersfield. The results showed an unexpected increase in percapita emissions in the land use alternative scenario possibly caused by increased interaction with County cordons. The group did not act on the Metro only model results.

Mr. Ball went on to present a handout to the group that was an attachment to the letter that went to ARB. Mr. Ball went on to give a brief description of the handouts.

Mr. Ball stated that we can only model within our county. He explained that there are a couple of methodologies for what we do with the portion of a trip that may be traveling to an attractor within Kern County, that portion of trip should be our responsibility. Mr. Ball stated that they had hired a consultant to run the state wide model for us. They put Kern's socio-economic data from the scenarios into the statewide model and ran them. They then explained to us what the VMT travel was outside of the County, that is called Beyond Model Travel (BMT). Mr. Ball explained that the statewide model seemed like the best source for information to measure the out of county travel. Mr. Ball explained that the VMT number on the handout was half of the travel from the statewide model that is outside our County that is destined to or originating from Kern.

Someone asked Mr. Ball if the statewide modeling forecast shows a decrease in interregional travel. Mr. Ball responded that the per capita, per person emissions are decreasing from Kern County.

Someone asked Mr. Ball if the model takes in account cost of gasoline. Mr. Ball responded that the statewide model is not doing that yet and Kern County has not started either. He explained that when they ran a quick test run, they saw a 1% decrease.

Someone asked Mr. Ball if High Speed Rail was too small of a percentage to incorporate into the model. Mr. Ball stated that the statewide model version they were using did not have it, however there is a version that uses it. He went on to state that they are looking at it, he noted that he believed it would help the numbers.

Someone asked if they were dealing with the large utility scale solar employment in the outline area only. Mr. Ball responded that they are only looking at the major center and not at residential users.

Someone stated that during the construction of the solar facility that there is a large number of jobs to account for, however when it goes into operation, there will be very few jobs.

Mr. Ball stated that if Kern County had been divided up differently they would show some real progress towards the climate change goals. He explained that because they are not, the argument would be that they are showing an increase because they are taking in account all of the rural areas. He noted that we need to take steps to optimize that growth in the rural areas, such as providing housing closer to where the employment is and ensure there are enough retail

opportunities to drive down the overall growth in those areas. He explained that they need to point out to the rest of the State and environmental groups that are going to be pushing for a lower number that our numbers are going to be higher because of the unusual nature of our Region.

Mr. Ball stated that by the next meeting, he hopes to have a number that is going to show fuel pricing. The large MPO's have included an assumption that pricing will go from 2009 levels up to \$4.35 a gallon by 2020 and \$5.60 a gallon by 2035. As a result of that VMT will be decrease. Someone asked if there was enough transit capacity for the future to offset the drivers that will not be taking their cars. Mr. Ball responded that there was not enough. He explained that people will not only be consider transit, but also the use of electric vehicles.

Mr. Ball stated that in the time since they have submitted their numbers to ARB, he has had an e-mail and a phone call from them. He went on to explain that after ARB had looked at the initial numbers, they had two questions. One was easily answered because ARB had read some numbers incorrectly. The other involved wind energy. They showed removing 100% of wind energy and also removing 50% of removing wind energy. When you compare the two that the difference is 70/30. Mr. Ball advised that they are in conversations with the consultant right now to determine what is correct. He noted that he felt like it might be two different runs and because of that it is doing a different reassignment where the number of employees is.

Mr. Ball noted that he believes they were the first in the State to get their numbers turned in. He went on to explain that the rest of the Valley was looking at the end of May to submit their numbers.

Someone asked Mr. Ball, now that they had submitted the numbers to ARB, if they would then look at the different methodologies and assumptions and respond with which ones are acceptable and which ones are not. Mr. Ball responded that CARB has made indications that they will be releasing individual numbers for each MPO. That will in turn start another step in the process. He went on to explain that at that point they are allowed to negotiate with them on the number. Mr. Ball stated that the number they submitted is just information for ARB, they will use it to decide what they think the target should be. Mr. Ball stated that he feels Kern has set themselves up nicely for getting a number for their MPO based on our local situation because they have provided ARB with plenty of information, data and modeling. That demonstrates that Kern is doing its due diligence to get an accurate number.

Someone asked Mr. Ball to explain Multi-County Target Proposal Option. Mr. Ball explained that under SB375, the eight Valley COGS can propose one target. He went on to explain that the COG Directors have met twice regarding this. Mr. Ball expressed that in his opinion it was too late in the process to come up with a number that can be bought off by all the MPOs and their member agencies. Mr. Ball stated that the five smaller MPO's within the San Joaquin Valley are very behind in the modeling activity. They are seeking some help. There is a Valley Wide Air Quality consultant that has generated some numbers for the smaller MPO's and have helped them to put the numbers together. They may be included in one submittal.

Mr. Ball stated that if they needed more information, that it will be on the Kern COG website.

#### **Member Agency Requested Changes to Socio-Economic Forecast Distribution**

Mr. Ball stated that they had not done anything with this item yet. He stated they would get to this item at the next meeting.

#### **4. 2011 RTP 45-Day Public Review – Begins April 30, 2010**

Mr. Ball stated that the 2011 RTP is on the Kern COG website for review. The review period will last until June 14<sup>th</sup>.

#### **5. Kern COG Modeling Activity Report – Information**

Mr. Ball stated that they have not developed any modeling since the last meeting.

#### **6. Cumulative Model Assumptions Revisions – Information**

No Requests for this

**7. Model Update Contract Status Report – Information**

Mr. Ball stated that they had wrapped that up and they continue to get support from Parsons and the TRIP office on the modeling.

They have some future model updates that are coming. A \$150,000 contract has been awarded to do a short range model improvement plan for implementation of SB375 for the eight San Joaquin Valley MPO's. Fehr and Peers is the lead for that. There will be draft of the model improvement plan by September, it will serve as a road map as to what changes they need to make to the model to develop their SCS. The SCS model needs to be in place by 2012 to then go through the public review process for the 2014 RTP update.

Someone asked as what point they will be addressing the other recommendations that the County that made about zero sum adjustments and the other issues the County brought up. Mr. Ball responded that the modeling committee will be reviewing and overseeing Kern County's portion of that model improvement plan, which will include updated socio economic data in that process. The updated socio economic data will require a zero sum adjustment.

Mr. Ball stated that there will be a new DOF number in July of 2011. He explained that they will do an interim projection and if they are above what the census is or below they will do an adjustment.

He went on to explain that SB375 requires that our horizon year must be within 3% of DOF, right now we are 13% below DOF.

Mr. Hightower stated that they have a new document that had just come in, he explained that it is a diagram that shows from the beginning of the development, what stages they go through, if it is compatible with the SCS and if is not what steps we go through. Mr. Hightower informed the group that it was being put into PDF form and would be distributed to the group.

**8. Regional Traffic Count Program Update - Information**

Mr. Ball stated that there was a new consultant updating the website and data base. He asked Mr. Flickinger for an update on how that was progressing. Mr. Flickinger responded that they would be updating the arc server. They will also be switching from Micro-Soft Access data base to SQL for storing traffic counts.

**9. Other Business/ Schedule Next Meeting**

Mr. Ball stated that they had been meeting jointly as the Modeling Committee and the Climate Committee. He explained that he would like to merge those two groups into the Modeling Committee. The Committee will meet every other month.

**ACTION:** The item was passed by informed consent.

**10. Adjourned at 11:59 A.M.**