



**Kern Regional Transportation Modeling Committee (KRTMC)
DRAFT MEETING NOTES**

KERN COG CONFERENCE ROOM
1401 19TH STREET, THIRD FLOOR
BAKERSFIELD, CA

Wednesday
June 23, 2010
10:30 A.M.

1. INTRODUCTIONS:

David Berggren	Caltrans
Eddie Quintero	City of Taft
Karl Davisson	City of Bakersfield
Mike McCabe	City of Delano
Brian Blacklock	Kern County Roads
Warren Maxwell	Kern County Roads
Steve Young	Kern County Roads
Patty Poire	Western Properties
Craig Murphy	Kern County Planning
David Crowder	Tejon Mountain Village
Martin Ortiz	City of Bakersfield
Ryan Starbuck	City of Bakersfield
Cecelia Griego	City of Bakersfield
Dave Dmohowski	Premier Planning Group
Walt Alen	Parsons

STAFF:	Robert Ball	Kern COG
	Ben Raymond	Kern COG

2. Approve Meeting Notes

Mr. Ball asked if there were any comments or concerns regarding the April 28, 2010 meeting notes for the Kern Climate Change Task Force (KCCTF) and Kern Regional Transportation Modeling Committee (KRTMC) meeting. Comments: Item #1 - correct spelling of Mr. Nienke's name; Item #3 should read "area" not "are"; Item #10 should read "12:10PM."

Action: Approved by Informed Consent with corrections per comments

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

a. June 17th COG Board Meeting Status report:

Mr. Ball noted that the staff report which was included with the agenda contained a copy of the presentation which Mr. Ball presented to the board on June 17th.

b. California Air Resources Board meeting report from June 22:

Mr. Ball noted that there would be a draft staff report presented at the ARB meeting at 3:00pm today which will most likely contain target numbers selected by ARB. The draft report will most likely be posted on the ARB website by tomorrow morning. Mr. Berggren asked if ARB would be giving a target number for the entire state as requested by an adamant member at the RTAC presentation. Mr. Ball responded that ARB indicated they would give each MPO a number that requested a number. Mrs. Poire discussed that the SJV had submitted a combined valley wide number. The valley wide target was an average of each MPO's individual target. Mr. Berggren asked if the November ballot item, to post pone AB 32 related work and deadlines until the state has lower unemployment, would affect work on SB 375 also. Mr. Ball responded that the item would only post pone the efforts of SB 375 and would actually give more time to refine targets and perform further analysis. Mr. Berggren noted that the DOF had posted new numbers in their database; he will forward a link to Mr. Ball.

4. Member Agency Requested Changes to Socio-Economic Forecast Distribution – Information

Mr. Ball distributed maps and tables depicting requesting changes to current trends data by the City of Delano. Mr. Ball noted that Delano had indicated the number of households seemed to be

in excess of what could be expected in Delano by 2035. Delano estimated an additional 1600 households beyond what should be expected. Delano also felt the number of employees was under estimated by about 240. Kern COG staff has suggested moving the 1600 households to the Tejon Mountain Village TAZs and the San Emidio TAZs as depicted in the distributed table. Mr. Murphy asked why the 86 households were placed in TAZ 964. Mr. Ball indicated that TAZ 964 was included in the Tejon Mountain Village project, the households were placed there to fulfill the requested households for the Tejon Mountain Village project.

Mr. Murphy asked if Mr. Ball could explain the necessity to make changes to the TAZ data. Mr. Ball explained that it is the Modeling Committee task to review requested adjustments by member agencies and determine if the adjustments will make the model more accurate. The model is used in many processes for projects and its accuracy is important for project delivery.

Mr. Murphy noted that the county has been entertaining many inquiries and applications for industrial developments along Hwy 99 near the TAZ which Delano had suggested moving employees out of, and he did not feel comfortable moving the employees from the TAZ.

Mr. Ball informed Mr. Murphy that at this time the request is an information item, the committee will have the time between now and the next KRTMC meeting to review the request when the item will be brought back as an action item. Mr. Crowder added that it is good that the committee continues to look at what projects/plans are coming in and already on the books and to reflect these projects/plans in the model. Mr. Murphy asked if the Metro Bakersfield update had been reviewed for it changes to the model. Mr. Ball responded that Bakersfield staff had submitted updates and the changes had been made.

Mr. Davisson asked if employees and households were linked in the model. Mr. Ball responded that employees are calculated based on the number of households at a rate of approximately 1.1-1.2 employees per household.

Mr. Murphy asked why the movement has to be zero sum, why can't we add employees if we feel the county will have more employees. Adding employees is not as difficult as adding population and housing. Mr. Ball replied that the adopted Kern COG policies and procedures require using the adopted growth forecast the countywide population total. To not do a zero sum adjustment means that we are changing the adopted countywide forecast for population. Under the current MOU and adopted policy and procedure, only the Kern COG board is allowed to do that once every 3-5 years. Employment is calculated based on a countywide jobs housing ratio and developed using the Caltrans Economic Forecast. Small changes to the countywide employment total would not affect the job housing ratio based on the adopted forecast for population. The 3-5 year procedure provides stability to the regional growth forecast allows member agencies time to implement projects and environmental documents without constantly having to update documents because of a change to the regional growth forecast numbers.

Mr. Berggren asked is permanent jobs vs. temporary jobs are shown in the model. Mr. Ball responded that the jobs are not identified separately.

5. Kern COG Modeling Activity Report – Information

Mr. Ball noted that the High Speed Rail (HSR) Authority Consultant (URS) has requested traffic modeling of 7,500 daily boarding for the HSR station in downtown Bakersfield. The model can be created with a special generator at the proposed HSR station site to represent the trips for the boardings; the key will be to determine how to model commuter vs. overnight/vacationers. Kern COG staff is working with Parsons and Fehr & Peers to determine best methods of modeling for the 7,500 boardings. Models will be presented as they come up.

6. Cumulative Model Assumptions Revisions – Information

No requests

7. Future Model Updates – Information

GET's Long Range Transportation Study? Mr. Ball noted that Caltrans gave \$2.5M to the eight SJV COGs (Fresno COG is the lead) to update the 8 models by 2012 for SB 375; Kern COG is concerned about having to spend this by 2012 which will mean the modeling will be done on data that is about to be replaced. A second grant will be used to purchase iPlaces3 for all the valley COGs and develop modeling with iPlaces3. There is a third grant for improvements to the state wide model for the valley; concerns are the grant is a temporary funding source. How are we to maintain modeling.

Mr. Davisson asked if iPlaces3 is pixel based. Mr. Ball responded that it is and it is at the parcel scale.

Mr. Ball stated that the RHNA and RTP are now being updated simultaneously. Supplemental housing data may become available for member agencies from consultant. This item will be added to next agenda?

8. Regional Traffic Count Program – Information

Mr. Ball noted that the traffic count webpage is being updated and the link has moved from the bottom of the main page to under the Data Center menu. Mr. Berggren asked if the ADT vs. Class count could be shown. Mr. Ball replied that he would inquiry with Michael Heimer. Mr. Berggren asked if the Caltrans counts could be incorporated into webpage. Mr. Ball responded that the issue would be updating the counts as Caltrans updates along with the Kern COG count updates. If a maintenance path is created, it could be done.

9. Other Business/Schedule Next Meeting – Wed., Aug 25, 10:30AM at Kern COG

July 22nd meeting for planning of how to spend the modeling funds.

10. Adjourned at 11:52AM

DRAFT Kern COG Response to 8-9-10 ARB Staff Report - Version 1

The following comments are being provided to the California Air Resources Board and will be incorporated into a response letter to be approved by the Kern COG Board on September 15, 2010. The CARB staff report available at <http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/sb375/sb375.htm>.

- **10% Reduction by 2035 May Be Too Ambitious** – As pointed out in the 8-9-10 Staff Report this target is way beyond any modeling provided from any Valley MPO to date. Kern bears little resemblance to the big four major metropolitan areas, and basing targets for Kern on what other regions can do is arbitrary, unfair and could have serious repercussions to state environmental, economic and equity goals. For example the rural nature of the San Joaquin Valley and lack of mass transit options make emissions savings difficult to achieve. **Recommendation:** Provide provisional targets that reflect local modeling and are not based on comparison to other regions.
- **Placeholder Targets** - Kern COG supports the concept of the placeholder targets with provisional targets to be provided by 2012. This will allow more time to enhance the modeling to more accurately reflect local conditions on what is ambitious, yet achievable as well as interregional travel and strategic employment areas. **Recommendation:** New modeling enhancements underway may not be ready by 2012 due to the limited modeling resources of the Valley MPOs. Allow an additional update of information to the provisional targets prior to their final adoption in 2014 or the next RTP cycle.
- **Valleywide Target Precedent** - Kern COG is concerned that a single placeholder target for the “Valley” will preclude the establishment of targets for subregions. **Recommendation:** Provide separate provisional target(s) to MPO(s) from the San Joaquin Valley 8-County region that are unable to coordinate with the rest of the Valley. Base targets on modeling information specific to the each MPO.
- **Subarea Targets for MPOs Split by Air Districts** - Kern County is a diverse region governed by two separate air districts/basins. The East Kern Air District is not in the San Joaquin Valley. **Recommendation:** If an MPO is split by air districts, allow the MPO to provide information during the provisional update for creating separate targets for each air district sub area similar to the process in the SCAG region. For example, the San Joaquin Valley portion could apply to the San Joaquin Valley Target.
- **Strategic Employment Areas** - Kern COG has is dominated by rural resource land uses. These areas contain employment activities strategic to the state climate change and other goals. The RTAC recommended consideration for Strategic Employment Areas (such as military, wind energy, prisons, etc.) in the target setting process. There is no mention of this in the staff report. **Recommendation:** Allow not only an exemption Strategic Employment Areas but a credit because of their essential contribution to climate change and other state goals.

- **Alternative Numeric Method to Percent Per Capita CO2 Reduction** – The percent per capita method creates problems for smaller high growth MPOs that can be subject to dramatic percent per capita changes because their population may be doubling every 30-40 years. It is important not to force an APS on a region that can show a significant savings in CO2 emissions compared to the future year baseline but are unable demonstrate compliance with their approved provisional target on a percent per capita basis. This could result in the voluntary APS strategies being ignored by the local governments in the region, wiping out the potential emissions savings demonstrated by the MPO's proposed SCS that is considered ambitious and achievable by the local MPO. MPO's should be allowed to prepare an SCS if their target meets one of the following requirements:

- a. Current Method - The Percent Per Capita CO2 Reduction from 2005 baseline meets or is better than the MPO's approved target.

Or

- b. Alternate Method (10% Reduction in CO2) - The MPO's proposed SCS shows a CO2 emissions 10% below the statewide average, and the numeric pounds of CO2 per capita is 10% below the region's 2020 and 2035 baseline emissions (pre-Pavely/LCF). For example, if the average SCS is 20 pounds per person in 2035, an MPO would need to show that it was below 18 pounds per person. This method should be considered as an addition to Section IV. of the Functionally Equivalent Document.

This alternative method reflects the RTACs recommendation for a substantial improvement in CO2 emissions.

- **Pavley/LCF** - 2010 Provisional Targets do not include Pavely and Low Carbon Fuels standards as required by SB 375. **Recommendation:** Provide Targets that include the emission savings provided by technology gains from Pavely and Low Carbon Fuels efforts statewide.

Kern COG is supportive of CARBs efforts to work with the 8-Valley MPOs and to provide more time to improve information being provided in your bottom-up approach to target setting.