

# Report on MPO / ARB GHG Target Setting Analysis

*Presentation to  
California Air Resources Board by  
Joint MPO Executive Director Group*

*June 24, 2010*



# Overview

- **Background**
- **SB 375 GHG Target Setting Analysis Process**
- **Summary of Results Obtained to Date**
- **Conclusions and Recommendations**

# Background

- **MPO Executive Directors and ARB senior staff developed joint process:**
  - **Planning Working Group**
  - **Modeling Working Group**
  - **Legal Working Group**
- **Planning Working Group coordinated target setting analysis**
- **MPO Executive Directors and ARB senior staff reviewed key assumptions, methodology and results**

## **Step 1 & 2– Analysis of Existing RTPs**

### ***Step 1***

**Each MPO analyzed its adopted fiscally constrained RTP for 2005 base year, and for 2020 and 2035, using consistent planning assumptions for:**

- Fuel prices and vehicle operating costs**
- Fleet mix and fuel efficiency standards**
- Removal of pass-through trips**
- Updated revenue and demographic forecasts**

### ***Step 2***

**ARB compiled information from Step 1 and distributed for public review**

## **Step 3 – Preparation of Alternative Scenarios**

- **MPOs identified four categories of alternative scenarios:**
  - **Land Use Measures**
  - **Transportation System Improvements (public transit, bicycle, pedestrian)**
  - **Transportation Demand Management (TDM) and System Management (TSM) measures**
  - **Pricing Measures**
- **Each MPO developed its own set of alternative scenarios**


## **Step 4 – Analysis of Alternative Scenarios**

- **MPOs performed initial analysis of alternative scenarios; compared results**
- **Scenarios were refined and re-tested**
- **Comparison tables and charts were prepared**

# Conclusions/Findings


Our current RTPs move us in the right direction

Comparison of GHG Reductions for Large MPOs



# Conclusions/Findings


Existing highway and transit M & O obligations limit funding flexibility



# Conclusions/Findings

Some regional variations in GHG reductions may be explained by differences in:

- Levels of highway congestion and capacity investment
- Assumptions regarding TDM programs
- Growth rates and land use distribution



# Conclusions/Findings


- Each MPO can improve GHG reductions from our existing RTPs
- GHG reduction results for some of the alternative scenarios are overly ambitious:
  - “Fiscally constrained” revenue test not met
  - Widespread application of some strategies (e.g., pricing, land use policies) may be politically infeasible



# Recommendations

- **Targets for 2035 should allow us to build on progress we will have made by 2020**
- **CARB staff should release draft targets as “ranges:”**
  - **Staffs will continue to work over the next several weeks to refine target setting analysis**
  - **Allow time to share results with our policy boards and stakeholders**





# Report on MPO / ARB Target Setting Analysis

*Presentation to  
California Air Resources Board by  
Joint MPO Executive Director Group*

*June 24, 2010*