

MPO Follow-up Questions

Revised: 6/1/10

1. If you were to fully account for the impact of the recession in your region, how would the % reductions in GHG/capita numbers change for each scenario in 2020?

BCAG: We could make the assumption that the BCAG region would see a lesser reduction than what has been prepared with the scenarios based on the fact that changes in VMT and GHG are driven by more compact and mixed uses of future land. In order to see these changes in land use occur there must be growth. BCAG staff has not analyzed the exact reduction based on a lack of revised growth projects (see additional info below).

- a. In what ways has the economy affected your region (e.g. population, jobs, unemployment, new development, foreclosures, vacancy rates, etc.)?

BCAG: As with other areas in the state, the Butte County region has seen an increase in the unemployment rate including a slow down in new development and population growth. Vacancy rates in both the residential and commercial markets have increased.

- b. If you have already included the impact of the recession, where is it reflected in your scenario data?

BCAG: For the purposes of the scenario analysis, BCAG's 2006 regional growth projections were used which do not reflect the current economy and housing market. BCAG will be revising the regional population/housing/jobs projections during the second half of 2010.

2. What factors cause the reductions in 2020 to be different from 2035, and where do they show up in your data?

BCAG: In regards to per capita VMT changes, BCAG's numbers show a minimal decrease (-0.3) from the year 2020 to 2035 numbers for the RTP Build scenario. We could assume this is due to the overall larger development footprint of this scenario. The Concept SCS scenario shows a minimal increase (0.2) from 2020 to 2035. This scenario has a much more compact development footprint with higher residential densities, thus creating shorter trip lengths.

3. What model improvements, changes in planning assumptions, or additional policies are you considering that were not used in developing your scenarios?

BCAG: Once our modeling improvements have been implemented, we will be looking at scenarios which incorporate alternative modes of travel (bike, pedestrian, transit).

- a. How will they impact the direction and/or magnitude of change?

BCAG: We could expect that it will increase the overall reductions, but to what extent is unknown at this time.

4. Have the sensitivities of your model changed since the 2009 Model Evaluation Survey conducted for RTAC? If yes, please explain why. (i.e., are you using any new models or postprocessors to develop your scenarios that were not evaluated during the RTAC Survey?)

BCAG: No, they are the same as those included in the 2009 survey. We did utilize the newly developed Pavley 1 + LCFS post processor.

5. Did you add, remove, or change the level of deployment of any transportation projects or programs in your scenarios? If so, what type of projects or programs?

BCAG: No, with the exception of the No-Build scenario, they are the same transportation projects as analyzed for BCAG's 2008 RTP.

6. Please provide calculations of Vehicle Miles Traveled per capita as well as Greenhouse Gas Emissions per capita in reporting results of the evaluation of your adopted RTP and alternative scenarios.

BCAG: Information has been revised and included in BCAG's report to ARB.

Completed by: Brian Lasagna, BCAG Senior Planner 06/04/10