

July 15, 2010

TO: Transportation Planning Policy Committee

FROM: RONALD E. BRUMMETT
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

By: Rob Ball, Senior Planner
Troy Hightower, Planner II

SUBJECT: TPPC AGENDA NUMBER VII.
SB375 Target Setting Process – Status Report

DESCRIPTION:

On April 23, 2010 Kern COG submitted a proposed target for passenger vehicle related Greenhouse Gas emissions to the California Air Resource Board (ARB). Under SB375, ARB is required to release Final Targets by September 30, 2010. Since the April Kern COG board meeting staff has met with the Kern Climate Change Task Force and the ARB Regional Target Advisory Committee (RTAC). For copies of presentations, reports submitted to ARB, and meeting notes go to <http://www.kerncog.org/cms/climatechange>. ARB staff presented Draft Targets at the June 24, 2010 meeting of the ARB Board of Directors.

DISCUSSION:

Background

In September 2008 the Governor signed Senate Bill (SB) 375 to control Climate Change emissions from cars, SUVs and light duty trucks primarily by creating a more efficient land use to reduce vehicle miles traveled. In October 2008 Kern COG established the Kern Climate Change Task Force to coordinate our region's response to SB 375 and to become as proactive as possible.

On April 15, 2010 the Kern COG board approved the regional target proposal for Kern, instructing staff to consider solar employment areas as a possible additional exemption. On April 23, 2010 Kern COG submitted the proposed target to ARB staff.

Recent Activity

On April 28, 2010 the Kern Climate Change Task Force consented to merge with the Kern Regional Transportation Modeling Committee. The two groups have been holding joint meetings since December 2009. The most recent meeting was held on June 23, 2010. Meeting notes are attachment 1.

On May 25, 2010 Kern COG staff presented 5 key points about Kern's target setting process to the RTAC and ARB staff. This was a special meeting held by the RTAC and ARB to give MPO's the opportunity to present additional information and concerns.

On June 24, 2010 ARB staff gave a presentation before the ARB Board on the target setting process and released Draft Targets for most MPO's. ARB proposed splitting the 18 MPO's into three groups; the four Large MPOs, the eight San Joaquin Valley MPOs, and the remaining 6 MPOs. The targets were released as a range of reductions, which are listed in the following table. The ARB staff report is attachment 2, the full staff report with appendices is available at <http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/sb375/targets/drafttargetrelease.pdf>.

Draft Targets	2020	2035
Four Large MPOs	5 - 10% reduction in CO2/person	To be determined in July workshops
SJV MPOs	1 – 7 % reduction in CO2/person	1 – 7 % reduction in CO2/person
Remaining 6 MPOs	Set a current projected emissions	Set a current projected emissions

All information submitted by Kern COG, and the other MPO's have been posted on the ARB website: <http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/sb375/sb375.htm>

On July, 1, 2010 ARB staff made a conference call to Kern COG to discuss Kern issues and concerns. Namely, the challenge of going from a 8% increase to a 1-7% reduction in emissions per person. The discussion was focused on three strategies proposed by Kern COG staff:

- Request credit for Kern County because projected emissions/person are well below the statewide average now and in 2035.
- Kern is unique and requires special consideration for emissions related to interregional trips (30% of all travel in Kern) and Strategic Employment Centers (military, prisons, wind energy, etc). Regions that have these types of trip making that are generated by land use that is beyond their control, or are strategic to state climate change goals, should be allowed a higher target as long as they remain below the statewide average emissions in 2035, and can demonstrate a substantial net reduction in CO2 emissions.
- Continue to make improvements to the Land Use model for future use.

The following table illustrates the justification for requesting credit for Kern's emissions increase are lower than the statewide average.

CO2/Person	Kern	Statewide Average*
2005	15.4	18.7
2020	15.1	18.5
2035	16.7	21.4
2005 vs 2035	8%	13%

** Source: SANDAG, SJV MPOs, Based on non weighted average of MPOs that reported baseline emissions in May/June 2010*

Although Kern is showing an 8% increase in emissions, Kern's emissions are significantly below the statewide average and are not growing as fast as the baseline information for the rest of the State. Showing a net increase in emissions for Kern should be allowed because:

- 1) Although increasing, Kern's emissions stay well below the statewide average.
- 2) Region's that slow their emissions increase with an alternative scenario help the state make progress toward the AB 32 placeholder goal of 5 million tons of reduction.
- 3) A region should not be forced into development of an alternative planning strategy (that can be ignored under SB 375), if they are making significant progress in slowing the rate of growth in emissions for their region.
- 4) The RTAC recommended consideration for interregional travel and strategic employment areas. The current placeholder targets do not take these issues into account which account for over 30% of the travel in Kern. Local governments in Kern have no ability to affect this significant portion of passenger vehicle emissions in the region.

There was also discussion about the possibility of valley-wide targets and modeling capabilities. ARB staff indicated that targets will be provided individually for each MPO, however, the Valley MPOs could develop a joint Sustainable Communities Strategy for the 2014/15 RTP window at their discretion.

Next Steps

At the June 24th ARB Board meeting ARB staff stated that they are planning to focus on the SJV MPO's. ARB staff has scheduled a conference call with the Directors of the SJ Valley MPO's on July 8, 2010 to discuss target-setting issues and possibility of ARB Board member Dee Dee D'Adamo meeting with the Directors. ARB will have a public workshop in Fresno on July 22, 2010. Kern COG staff is planning to make a presentation at that workshop highlighting the issues and strategies for targeting setting.

ARB staff is expected to release the final draft targets on August 9th. This will conclude Step 6 of the RTAC recommended process for target setting. The Final Targets (Step 7) will be released on September 30, 2010.

The final target does not take effect for Kern until the next full update to the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) in 2014. Over the next 4 years Kern will work closely with member agencies and stakeholders to develop a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) as part of the 2014 RTP that strives to meet the final greenhouse gas target for Kern's passenger vehicles. ARB may consider revising the target every 4 to 8 years.

Meeting Schedule

July 22, 2010 – ARB meeting in Fresno at the SJV Air District Office
August 9, 2010 – Final Draft Target scheduled to be released by ARB (RTAC Step 6)
August 25, 2010 – Kern Regional Transportation Modeling Committee meeting
September 1, 2010 – Transportation Technical Advisory Committee meeting
September 15, 2010 – Kern COG Board of Directors meeting
September 30, 2010 – Final Targets to be adopted by ARB (RTAC Step 7)

Attachments

1. June 23, 2010 Kern COG Climate Change Task Force Meeting Notes – p. 3
2. May 25, 2010 Kern COG Presentation to the ARB RTAC meeting – p. 8

ACTION:

Information

Attachment 1

June 23, 2010

Kern COG Climate Change Task Force Meeting Notes



**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

Attachment 2

June 24, 2010

ARB Staff Report On Draft Targets

ARB Staff Release

Draft Regional Greenhouse Gas Emission Reduction Targets For Automobiles and Light Trucks Pursuant to Senate Bill 375

June 30, 2010

Electronic copies of this document can be found on ARB's website at <http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/sb375/sb375.htm>. Alternatively, paper copies may be obtained from the Public Information Office, Air Resources Board, 1001 I Street, Visitors and Environmental Services Center, 1st Floor, Sacramento, California 95814, (916) 322-2990. If you are a person with limited English and would like to request interpreter services, please contact ARB's Bilingual Manager at (916) 323-7053.

For individuals with sensory disabilities, this document is available in Braille, large print, audiocassette, or computer disk. Please contact ARB's Disability Coordinator at (916) 323-4916 by voice or through the California Relay Services at 711, to place your request for disability services.

This report has been reviewed by the staff of the California Air Resources Board and approved for publication. Approval does not signify that the contents necessarily reflect the views and policies of the Air Resources Board, nor does mention of trade names or commercial products constitute endorsement or recommendation for use.

Written comments

ARB maintains a web-based comment system to provide an ongoing opportunity for public comment during the target-setting process. Interested stakeholders may submit comments on this document to ARB through the following website: <http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/sb375/comments.htm>.

Written comments may also be sent directly to:

Attn: Ms. Lezlie Kimura Szeto
SIP and Local Government Strategy Section
California Air Resources Board
P.O. Box 2815
Sacramento, California 95812
Fax: (916) 322-3646

INTRODUCTION

For the first time statewide, Senate Bill 375 (SB 375), also known as the Sustainable Communities and Climate Protection Act of 2008, requires regional transportation plans to include a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) that links transportation and land use planning together into a more comprehensive, integrated process. This more integrated approach to planning is not new. There are communities in California that are already taking actions that will support a more sustainable future. Over the past decade, many California regions have pursued regional blueprint planning efforts to explore growth scenarios to help guide local land use and transportation decisions. These efforts are broad-based, collaborative local planning exercises. Many of the regional transportation plans (RTPs) that the Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) have in place today are beginning to reflect these initial efforts.

SB 375 is a mechanism to help further these sustainable planning efforts. The SCS adds more detail to the traditional land use allocations used by MPOs to "...set forth a forecasted development pattern for the region, which, when integrated with the transportation network, and other transportation measures and policies, will reduce greenhouse gas emissions from passenger vehicles to achieve, if there is a feasible way to do so, the greenhouse gas targets set by the state board...¹." Put most simply, the SCS is a mechanism for more effectively linking a land use pattern and a transportation system together to make travel more efficient and communities more livable. The result is reduced greenhouse gas emissions from passenger vehicles along with other benefits.

Under SB 375, the California Air Resources Board (ARB) is required to set passenger vehicle greenhouse gas emission reduction targets for 2020 and 2035 for each of the 18 MPO regions in California. ARB must set targets by September 30, 2010. The law also recognizes ARB's target-setting responsibility as a recurring process, allowing ARB to update the targets every four years.

To assist ARB in setting targets, SB 375 calls for ARB to appoint a Regional Targets Advisory Committee (RTAC) composed of representatives of MPOs; affected air districts; the League of California Cities; the California State Association of Counties; local transportation agencies; and members of the public, including homebuilders, environmental organizations, environmental justice organizations, affordable housing organizations, and others. ARB established the 21 member committee in January 2009 to recommend factors to be considered and methodologies to be used in setting targets. The RTAC delivered its recommendations to ARB in September 2009.

The RTAC's final report contains a number of recommendations on SB 375 implementation issues. One key technical recommendation is for the targets to be expressed in terms of a percent reduction in per capita greenhouse gas emissions from a 2005 base year. The metric is simple, easily understood, can be developed

¹ Government Code Section 65080(b)(2)(A)(i)

with currently available data, and is used by MPOs today. This metric also has the advantage of directly addressing growth rate differences among the regions. Beyond its technical recommendation on the target metric, the RTAC also made recommendations on the target-setting process. The Committee emphasized the need for a high degree of collaboration among ARB and the MPOs, since MPOs are directly responsible for carrying out the planning requirements in SB 375. To help guide the collaboration through the target-setting process, the RTAC outlined a multistep “bottom-up” approach. ARB and the MPOs have been following this approach over the past nine months, to the extent that time and resources have allowed.

In addition to its recommendations on target-setting, the RTAC also made recommendations on longer-term implementation issues. In particular, the RTAC recognized the importance of highlighting the additional benefits, beyond greenhouse gas reductions, that communities and local governments can realize from sustainable planning efforts under SB 375. Some of these potential benefits include increased mobility, cleaner air, improved health, better protection of our State’s natural resources, and cost savings. The RTAC recommended that MPOs identify, quantify, and highlight these and other co-benefits in their planning processes. MPOs can quantify some of the benefits, such as reduced congestion, through their own local planning processes using their existing travel models. The RTAC did recognize the limitation in the available methods, and acknowledged that additional tools are needed to help quantify community co-benefits.

Following the completion of the RTAC report, MPO staff formed a technical working group, which included ARB staff, to coordinate the development of various land use and transportation policy scenarios for ARB’s target-setting process. These scenarios were developed to test the effectiveness of implementing various transportation and land use policies. The MPOs discussed technical issues including: land use and transportation strategies that could be tested in the MPO scenarios, different approaches to interregional travel, travel cost assumptions, and future revenue assumptions. A number of MPOs provided the initial results of their scenario analyses and target-setting approaches to ARB and the public in time for the final RTAC meeting on May 25, 2010.

Over the last six months, a number of MPOs developed planning scenarios that use travel models and other technical tools to show how a region’s land use and travel patterns can change over time using different assumptions about land use and transportation policies. Many MPOs started developing these scenarios by building on existing blueprint efforts and other sustainable planning actions in their regions. While these scenarios are not the official long-range plans adopted by the regions, they do provide insight into the potential benefits that may result from different sets of local and regional land use and transportation policy decisions. The MPO scenarios are intended to inform the target-setting process and show ARB and the public the possible benefits of more integrated planning under SB 375.

Over the long-term, these potential benefits are expected to grow as land use and transportation plans shift to reflect changing demographics, market trends, and sustainability goals. When looking at the data provided by the MPOs, it is clear that it will take several four-year RTP planning cycles for the land use forecasts and transportation investments to fully reflect the changes envisioned by SB 375.

DRAFT TARGETS

For the 2020 targets, two points have consistently been made over the past few months by MPO staff and other stakeholders. First, significant change in land development patterns and transportation infrastructure will take time. As a result, a significant portion of the built environment in 2020 will be defined by decisions that have already been made, and a large portion of the near-term benefits will come from improving the efficiency of each region's existing transportation network. Second, the timing of economic recovery, including the recovery of the housing market and resources for local planning and implementation, will matter. Many MPOs have reported that their forecasts are adjusted to account for some of the near-term effects of the recession in their regions. Given the relatively short forecast period between now and 2020, those adjustments are important.

For the 2035 targets, ARB staff recognizes that the forecasting uncertainties are much greater than for the 2020 scenarios. While significant changes in land use patterns and transportation infrastructure can be expected over the next 25 years, predicting the pace and nature of change is challenging. A number of MPOs are continuing to develop additional land use and transportation scenarios which will be considered in the final staff target proposal.

In recognition of the additional MPO work underway, ARB staff is releasing a draft 2020 target range for the four largest MPOs, placeholder 2035 target ranges for the four largest MPOs, and placeholder target ranges for the San Joaquin Valley MPOs for both 2020 and 2035. While the draft targets for these MPOs are now ranges, ARB staff will propose specific targets for each region for ARB Board consideration in September. For the remaining six MPOs, ARB staff proposes an alternative approach for setting targets. These approaches are described in greater detail below.

Four Largest MPOs

The four largest MPOs in the State² clearly demonstrated the capability to bring significant staff and technical resources to the target-setting process. These MPOs have provided the most complete technical information and scenario results. Based on the information provided, ARB staff is proposing a 2020 draft target range of five to ten percent per capita reduction in greenhouse gas emissions from 2005 levels. This range is based on the potential reductions from land use and transportation planning scenarios provided by the MPOs.

² Metropolitan Transportation Commission, Sacramento Area Council of Governments, San Diego Association of Governments, and Southern California Association of Governments

**Table 1. Four Largest MPOs
Draft Greenhouse Gas Reduction Targets for 2020
(Percent Reduction in Per Capita Emissions Relative to 2005)***

MPO Regions	2020 Draft Targets
Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG)	5 - 10%

* Percent reduction numbers do not include emission reductions expected from Pavley Greenhouse Gas Vehicle Standards and Low Carbon Fuel Standard measures.

There is less complete information available for setting the long-term 2035 targets than for 2020. This is evident in the variability of the scenario results for the four large MPOs, which the MPOs point out, include policy scenarios that would be easily achievable by the region, as well as extremely aggressive policy scenarios that could not realistically be implemented³.

At this time, only the Southern California Association of Governments has identified a target range for 2035: a five to six percent reduction in per capita greenhouse gas emissions from 2005 levels. However, the Executive Directors for each of the four largest MPOs have acknowledged the need for additional work to be done prior to setting final targets, and have committed to continuing the technical work in the coming weeks.

Given the status of work on 2035 scenarios, ARB staff is proposing to use each MPO's individual 2035 scenario range as the 2035 placeholder targets.

**Table 2. Four Largest MPOs
Placeholder Greenhouse Gas Reduction Targets for 2035
(Percent Reduction in Per Capita Emissions Relative to 2005)***

MPO Regions	2035 Placeholder Targets
Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC)	3-12%
Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG)	13-17%
San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG)	5-19%
Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG)	3-12%

* Percent reduction numbers do not include emission reductions expected from Pavley Greenhouse Gas Vehicle Standards and Low Carbon Fuel Standard measures.

³ See Appendix for MPO descriptions of scenarios. Full MPO data submittals can be viewed on ARB's website: <http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/sb375/data/data.htm>

San Joaquin Valley MPOs

The San Joaquin Valley (Valley) MPOs⁴ have a long history of multi-county coordination that is recognized in SB 375 through a special provision granting the Valley MPOs the option of developing a joint SCS. To address SB 375, the Valley MPOs are using the existing valleywide planning structure to coordinate on SB 375 implementation.

The San Joaquin Valley is a rapidly growing region, with population growth rates double those in most other areas of the State. Whether it is done collectively as a Valley or as individual counties, the local and regional planning efforts to accommodate this expected population growth are extremely relevant to the long-term success of SB 375.

Consistent with their history of coordination on air quality, transportation, and other regional issues, the Valley MPOs have been working together to provide baseline data to ARB. This effort culminated in data submissions from Fresno and Kern, and a joint effort from the remaining six Valley MPOs.

Four of the eight Valley MPOs provided target-setting scenarios and three provided recommended targets⁵. The San Joaquin Council of Governments provided a target-setting scenario based on data from the local blueprint effort and supplemented by updated information about local jurisdictions' planned growth and General Plan updates. The Council of Fresno County Governments submitted scenarios and suggested greenhouse gas emission reduction targets that reflect ongoing discussions with their local jurisdictions about the region's approach to target-setting. The Kern Council of Governments provided scenarios and suggested targets that are based on existing plans; removed the travel impacts from strategic employment resources, defined as military bases, wind farms, and prisons; and reflected an increase in per capita greenhouse gas emissions. The Kings County Association of Governments recommended a target that relies on current baseline projections and reflects progress that has been made to implement the local blueprint. To date, the San Joaquin Valley MPO submittals span a range in per capita greenhouse gas emissions from a seven percent reduction to a twelve percent increase.

Overall, the data from the Valley MPOs provides a limited technical foundation for target-setting. ARB staff intends to work closely with the San Joaquin Valley MPOs before recommending final targets. In the interim, staff is guided by the principle that the targets in the San Joaquin Valley should reflect a reduction, not an increase, in per capita greenhouse gas emissions. As a result, staff is releasing a placeholder target range of one to seven percent reduction for both the 2020 and 2035 targets in

⁴ Council of Fresno County Governments, Madera County Transportation Commission, Merced County Association of Governments, Kern Council of Governments, Kings County Association of Governments, San Joaquin Council of Governments, Stanislaus County Council of Governments, and Tulare County Association of Governments

⁵ See Appendix for MPO descriptions of scenarios. Full MPO data submittals can be viewed on ARB's website: <http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/sb375/data/data.htm>

the San Joaquin Valley, reflecting the portion of the Valley MPOs' submitted ranges that result in per capita greenhouse gas emission reductions.

**Table 3. San Joaquin Valley MPOs
Placeholder Greenhouse Gas Reduction Targets for 2020 and 2035
(Percent Reduction in Per Capita Emissions Relative to 2005)***

MPO Regions	2020 Placeholder Targets	2035 Placeholder Targets
Council of Fresno County Governments Madera County Transportation Commission Merced County Association of Governments Kern Council of Governments Kings County Association of Governments San Joaquin Council of Governments Stanislaus County Council of Governments Tulare County Association of Governments	1-7%	1-7%

* Percent reduction numbers do not include emission reductions expected from Pavley Greenhouse Gas Vehicle Standards and Low Carbon Fuel Standard measures.

Remaining Six MPOs

Collectively, the remaining six MPOs⁶ represent about five percent of both the State's greenhouse gas emissions and vehicle miles traveled from passenger vehicles. They have the most limited resources, staffing, and technical expertise to bring to the target-setting process.

For these MPOs, ARB staff is proposing to use the most current greenhouse gas per capita projections from each MPO, adjusted for the impacts of the recession, as the basis for individual MPO targets for this first target-setting cycle. This approach allows the focus of this first target-setting cycle to appropriately remain on the largest and fastest growing regions of the state.

ARB staff will continue to work closely with these six MPOs to ensure the most current projections from each region are used. Based on the MPO submittals to date from this group, ARB staff anticipates some will identify greenhouse gas emission reductions beyond what is currently reflected in their adopted RTPs.

NEXT STEPS

These proposed draft targets will be revised after a public workshop process. A final staff proposal will be released in August and the Board will consider adoption of targets in September.

⁶ Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments, Butte County Association of Governments, San Luis Obispo County Council of Governments, Santa Barbara County Association of Governments, Shasta County Regional Transportation Planning Agency, and Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization