

MTC Responses to CARB

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?
 - a. In what ways has the economy affected your region (e.g. population, jobs, unemployment, new development, foreclosures, vacancy rates, etc.)? MTC previously updated its RTP with ABAG's Projections 09 (our 2009 RTP used Projections 07 as it was the most current available at that time). The Projections 09 series had about 157,000 fewer employed residents in 2020 compared to Projections 07 and about 180,000 fewer employed residents in 2035. The result was an approximate 5% improvement in weekday pounds of GHG emissions per capita in 2020 and 2035 compared to Projections 2007.
 - b. If you have already included the impact of the recession, where is it reflected in your scenario data? The Projections 09 series, while about 2 years old, is the best available information we have at this time. ABAG is in the process of updating Projections 09 to develop a basecase for subsequent scenarios assessments; however, the update won't be completed before CARB needs to adopt targets in September 2010. While ABAG expects the updated basecase to have lower economic activity growth than Projections 09 due to the prolonged recession, we cannot say to what level at this time.

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

We think that congested speeds are a major reason. Our analyses show very little average speed difference between 2005 and 2020. However, average speeds drop about 5% between 2005 and 2035. More significant, average weekday VMT at congested speeds (less than 35 mph) are estimated to increase more than 10% between 2005 and 2020; however, congested speeds in 2035 increase about 50% during the same time period. This makes sense since the region's highway system has very limited excess capacity and the RTP invests relatively little in capacity expansion, so that so much more that system exceeds available capacity in 2020 than 2035

To a lesser degree, our RTP is somewhat front loaded so that we get the benefits on some of the expansion projects sooner, however that degrades over time due to 2 million more people and jobs forecasted for the region by 2035.

3. What model improvements, changes in planning assumptions, or additional policies are you considering that were not used in developing your scenarios?
 - a. How will they impact the direction and/or magnitude of change? We are transitioning from a trip-based to activity-based model, with more integration between the land use and transportation models. We expect the new models to be operational at the end of this year and be much more sensitive to transportation and land use changes; however it's difficult to say in what direction and magnitude those changes will occur.
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?) No.
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? No, we only changed land use and pricing assumptions. However, it's important to keep in mind that more than 80% of our RTP expenditures are for maintaining and operating our existing transportation system. In addition, most of the remaining 20% is spent on transit expansion and other TDM/TSM improvements.
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.

VMT per capita:

2005 – 20.7

2020- 20.6

2035 – 20.5