

Comparison of Target-Setting Frameworks

	Dual-Path (Wallerstein)	Blueprint-Review (Walters)	Modified-Uniform (ARB Staff)
<p>Summary of Frameworks</p>	<p>Two alternative paths developed for MPOs to show they meet their assigned targets. No target-setting process described.</p> <p><u>Path 1 Modeling:</u> Requires an MPO to submit proposed modeled scenarios, with documentation of key input and output assumptions, to ARB for review and approval.</p> <p><u>Path 2 Best Management Practices (Point System):</u> Requires an MPO to select transportation and land use strategies from a menu. All strategies have associated point values. MPOs select strategies from the list to reach a point total requirement, established by ARB, corresponding with their GHG reduction target. Path 2 is only available to MPOs for the first RTP cycle after targets are established, or until 2014, whichever is earlier.</p>	<p>RTAC determines ambitious achievable targets through its review of existing blueprints and empirical data on the relationship between travel and land use.</p> <p>There are two alternative paths, similar to those in the dual-path approach, for MPOs to show they meet their assigned targets. The primary path is through modeling. The secondary path is with a Best Management Practices (Point System) system limited to small, slow growing MPOs that do not have existing travel models.</p>	<p>Targets are set through a 3-step process.</p> <p><u>Step 1:</u> ARB identifies preliminary statewide targets for 2020 and 2035 on a trajectory to reach statewide 2050 goals using empirical data on the relationship between travel and land use, existing RTPs and blueprints, and the GHG reduction benefits from fuels and fuel efficiency.</p> <p><u>Step 2:</u> MPOs evaluate preliminary targets using model or off-model tools and suggest modifications based on region-specific characteristics.</p> <p><u>Step 3:</u> ARB considers MPO data, policies, and any empirical evidence, and sets targets for each MPO.</p>

Framework Elements	Dual-Path (Wallerstein)	Blueprint-Review (Walters)	Modified-Uniform (ARB Staff)
Form of the target	Percent reduction of GHG [Varies by region based on no more than 2 factors.]	Percent reduction in GHG per new household.	Per capita reduction of GHG.
Target surrogates used in framework	Path 2: Point system established as a surrogate for meeting targets.	Point system established as a surrogate for meeting targets for small, slow growing MPOs that do not have existing travel models.	None.
Base year	Historical base year that is the same for each MPO.	Not addressed.	Not specified.
Credit for early action	Allow credit for past actions through use of a historical base year.	Only indirectly addresses credit.	Step 2: MPOs can quantify early actions in their evaluation of the preliminary targets.
Models and off-model tools	Path 1: MPO models and off-model tools are the primary tools for MPOs to demonstrate they meet targets.	Modeled performance of blueprint scenarios used to help set targets. MPO models and off-model tools are the primary tools for MPOs to demonstrate they meet targets.	Step 1: Modeled performance of blueprint and other visionary scenarios used to help set preliminary statewide target. Step 2: MPO models and off-model tools used to help MPOs evaluate preliminary targets. MPO models and off-model tools are the primary tools for MPOs to demonstrate they meet targets.

Framework Elements	Dual-Path (Wallerstein)	Blueprint-Review (Walters)	Modified-Uniform (ARB Staff)
Policies	<p>Path 2: Policies have the central role in the form of a Best Management Practices (BMP) menu. MPOs may use the menu and points as a surrogate to demonstrate they meet targets. ARB would develop the BMPs included on the menu and assign points to each according to their emission reduction effectiveness. How MPOs calculate plan GHG impacts, as required by Gov't code 65080(b)(2)(I)(i) & (ii), is not addressed.</p>	<p>During the RTAC's evaluation of existing blueprints, the RTAC would assess the degree to which blueprints contain policies/strategies known to reduce VMT and resulting GHGs.</p> <p>A BMP list can be used for a general checklist for MPO use.</p>	<p>Step 2: Examples of policies that have a significant role in reducing GHGs are provided to support MPOs proposed modifications to the preliminary statewide target.</p> <p>The RTAC may suggest a prioritization of policies for MPOs to address.</p>
Empirical data	<p>Path 1: Used by ARB and technical experts to develop modeling standards.</p> <p>Path 2: Used to estimate the percent reduction in GHG that each BMP could achieve.</p>	<p>Used to determine how much GHG reduction can be expected from different strategies.</p> <p>Also used to help refine model and off-model tools for MPOs to demonstrate they meet targets.</p>	<p>Step 1: Used to help develop preliminary statewide target.</p> <p>Step 2: Used to help MPOs refine model and off-model tools, and by ARB to evaluate the MPOs' suggested modifications.</p>

Framework Elements	Dual-Path (Wallerstein)	Blueprint-Review (Walters)	Modified-Uniform (ARB Staff)
Blueprints/visionary scenarios	Not addressed	Key component in target-setting framework.	<p>Step 1: Performance of blueprint and other visionary scenarios one of the considerations for setting a preliminary statewide target.</p> <p>Step 2: Expected to be used by MPOs to evaluate preliminary targets.</p>
Summary of where uniformity shows up in each framework	<p>Includes uniform use of a historical base year.</p> <p>Path 1: Includes establishment of a set of uniform modeling assumptions statewide (e.g. price of gas).</p> <p>Path 2: Common list of BMPs, and comment set of BMP points apply.</p>	RTAC recommends uniform percent GHG reduction per new household.	<p>Step 1: Development of a preliminary uniform statewide target.</p> <p>Step 2: Includes establishment of a set of uniform modeling assumptions statewide (e.g. price of gas) for MPOs to use as they identify and quantify proposed modifications to the statewide targets, also MPOs are asked to consider a uniform list of policies and performance indicators as part of their evaluation.</p>

Framework Elements	Dual-Path (Wallerstein)	Blueprint-Review (Walters)	Modified-Uniform (ARB Staff)
Summary of where region-specific considerations show up in each framework	Targets may vary by region but based on no more than two factors (e.g. variation in land character, growth rates, existing transportation infrastructure, or urban v. rural differences).	In recommending the uniform percent reduction per new households, RTAC would consider regional blueprint and any available regional empirical data.	<p>Step 2: MPOs would propose adjustments to the preliminary statewide targets that consider differences in future regional growth rates, travel, development patterns, as well as current and expected future economic conditions.</p> <p>Step 3: ARB would review suggested adjustments received by MPOs, in conjunction with factors that led to development of the uniform statewide target, and propose modified targets.</p>
Economic factors	Not addressed.	RTAC would consider economic factors in the target setting process, approach not specified.	Step 2: MPOs would consider economic factors as part of their evaluation of preliminary statewide target.
Tracking/monitoring	<p>Path 2: Ability to track progress is added as a criterion for ARB acceptance of SCS/APS.</p> <p>Also, suggests ARB develop a tracking tool and periodic update compliance options for Scoping Plan and SIP implementation.</p>	Not addressed.	Not addressed.