



TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TAC)

Thursday, March 27, 2014

Key to colors:

Blue: Items that are clearly Action Items

Attendees:

Pam Korte (PK)	Chad Baker (CB)	Gabe Corley (GC)
Jesse Gage (JG)	Austin Hicks (AH)	Frances Dea-Sanchez (FS)
Bob McBride (BM)	Rose Agacer (RA)	Doug Maclvor (DM)
Rahul Srivastava (RS)	Ryan Ong (RO)	
Aniss Bahreinian (AB)	Al Arana (AA)	

By Phone:

Chris Ganson (CG)	Sean Tiedgen (ST)	Sarah Chesebro (SC)
Rex Jackman (RJ)	Steve McDonald (SM)	
Dave Vautin (DV)	Ron West (RW)	

Welcome, Action Items and Agenda Review – Pam/Austin

- MTC provided information on telecommuting and road user pricing
- Ron provided feedback on the strategies effectiveness
- BRT has now been included in the strategies chart
- Today we are going to cover two items
 - Strategies level of effectiveness
 - PAC survey results on 3 new strategies

Strategies Level of Effectiveness – Pam/Austin

- RW – Cambridge Systematics provided the information on the level of effectiveness
- RW – Ron provided an overview on the ranking of the effectiveness
 - Marginal – less than 1%
 - Moderate – between 1 – 2%
 - High – greater than 2%
- CEC – Is this based on model runs?
- RW – This is based on the development and update of the CSTDM and not actual model runs
- PK – It should be noted that none of the strategies had a high ranking
- PK – There is not an individual strategy that can solve GHG reduction goals
- PK – The whole purpose is so develop a package of these strategies in which strategies can benefit each other and provide greater effectiveness

Discussion on Strategies

VMT Fee and Regional Gas Tax

- RW – High Speed Rail auto operating costs research is the basis for the CSTDM auto operating cost assumptions
- RW – effectiveness was done on a basis of comparing apples to apples
- Sunk vs. auto operating costs do have different psychological effects
- CEC – Any research on consumer responses to VMT vs. gas tax
- RW – There is research on sunk vs. out of pocket costs



TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TAC)

Thursday, March 27, 2014

Congestion Pricing

- AH – There are 4 time periods which are essentially two peak periods and two non-peak periods
- RW – We can assess a higher toll during a peak period, but cannot vary the price on capacity during the peak period. A flat rate is the only option for a time period.
- RW – Keep it simple like the Bay Bridge toll which would be considered a congestion price
- **RW – Need to follow-up with David Ory on toll rates**
- CG – Would like to see multiple model runs done to find each regions toll price sweet spot, but the CTP have a limited budget
- **RW – Regional toll could be identified by a screen line analysis which would cost less**
- CG – Congestion pricing is the holy grail to transportation planning if it was only political feasible
- RW – Model shift and mode share can be provided
- CEC – How is congestion pricing accounted for in the CSTDM?
- RW – Envisioned only a freeway congestion pricing and not local road pricing
- PK – Focusing on what the regions did
- RW – Would prefer a more global implementation and analysis
- Rose – Congestion pricing on freeways could force vehicles onto local roads which may cause more GHG
- RW – Maybe, maybe not. Overall, we would want to make sure GHG is reduced
- RS – Does not believe congestion pricing would reduce VMT, just redistribute VMT over the other time periods
- CG – Congestion pricing will affect and reduce VMT
- RW – Congestion pricing will reduce VMT
- RW – Todd Littman is a good source on congestion pricing reducing VMT
- RS – Todd Littman is not peer reviewed
- CG – Agrees with RW's description determining regional tolls with a screen line analysis
- CG – Why not local congestion pricing?
- PK – PAC removed cordon pricing so local streets should be excluded

Telecommuting

- CG – Would like to have a literature review done on telecommuting
- AH – UC Berkeley study completed for the CTP in January includes a literature review from ARB on telecommuting

Park and Ride Lots

- **Waiting to discuss this strategy with the PAC**

Carpooling

- **PK – Need to check if carpooling was included in UC Berkeley study**
- **RW – Need to follow-up with Clint Daniels**

Carsharing

- DV – Greater impact on car-sharing
- DV – Subsidizes car-sharing for year in dense areas and now moving to subsidize less dense suburban areas

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TAC)

Thursday, March 27, 2014

Transit

- AH – There are two ways to affect transit in the CSTDM
 - Increase revenue service miles or frequency
 - Expand service area
- **AH – We are going to continue to focus on increasing revenue service miles**
- CB – Transit only considers two time periods
 - On-peak
 - Off-peak
- CB – Looked at the future years and there are very few areas with large population growth that is no service by transit so increasing transit service areas should not be necessary or would be easy
- CB – Reducing transit fares is another implementation we may want to consider
- SM – Supports reducing transit fares and increases in frequency

Expand Bike and Pedestrian

- Rose – 40% of bike and ped mode share is less than 3 miles
- RW – Most activities are during congestion periods and longer than 3 miles
- CB – Could take trip purpose tables and adjust the trips under 3 miles to reflect larger share of bike and ped trips
- **AH – Going to look at CHTS datasets and break out mode share, trip purpose and mode share by trip purpose and compare to 2000 CHTS for potential growth pattern**
- RS – It is important to provide bike and ped infrastructure to support transit especially the first and last mile of a trip

HOV/HOT Lanes

- PK – Our executive management has told us to go with what the regions have identified for HOV/HOT lanes and not expand the network beyond
- AH – We have been talking to our Traffic Operations staff and they have provided us with some sketch planning GHG reductions by implementing transportation system management and operations strategies

PAC Survey Results on 3 New Strategies

- AH – A survey was emailed out to the PAC to add an additional three strategies that were identified by the UC Berkeley study for the CTP
- AH – The three strategies identified were added to the list and they are:
 - Eco-driving
 - Reduced speed limits
 - Voluntary travel behavior change
- PK – If PAC members did not respond then it meant they agree to adding the strategies to the list
- PK - 11 PAC responses were received
 - 8 agreed
 - 3 disagreed for various reasons
- **PK – Reduced speed limits may need to be removed**
 - **Bring it to PAC**

Comments

- ST – Reviewed an electric vehicle study revealed that a 1% market penetration of EVs causes a 1% reduction in GHG.