

**JOINT POLICY COMMITTEE  
MINUTES OF  
WEDNESDAY, JUNE 24, 2009**

**Elected Officials Present**

John Shoals (SLOCOG President)  
Jim Patterson (SLOCOG Past-President)  
Bruce Gibson (County Supervisors Chair)

**Directors Present**

Ronald De Carli (SLOCOG Executive Director)  
Larry Allen (APCD Air Pollution Control Officer)  
Paul Hood (LAFCO Executive Director)  
Ron Whisenand (City of Paso Robles, Planning Director)  
Kami Griffin (SLO County, Assistant Director)

**Staff Present**

David Church (LAFCO)  
Michael Codron (City of San Luis Obispo, Planning Staff)  
Chuck Stevenson (SLO County)  
Aileen Loe (Caltrans)  
Rich Murphy, James Worthley, and Geoffrey Chiapella (SLOCOG)

**1. Welcome, Introductions** (SLOCOG President John Shoals)

**2. In-kind match requirement**

**Ron De Carli** informed the committee that we are setting up a process for the in-kind match contribution. We will be discussing that in more detail at the next Working Team meeting.

**3. JPC meeting notes; Working Team meeting information**

Minutes of the May 18<sup>th</sup> Joint Policy Committee meeting and June 12<sup>th</sup> Working Team meeting were approved.

**4. Performance Monitoring**

**Mr. De Carli** presented a brief overview of the Statewide Regional Indicator's Report Committee, which met last week to review a survey about which statewide indicators to retain, and identify additional indicators to include in this report.

**Jim Patterson** pointed out, in making reference to the initial statewide regional indicators report, that conditions are vastly different since 2007. He requested a clarification of what indicators were being collected. **Aileen Loe** explained that this process came out of the Caltrans regional blueprint planning process and the progress report is meant to be an update from the 2007 report.

**Larry Allen** asked what performance measures were to be included in SB 375 and through the pSCS process. **Mr. De Carli** noted that that would be answered from material later in the meeting.

**5. Emissions targets**

**a. Emissions inventories**

**(1) Mr. De Carli** emphasized that there were two different emissions inventory processes underway – the individual cities' and county's greenhouse gas emissions inventories and subsequent climate action planning process, and the land use/transportation modeling process that is part of the pSCS is a sector-specific emissions inventory of emissions from transportation countywide. **Mr. De Carli** noted that the power point slides that were included in the packet were meant to be an attachment at the end of the agenda packet. They were meant to provide background information on the Regional Targets Advisory Committee. **Mr. De Carli** then provided

an explanation of the RTAC process, and the methodology the committee is using to develop targets for each region. The committee is to consider the following, as they relate to establishing regional targets:

- Relative (% , per unit) or Absolute (metric ton)
- Reduction from current year conditions or Reduction from future year conditions
- Uniform statewide or MPO-specific (varying based on the region)

**Mr. Allen** provided a status of the greenhouse gas emissions inventories to date, noting that the County and the City of San Luis Obispo have completed their greenhouse gas emissions inventories. Paso Robles and Morro Bay are nearing completion with their respective inventories. Pismo Beach is just starting, while Arroyo Grande and Atascadero are in between Pismo Beach and Morro Bay.

**Mr. Allen** noted that 67 percent of emissions from the County's inventory are from transportation emissions, while 61% percent of emissions from the City's inventory are from transportation. This means that we need to focus on VMT. He noted that emissions that were attributable to airports, railroad, and ports is not included in these inventories. **Mr. Allen** pointed out that modeling process of PLACE3S/TransCAD/EMFAC is sensitive to adjustments in land use changes as it relates to transportation emissions, whereas the GHG inventory process is more generalized (with some specificity) as it relates to transportation emissions. It was emphasized that it is important to make the distinction between the two inventory processes currently underway.

**Mr. Allen** passed out a handout titled "Interim Regional GHG Targets for SLO County". He described the three different approaches to developing an interim GHG target for the pSCS, taking direction from ARB's *Proposed Scoping Plan*. These are briefly described below:

- The goal of reducing statewide emissions related to land use and transportation is 5 million metric tons (MMT). The regional goal could be based on the county's share of statewide population (less than 1%), and that could be applied to the 5MMT total to determine our share.
- 15% reduction in emissions for Local Governments. This is not a mandatory – it is voluntary. It is important to note that the 15% includes all municipal operations, energy use, etc.
- Reduction from 14 metric tons per capita to 10 metric tons per capita.

**Mr. Allen** then explained the potential metrics that could be used. He pointed out that there is no absolute reduction identified in SB 375. VMT would be a good potential metric, as the conversion to GHG would be fairly straightforward. The relative reductions (per capita, per household, per driver) would also be good metrics to use, noting that the public would be able to relate to these metrics. He suggested a per capita reduction may need a qualifier as not all people are driving.

The following discussion included what year to use as a baseline, and how do we establish a baseline for VMT – where do we get that data.

**Mr. De Carli** noted that there are multiple efforts to address the quantification of VMT, and we will be working on making sure that they are coordinated.

**Michael Codron** noted that if the county's absolute numbers are high relative to state numbers, then would it make sense to consider an absolute reduction in VMT and associated GHG emissions rather than a relative reduction as is being suggested as the better option. Several committee members agreed that was a good point.

Discussion ensued about making sure that we are cross-checking VMT figures from various sources. **Bruce Gibson** pointed out that we can't do the whole reduction just based on emission reductions from transportation.

**Mr. Allen** suggested that through this process if we can demonstrate a target that will be “ambitious and achievable”, which may be proposed to RTAC and ARB, it is possible that we could get some buy-off on it.

**Mr. De Carli** pointed out that the Working Team will continue to wrestle with these figures and numbers and come back with suggestions on the potential approaches to developing the interim regional GHG targets.

**Mr. Shoals** agreed with Mr. Allen that if we take the initiative to propose a target to RTAC and ARB, that we may put ourselves in a good position.

## 6. Modeling elements

### a. Overview of Modeling Process

**James Worthley** presented an overview of the three-model process and the model tools used (PLACE3S – land use, TransCAD – traffic, and EMFAC – air quality/emissions). He emphasized the limited capabilities of the traffic model, summarized the status of the traffic model process, and noted that staff is working with the traffic model consultant to develop finer-grain tools to address VMT reductions from biking, walking and transit.

### b/c. Land use Model Development/Preliminary Land Use Modeling Results

**Geoffrey Chiapella** provided an overview of the land use modeling process, the integration between the land use and transportation models, and more in-depth explanation of the land use modeling process, including preliminary results of the 2008 Existing Conditions scenario and 2035 “Business-As-Usual” scenario.

**Mr. De Carli** noted that the RTAC has not addressed car/van pooling. Several members expressed that a rural region such as ours needs to include that consideration. **Mr. Gibson** identified the alternative modes as a necessary component, and **Mr. Patterson** stated that changes in land use would have an impact at some point in the future, but a shift to alternative modes could have immediate impacts.

**Mr. De Carli** referenced recent materials that identified infill, redevelopment, and greenfield developments as measures for alternatives, and indicated that these would be incorporated into our modeling results.

**Paul Hood** inquired into the effects of shifting work schedules or increased telecommuting. **Mr. De Carli** responded that such would be a consideration within the 2010 RTP, and **Chuck Stevenson** noted that these are included in Clean Air Plans as well.

## 7. Next Steps

**Mr. De Carli** explained the next steps in the Preliminary SCS process. Staff will be seeking additional input regarding pending projects, target development areas identified in *Community 2050*, and the Working Team will further discuss the approach to developing interim targets for the pSCS.

**Mr. Stevenson** noted that the County’s Land Use Element update will be a collaborative effort with all the cities.

**Mr. Shoals** asked when the next Working Team meeting would be. **Mr. Worthley** suggested that it may be prudent to have two Working Team meetings before the next Joint Policy Committee meeting, in order to discuss pending projects and allow for a review of the Target Development Areas. **Mr. De Carli** suggested the next meeting would likely be in early August (1<sup>st</sup> or 2<sup>nd</sup> week).

## 8. Adjourned at 10:35am