



METROPOLITAN
TRANSPORTATION
COMMISSION

Joseph P. Bort MetroCenter
101 Eighth Street
Oakland, CA 94607-4700
TEL 510.817.5700
TDD/TTY 510.817.5769
FAX 510.817.5848
E-MAIL info@mtc.ca.gov
WEB www.mtc.ca.gov

Memorandum

TO: MTC Planning Committee, ABAG Administrative
Committee, and Joint Policy Committee

DATE: January 7, 2011

FR: Executive Director

W. I.

RE: NGO-Based Alternative Proposal

Request for Interest-Based Alternative

In its August 21, 2010 letter (attached), TRANSDEF requests that MTC and ABAG allow non-profit organizations that have been involved in past Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) efforts to develop an alternative for consideration in the Environmental Impact Report (EIR).

Staff Proposal for Interest-Based Alternative

MTC and ABAG staff support the development of an alternative by non-profit and non-governmental organizations (NGOs). This provides an opportunity for NGOs to engage in the planning process, while holding them accountable for demonstrating how the higher greenhouse gas emission reduction targets they advocated for can be achieved. This NGO-based alternative will provide the basis for good comparative scenario analysis and debate. There is precedence for MTC to evaluate an NGO-based alternative in RTPs such as the RAFT alternative analyzed in the 1998 RTP EIR and the TRANSDEF alternative in the Transportation 2030 EIR.

MTC and ABAG staff recommend committee approval of this request subject to clear parameters and milestones for the development of the NGO-based alternative, as provided in Attachment A.

Staff Recommendation and Next Steps

Staff requests that the MTC Planning Committee and ABAG Administrative Committee approve the staff proposal for an NGO-based alternative, subject to the parameters in Attachment A.

Following committee approval, MTC and ABAG will release a Request for Letters of Interest to all interested organizations that may wish to be the lead organization to develop the interest-based alternative. MTC and ABAG staff will review letters of interest and will return in February 2011 to request committee approval of the lead organization.

Steve Heminger

SH: AN

J:\COMMITTEE\Planning Committee\2011\Jan11\3b_Interest-based Alternative_Nguyen.doc

Attachment A

1. **One Lead Organization:** There will be a single lead organization in charge of engaging fellow non-profits/NGOs in the development of an alternative to be evaluated by MTC and ABAG. The lead organization must meet the following requirements:
 - Have at least 100 active members.
 - Have demonstrated experience in working in collaborative relationships with nonprofit groups to advance the lead organization's vision and goals.
 - Have demonstrated experience in getting local residents involved in local and/or regional planning efforts similar in nature to the RTP/SCS.
 - Have ability to convene an advisory group composed of leading environmental and social equity advocates, business groups, public health experts, labor representatives, community-based organizations and academics to advise the lead organization on the development of an alternative.
2. **One Alternative:** There will only be one interest-based alternative so that MTC and ABAG staff can allocate the proper resources and time to code networks, complete model runs, and analyze and report results. This interest-based alternative would be evaluated along side other alternatives to be defined during the detailed SCS scenarios process.
3. **Targets:** The alternative must be designed to meet at minimum the two statutorily required targets: (1) GHG targets for 2020 and 2035 as set by CARB for the Bay Area, and (2) housing target. This parameter would apply to any alternative evaluated during the detailed SCS scenario process. In addition, the alternative will be assessed against all other performance targets identified for the RTP/SCS as approved by MTC and ABAG.
4. **Staff Consultations & Model Inputs:** The lead organization must appoint a project manager that would regularly consult with MTC and ABAG modeling staff in preparing the interest-based alternative to ensure that the alternative can be and will be properly coded in our models and comparable in terms of inputs to the other alternatives to be evaluated. The following technical parameters for model inputs must also be adhered to:
 - Land Use Inputs
 - Must be consistent with federal regulations that require a realistic growth development pattern as required by SB 375.
 - Must use Projections 2011 as the base land use because it reflects the most recent planning assumptions considering local general plans and other factors and meets the federal regulations noted above.
 - May shift jobs and housing from one traffic analysis zone (TAZ) to another but the regional income and age distribution must be consistent with Projections 2011 regional totals.
 - Highway Network
 - Must use Transportation 2035 highway network as the base.
 - May delete or add a roadway project, but the substitute roadway or transit project must be eligible to use the funds associated with the deleted project.
 - Transit Network
 - Must use Transportation 2035 transit network as the base.
 - May delete or add a transit project, but the substitute roadway or transit project must be eligible to use the funds associated with the deleted project.

- To maintain some level of financial constraint, should not assume new transit O&M funds beyond those freed up by other deleted projects or agreed-upon new pricing mechanisms mentioned below.
 - Consult with MTC staff on how outcomes of the Transit Sustainability Project (TSP) should be incorporated into network parameters.
 - Financial Assumptions
 - While transportation financial assumptions should be constrained and consistent with MTC’s forecasts, we may consider certain pricing and financing strategies on a case by case basis. If considered, pricing options would be limited to what is coded directly in MTC’s travel model. The model considers the following prices: bridge tolls, transit cash fares, HOT-lane tolls (which can be applied to any road), perceived automobile operating cost (which equates with gas price), long-term (e.g., 8-hours) parking rates, and short-term (hourly) parking rates.
5. **Review by Regional Advisory Working Group:** The lead organization must provide regular updates on the development of the interest-based alternative for review and comment by the Regional Advisory Working Group to ensure complete transparency through the scenario development process.
6. **Delivery Milestones:** The lead organization must meet all key delivery milestones as follows:

Key Milestone	Due Date
Present reports on the development of the interest-based alternative to RAWG for review and comment	To be scheduled at key points between March and June 2011
Consult with MTC and ABAG modeling staff	To be scheduled at key points between April and June 2011
Produce Draft Alternative	June 17, 2011
Produce Final Alternative for Analysis by MTC and ABAG	July 15, 2011

7. **EIR Analysis:** MTC and ABAG reserve the right to determine if the alternative is carried forward into the Environmental Impact Report for the RTP/SCS.