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Objectives

01 Where are we in the update process?

02 Discussion Scenario land use pattern & transportation investments

03 Discussion Scenario performance results

04 Progress on meeting state greenhouse gas targets

05 Next milestone (December Framework)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>December 2017</th>
<th>April 2018</th>
<th>September 2018</th>
<th>December 2018</th>
<th>April 2019</th>
<th>February 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy Framework &amp; Growth Forecast</td>
<td>Land Use Inputs</td>
<td>Transportation Inputs &amp; Discussion Scenario Results</td>
<td>Preferred Scenario Framework</td>
<td>Preferred Scenario</td>
<td>Adopt Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Board Action</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*Board Action</td>
<td>*Board Action</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Major Steps in the Update Process**
The Discussion Scenario set out to answer two main questions:

1) Does a scenario that is focused on maintaining or improving the existing plan’s performance achieve the SB 375 GHG reduction target & other objectives?

2) How can land use, transportation, revenue, pricing, and technology/innovation assumptions affect performance?
Discussion Scenario at a glance

Growth Forecast
270,000 jobs
260,000 homes

Land Use Pattern
61% Established & Center/Corridor Communities
38% Developing Communities
74% Small-Lot & Attached Homes
26% Large-Lot Homes & Rural Residential

Transportation Investments
$6B road expansion
1,240 new lane miles
4,400 added hours of transit service
How does the Discussion Scenario perform?

Compared to the current MTP/SCS, the Discussion Scenario is:
• Slightly higher on combined bike, walk & transit share (12% compared to 11%)
• Comparable in auto & transit accessibility to jobs
• Comparable on VMT per capita for household travel (about 18 miles per person per weekday)
• Lower on total VMT (78 million miles per weekday, compared to 81 million)
• About the same on overall roadway congestion level (6% of all vehicle travel in heavy congestion for both)
• Comparable on the SB 375 GHG reduction target: 14 percent
Meeting State Greenhouse Gas Targets

• Q: Why does current MTP/SCS only get to 14 percent GHG reduction?
  • A: We re-assessed current MTP/SCS with updated assumptions on future auto costs (lower)
• Q: 14 percent is a long way from 18 or 19 percent--can we make up this difference
  • A: We knew the higher targets would be a challenge. Additional GHG reductions can come from several sources:
    • Scenario refinement (changes made to Discussion Scenario between now and plan adoption
    • Accounting for GHG reduction capability of innovative programs
    • ARB Pilot
    • Pricing
Meeting State Greenhouse Gas Targets

- Baseline GHG Reduction - Discussion Scenario
- Scenario Refinement
- Innovative TDM & Mobility Projects
- ARB Pilot + Pricing

The chart shows a graph with the years 2020 and 2035 on the x-axis, and percentage values on the y-axis. The graph illustrates the progression towards meeting state greenhouse gas targets.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOPIC</th>
<th>POLICY CHOICES &amp; ASSUMPTIONS</th>
<th>POLICY DIRECTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Pattern</td>
<td>• Infill vs greenfield split&lt;br&gt;• Housing product mix (small-, large-lot, attached)</td>
<td>Example: Maintain land pattern and housing splits of Discussion Scenario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Budget</td>
<td>• New revenue assumptions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment Priorities</td>
<td>• System expansion vs system preservation focus&lt;br&gt;• Prioritize investments that align with land use pattern</td>
<td>Example: Prioritize fix-it-first investments on existing system before expansion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System Pricing</td>
<td>• Facility (e.g., tolls) &amp; mileage (VMT fees) pricing or not&lt;br&gt;• Pricing as a management strategy or not</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDM &amp; New Mobility</td>
<td>• Innovative programs &amp; technology&lt;br&gt;• State pilot program partnership</td>
<td>Example: Pursue an electrification pilot project with the state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Prosperity</td>
<td>• Sub-regional jobs-housing balance&lt;br&gt;• Priority for projects that create access to jobs/job centers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Targets</td>
<td>• Achieve state greenhouse gas reduction targets&lt;br&gt;• Maintain or improve performance over current plan for VMT, congestion, mode shares, and air quality</td>
<td>Example: Preferred scenario should achieve at least 18% GHG reduction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2018
• Budget Assumptions
• New Mobility Strategies
• System Maintenance Needs (Board Luncheon)

2018
• Pricing Strategies
• Project Level Performance Assessment (Board Luncheon)

2018
• Board action on a Preferred Scenario Framework

2018
• Final performance and financial analyses

2019
• Board action on a Draft Preferred Scenario