

REPORT TO SHASTA COUNTY RTPA

SUBJECT	MEETING DATE	ITEM NUMBER
Senate Bill 375 (SB 375): Draft Targets for Regional Greenhouse Gas Emissions	7/27/10	9

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Board direct staff to submit a regional greenhouse gas "reduction" target range of 0 to +8 percent for 2020 and 2035 to the California Air Resources Board (CARB).

SUMMARY

SB 375 requires CARB to set per-capita, passenger-vehicle greenhouse gas (GHG) emission reduction targets for 2020 and 2035 in the Shasta region. Targets will be the basis for a required Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) in 2015. The SCS must include policy, development, and investment strategies to achieve the target. CARB requests that the RTPA recommend an interim target based on the difference between our current travel model projections and adjusted forecasts resulting from the economic recession. The attached memorandum from Dowling Associates shows that this adjustment will result in minimal reductions in per capita travel and overall shows an 8 percent increase of per capita GHG by 2035.

It is doubtful CARB will allow a GHG increase of +8 percent as a "reduction" target. Therefore, staff recommends a range from 0 to +8 percent as reasonable. To date, CARB staff has only recommended targets to decrease GHG, so it remains to be seen how CARB will react to our recommendation. CARB will provide final targets by September 23, 2010. The target adopted by CARB is considered interim because it will be revisited in four years as our SCS is being finalized.

DISCUSSION

SB 375 requires CARB to set passenger vehicle GHG emission reduction targets for 2020 and 2035 in each of California's eighteen MPO regions. To help guide transportation sector GHG reduction efforts, all MPOs in the state are required to develop an SCS or a realistically achievable growth and development pattern that, when combined with transportation network and mobility improvements, will allow the region to meet its target.

CARB has encouraged regions to submit their own target or target range recommendation that reflects SB 375's goal of "aggressive but achievable" emission reductions. Utilizing input provided by regional and local agencies, CARB staff has formulated the attached recommended targets for the CARB Board to consider. The CARB Board must determine each region's final target no later than September 30, 2010. The law recognizes, however, that target-setting will be a recurring process and permits CARB to update the targets as often as every four years.

Potential benefits stemming from the SCS process include: new or improved state and federal grant opportunities; California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) streamlining; and a more coordinated set of growth and development policies across all jurisdictions in Shasta County. Each MPO region must incorporate the SCS as a new element in their next Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) update. Shasta County's next required RTP update will occur in 2015.

Draft CARB Recommendations

At the June 24, 2010, meeting of the CARB Board, CARB staff proposed "provisional placeholder target ranges" based on information provided by each region. The state's eighteen MPO regions were grouped into the following three tiers with accompanying recommendations:

**Per Capita GHG Target Ranges:
 CARB Staff Recommendations to CARB Board
 (Reductions From 2005 Levels)
 (June 24, 2010)**

2020 Draft Targets		2035 Placeholder Targets
'Big Four' MPO Regions		
Bay Area	-5 to -10%	-3 to -12%
Sacramento		-13 to -17%
San Diego		-5 to -19%
Southern California		-3 to -12%
Fast-growing San Joaquin Valley MPO Regions		
Merced	-1 to -7%	-1 to -7%
Fresno		
Kern		
Kings		
Madera		
Stanislaus		
Tulare		
San Joaquin		
Smaller MPO Regions		
Butte	To be determined based on current RTP or most recent projections provided by each region. Targets will be revisited in four years.	
Monterey Bay		
San Luis Obispo		
Santa Barbara		
Tahoe		
Shasta		

There is a clear focus on the "big four" metropolitan regions and the fast-growing San Joaquin Valley regions. The six remaining smaller MPOs, including Shasta, proved more difficult to evaluate, so specific targets were not recommended. CARB staff acknowledged that the statewide GHG contribution for these six regions combined is minimal -- about 5%. In addition, most of these regions are in attainment of federal air quality standards and, therefore, have not developed the modeling or specialized staffing needed to generate accurate targets within the timeframe allotted by SB 375.

Since other MPOs must prepare an SCS sooner than Shasta, we can learn from those experiences and develop more meaningful targets by the time they are revisited in 2014. In the interim, CARB staff suggests a simplified methodology that determines targets based on reduced travel forecast projections attributed to the economic recession.

SCRTPA Recommendation to CARB

The attached memorandum from Dowling Associates shows adjustments to travel forecasts due to the recession will have little long-term effect on per capita GHG emissions. This is essentially a status quo projection consistent with current trends. Our travel demand model predicts a per capita GHG emissions increase of 8 percent by 2035. In other words, the average resident will drive more miles than they do today.

To date, CARB has not agreed to a per capita GHG “reduction” target that is actually an increase. Such a target conflicts with the language and intent of SB 375. Nonetheless, using CARB’s simplified methodology, an 8 percent GHG increase is where we stand based on current information. Since the intent of Shasta’s 2015 SCS will be to reduce GHG emissions, it’s conceivable that as the SCS develops we can demonstrate a decrease in per capita GHG emissions consistent with SB 375. More importantly, market factors such as the cost of gasoline, housing, and vehicles are likely to result in reduced travel that can be factored into the 2015 SCS.

Given these variables, staff recommends a per capita GHG reduction target of 0 to +8 percent by 2025 and 2035 as a reasonable range. CARB will provide final targets by September 23, 2010. Based on current law, testimony at recent CARB hearings, and the above table of CARB recommendations to date, it is likely that CARB will reject Shasta’s target recommendation. Nevertheless, the 0 to +8 percent target is recommended by staff since it reflects the range between the minimal acceptable levels under SB 375 (and CEQA), and our current trend forecasts.

Implications of the Interim Target

This target will serve as a placeholder until 2014, at which time a more substantiated target may be provided. To the extent the target range includes the possibility of no per capita GHG increases, the interim target will be important for two reasons:

- 1) The SCS process may be referenced in all CEQA studies in lieu of project-by-project studies of cumulative GHG analysis related to transportation. This should cut time and cost for public and private project reviews;
- 2) The region will remain competitive for state and federal grants, which increasingly give higher consideration to regions meeting state and federal GHG objectives.

Long-term Actions Toward Target Setting/Compliance

Work tasks designed to inform the regional targets updates in 2014 and the 2015 SCS-compliant RTP are underway or being considered, including the following:

- o Proposition 84 funded enhancements to Shasta County Travel Demand Model – Enhancements will allow more precise modeling outputs and improve the ability to test scenarios.
- o Proposition 84 funded GIS data development – Includes development and/or compiling of congruent regional GIS data sets related to transportation, travel demand, and land use.
- o Regional GIS Platform Feasibility Study – The first step toward a centralized regional GIS server and online portal for improved access and analysis of regionally merged GIS data.

- Mobility Assessment Tool (MAT) – GIS-based 'hotspotter' tool designed to improve the analysis of regional growth scenarios and to assist in the spatial prioritization of urban investment and development.
- Grant funding – Various state and federal grant programs are available for planning and some project-level implementation activities.
- Beta-SCS Planning – An early effort to build regional consensus and test the outcomes of a non-binding SCS prior to the formal inclusion of the SCS element in the 2015 RTP.
- Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) Study – A feasibility study for the development of automated travel data collection points on key facilities and regional gateways.

OTHER AGENCY INVOLVEMENT

Information has been distributed to all partner agencies. They have been invited to attend and comment on both the regional target setting process and the RTPA's SCS approach. The Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) concurs with the staff recommendation.

ALTERNATIVES

The Board may recommend a fixed regional target within the recommended range of 0 to +8 percent, or a -1 percent target consistent with what is likely to be CARB's minimum acceptable level. If the fixed target is a per-capita increase in GHG (+1% or higher), the Board should consider the CEQA and grant implications noted on the prior page.

The Board may decline to recommend any target, in which case it would be set by CARB.

FINANCING

There is no direct fiscal impact; however, funding opportunities are increasingly dependent on the regions efforts to meet state and federal GHG objectives.



Daniel S. Little, AICP, Executive Director

DSL/DTW/jac

Attachments:

1. July 14, 2010, Memorandum from Dowling Associates Regarding Shasta SB 375 Targets
2. ARB Staff Release: Draft Regional Greenhouse Gas Emission Reduction Targets for Automobiles and Light Trucks Pursuant to SB 375



Date: July 14, 2010

Memorandum

To: Daniel Wayne, Shasta County Regional Transportation Planning Agency
From: Mike Aronson, Dowling Associates, Inc.
Reference #: A09-213
Subject: Shasta SB375 Targets

I do not have a good way to recommend GHG targets for Shasta County which represent a reduction from 2005 emissions per capita. I have researched the following:

- I read the submissions of draft targets to CARB from the other MPOs
- Bruce Griesenback at SACOG was willing to spend a long time last Friday explaining their scenario testing process. He also sent me their latest target submittal
- I have looked through the "Moving Cooler" report which was the reference for VMT and GHG reductions for several of the MPOs including SACOG

The starting point for Shasta County, based on travel model results with the current land use forecasts, is an increase in GHG per capita in 2020 and 2035. Dan Wayne's calculations are correct if we use total emissions in Shasta County. If we only include emissions from internal VMT and one-half of the internal-external (IX) or external-internal (XI) VMT, then the emissions per capita are 0.008958 in 2005, 0.009764 in 2020 and 0.009855 in 2030. That represents an increase of +9.0% in 2020 compared to 2005 and +10.0% in 2030 compared to 2005.

The baseline Shasta County results include the following:

- Land use growth is forecast where major developments are proposed and where cities indicated development is likely to occur. Land use has not been adjusted to represent potential changes in policy to encourage infill, mixed-use, etc...
- No real (adjusted for inflation) increases in fuel prices have been assumed
- No transportation demand management (TDM) policies or pricing policies have been assumed

Many of the measures used by the larger MPOs to achieve reductions in VMT per capita are not appropriate for Shasta County. These include assumptions of revised land use policies to encourage infill development, major investments in transit and HOV infrastructure, and assumptions of increased highway congestion and downtown parking costs. These are basic assumptions, even before some of the larger MPOs tested more aggressive policies such as VMT pricing.

In looking at the results from the other MPOs besides the four largest, most indicate a small reduction from 2005 GHG per capita could be possible. The exception is Kern County, whose baseline GHG increases are about the same or larger than Shasta County.

Shasta SB375 Targets Memorandum

July 14, 2010

As far as feasible reductions for Shasta County, I would estimate the following:

- -1% for assumed increases in fuel costs (based on sensitivity analysis done by Fresno COG)
- -1% for TDM programs at major employers (based on Moving Cooler reference)

I don't see any easy ways to get further reductions without revisiting the development assumptions for major projects outside the main urbanized area such as North Fork, Vineyards, Stillwater Business Park, etc...

Therefore, the realistic targets for Shasta County would be +7% in 2020 and +8% in 2035.

I don't believe that adjustments are required due to changes in the economy. Thomas Hays' analysis showed that the forecasts from 2005 were only about 1% high in population and 5% high in employment compared to the most recent statistics from the state. That amount of fluctuation is normal and does not necessarily indicate that the longer range forecasts for 2020 and 2035 need to be adjusted. Even if the longer range forecasts were adjusted downwards by 5%, the total VMT and GHG would be reduced but the per capita VMT and GHG would not necessarily be much different than the base forecast results.

It appears that CARB did not want to accept Kern County's increases as targets, and so they arbitrarily set a range of 1-7% reduction for all of the counties in the San Joaquin Valley.

In summary, RTPA could either recommend targets based on the current analysis of +7% in 2020 and +8% in 2035, or propose targets of -1% in 2020 and 2035 consistent with the minimum reduction proposed for the San Joaquin Valley MPOs.

ARB Staff Release

**Draft Regional Greenhouse Gas Emission Reduction Targets
For Automobiles and Light Trucks
Pursuant to Senate Bill 375**

June 30, 2010

Electronic copies of this document can be found on ARB's website at <http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/sb375/sb375.htm>. Alternatively, paper copies may be obtained from the Public Information Office, Air Resources Board, 1001 I Street, Visitors and Environmental Services Center, 1st Floor, Sacramento, California 95814, (916) 322-2990. If you are a person with limited English and would like to request interpreter services, please contact ARB's Bilingual Manager at (916) 323-7053.

For individuals with sensory disabilities, this document is available in Braille, large print, audiocassette, or computer disk. Please contact ARB's Disability Coordinator at (916) 323-4916 by voice or through the California Relay Services at 711, to place your request for disability services.

This report has been reviewed by the staff of the California Air Resources Board and approved for publication. Approval does not signify that the contents necessarily reflect the views and policies of the Air Resources Board, nor does mention of trade names or commercial products constitute endorsement or recommendation for use.

Written comments

ARB maintains a web-based comment system to provide an ongoing opportunity for public comment during the target-setting process. Interested stakeholders may submit comments on this document to ARB through the following website: <http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/sb375/comments.htm>.

Written comments may also be sent directly to:

Attn: Ms. Lezlie Kimura Szeto
SIP and Local Government Strategy Section
California Air Resources Board
P.O. Box 2815
Sacramento, California 95812
Fax: (916) 322-3646

For general questions, contact:

Mr. Douglas Ito, Manager
SIP and Local Government Strategy Section
phone: (916) 322-0285
email: dito@arb.ca.gov

INTRODUCTION

For the first time statewide, Senate Bill 375 (SB 375), also known as the Sustainable Communities and Climate Protection Act of 2008, requires regional transportation plans to include a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) that links transportation and land use planning together into a more comprehensive, integrated process. This more integrated approach to planning is not new. There are communities in California that are already taking actions that will support a more sustainable future. Over the past decade, many California regions have pursued regional blueprint planning efforts to explore growth scenarios to help guide local land use and transportation decisions. These efforts are broad-based, collaborative local planning exercises. Many of the regional transportation plans (RTPs) that the Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) have in place today are beginning to reflect these initial efforts.

SB 375 is a mechanism to help further these sustainable planning efforts. The SCS adds more detail to the traditional land use allocations used by MPOs to "...set forth a forecasted development pattern for the region, which, when integrated with the transportation network, and other transportation measures and policies, will reduce greenhouse gas emissions from passenger vehicles to achieve, if there is a feasible way to do so, the greenhouse gas targets set by the state board...¹." Put most simply, the SCS is a mechanism for more effectively linking a land use pattern and a transportation system together to make travel more efficient and communities more livable. The result is reduced greenhouse gas emissions from passenger vehicles along with other benefits.

Under SB 375, the California Air Resources Board (ARB) is required to set passenger vehicle greenhouse gas emission reduction targets for 2020 and 2035 for each of the 18 MPO regions in California. ARB must set targets by September 30, 2010. The law also recognizes ARB's target-setting responsibility as a recurring process, allowing ARB to update the targets every four years.

To assist ARB in setting targets, SB 375 calls for ARB to appoint a Regional Targets Advisory Committee (RTAC) composed of representatives of MPOs; affected air districts; the League of California Cities; the California State Association of Counties; local transportation agencies; and members of the public, including homebuilders, environmental organizations, environmental justice organizations, affordable housing organizations, and others. ARB established the 21 member committee in January 2009 to recommend factors to be considered and methodologies to be used in setting targets. The RTAC delivered its recommendations to ARB in September 2009.

The RTAC's final report contains a number of recommendations on SB 375 implementation issues. One key technical recommendation is for the targets to be expressed in terms of a percent reduction in per capita greenhouse gas emissions from a 2005 base year. The metric is simple, easily understood, can be developed

¹ Government Code Section 65080(b)(2)(A)(i)

with currently available data, and is used by MPOs today. This metric also has the advantage of directly addressing growth rate differences among the regions. Beyond its technical recommendation on the target metric, the RTAC also made recommendations on the target-setting process. The Committee emphasized the need for a high degree of collaboration among ARB and the MPOs, since MPOs are directly responsible for carrying out the planning requirements in SB 375. To help guide the collaboration through the target-setting process, the RTAC outlined a multistep "bottom-up" approach. ARB and the MPOs have been following this approach over the past nine months, to the extent that time and resources have allowed.

In addition to its recommendations on target-setting, the RTAC also made recommendations on longer-term implementation issues. In particular, the RTAC recognized the importance of highlighting the additional benefits, beyond greenhouse gas reductions, that communities and local governments can realize from sustainable planning efforts under SB 375. Some of these potential benefits include increased mobility, cleaner air, improved health, better protection of our State's natural resources, and cost savings. The RTAC recommended that MPOs identify, quantify, and highlight these and other co-benefits in their planning processes. MPOs can quantify some of the benefits, such as reduced congestion, through their own local planning processes using their existing travel models. The RTAC did recognize the limitation in the available methods, and acknowledged that additional tools are needed to help quantify community co-benefits.

Following the completion of the RTAC report, MPO staff formed a technical working group, which included ARB staff, to coordinate the development of various land use and transportation policy scenarios for ARB's target-setting process. These scenarios were developed to test the effectiveness of implementing various transportation and land use policies. The MPOs discussed technical issues including: land use and transportation strategies that could be tested in the MPO scenarios, different approaches to interregional travel, travel cost assumptions, and future revenue assumptions. A number of MPOs provided the initial results of their scenario analyses and target-setting approaches to ARB and the public in time for the final RTAC meeting on May 25, 2010.

Over the last six months, a number of MPOs developed planning scenarios that use travel models and other technical tools to show how a region's land use and travel patterns can change over time using different assumptions about land use and transportation policies. Many MPOs started developing these scenarios by building on existing blueprint efforts and other sustainable planning actions in their regions. While these scenarios are not the official long-range plans adopted by the regions, they do provide insight into the potential benefits that may result from different sets of local and regional land use and transportation policy decisions. The MPO scenarios are intended to inform the target-setting process and show ARB and the public the possible benefits of more integrated planning under SB 375.

Over the long-term, these potential benefits are expected to grow as land use and transportation plans shift to reflect changing demographics, market trends, and sustainability goals. When looking at the data provided by the MPOs, it is clear that it will take several four-year RTP planning cycles for the land use forecasts and transportation investments to fully reflect the changes envisioned by SB 375.

DRAFT TARGETS

For the 2020 targets, two points have consistently been made over the past few months by MPO staff and other stakeholders. First, significant change in land development patterns and transportation infrastructure will take time. As a result, a significant portion of the built environment in 2020 will be defined by decisions that have already been made, and a large portion of the near-term benefits will come from improving the efficiency of each region's existing transportation network. Second, the timing of economic recovery, including the recovery of the housing market and resources for local planning and implementation, will matter. Many MPOs have reported that their forecasts are adjusted to account for some of the near-term effects of the recession in their regions. Given the relatively short forecast period between now and 2020, those adjustments are important.

For the 2035 targets, ARB staff recognizes that the forecasting uncertainties are much greater than for the 2020 scenarios. While significant changes in land use patterns and transportation infrastructure can be expected over the next 25 years, predicting the pace and nature of change is challenging. A number of MPOs are continuing to develop additional land use and transportation scenarios which will be considered in the final staff target proposal.

In recognition of the additional MPO work underway, ARB staff is releasing a draft 2020 target range for the four largest MPOs, placeholder 2035 target ranges for the four largest MPOs, and placeholder target ranges for the San Joaquin Valley MPOs for both 2020 and 2035. While the draft targets for these MPOs are now ranges, ARB staff will propose specific targets for each region for ARB Board consideration in September. For the remaining six MPOs, ARB staff proposes an alternative approach for setting targets. These approaches are described in greater detail below.

Four Largest MPOs

The four largest MPOs in the State² clearly demonstrated the capability to bring significant staff and technical resources to the target-setting process. These MPOs have provided the most complete technical information and scenario results. Based on the information provided, ARB staff is proposing a 2020 draft target range of five to ten percent per capita reduction in greenhouse gas emissions from 2005 levels. This range is based on the potential reductions from land use and transportation planning scenarios provided by the MPOs.

² Metropolitan Transportation Commission, Sacramento Area Council of Governments, San Diego Association of Governments, and Southern California Association of Governments

**Table 1. Four Largest MPOs
Draft Greenhouse Gas Reduction Targets for 2020
(Percent Reduction in Per Capita Emissions Relative to 2005)***

MPO Regions	2020 Draft Targets
Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG)	5 - 10%

* Percent reduction numbers do not include emission reductions expected from Pavley Greenhouse Gas Vehicle Standards and Low Carbon Fuel Standard measures.

There is less complete information available for setting the long-term 2035 targets than for 2020. This is evident in the variability of the scenario results for the four large MPOs, which the MPOs point out, include policy scenarios that would be easily achievable by the region, as well as extremely aggressive policy scenarios that could not realistically be implemented³.

At this time, only the Southern California Association of Governments has identified a target range for 2035: a five to six percent reduction in per capita greenhouse gas emissions from 2005 levels. However, the Executive Directors for each of the four largest MPOs have acknowledged the need for additional work to be done prior to setting final targets, and have committed to continuing the technical work in the coming weeks.

Given the status of work on 2035 scenarios, ARB staff is proposing to use each MPO's individual 2035 scenario range as the 2035 placeholder targets.

**Table 2. Four Largest MPOs
Placeholder Greenhouse Gas Reduction Targets for 2035
(Percent Reduction in Per Capita Emissions Relative to 2005)***

MPO Regions	2035 Placeholder Targets
Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC)	3-12%
Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG)	13-17%
San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG)	5-19%
Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG)	3-12%

* Percent reduction numbers do not include emission reductions expected from Pavley Greenhouse Gas Vehicle Standards and Low Carbon Fuel Standard measures.

³ See Appendix for MPO descriptions of scenarios. Full MPO data submittals can be viewed on ARB's website: <http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/sb375/data/data.htm>

San Joaquin Valley MPOs

The San Joaquin Valley (Valley) MPOs⁴ have a long history of multi-county coordination that is recognized in SB 375 through a special provision granting the Valley MPOs the option of developing a joint SCS. To address SB 375, the Valley MPOs are using the existing valleywide planning structure to coordinate on SB 375 implementation.

The San Joaquin Valley is a rapidly growing region, with population growth rates double those in most other areas of the State. Whether it is done collectively as a Valley or as individual counties, the local and regional planning efforts to accommodate this expected population growth are extremely relevant to the long-term success of SB 375.

Consistent with their history of coordination on air quality, transportation, and other regional issues, the Valley MPOs have been working together to provide baseline data to ARB. This effort culminated in data submissions from Fresno and Kern, and a joint effort from the remaining six Valley MPOs.

Four of the eight Valley MPOs provided target-setting scenarios and three provided recommended targets⁵. The San Joaquin Council of Governments provided a target-setting scenario based on data from the local blueprint effort and supplemented by updated information about local jurisdictions' planned growth and General Plan updates. The Council of Fresno County Governments submitted scenarios and suggested greenhouse gas emission reduction targets that reflect ongoing discussions with their local jurisdictions about the region's approach to target-setting. The Kern Council of Governments provided scenarios and suggested targets that are based on existing plans; removed the travel impacts from strategic employment resources, defined as military bases, wind farms, and prisons; and reflected an increase in per capita greenhouse gas emissions. The Kings County Association of Governments recommended a target that relies on current baseline projections and reflects progress that has been made to implement the local blueprint. To date, the San Joaquin Valley MPO submittals span a range in per capita greenhouse gas emissions from a seven percent reduction to a twelve percent increase.

Overall, the data from the Valley MPOs provides a limited technical foundation for target-setting. ARB staff intends to work closely with the San Joaquin Valley MPOs before recommending final targets. In the interim, staff is guided by the principle that the targets in the San Joaquin Valley should reflect a reduction, not an increase, in per capita greenhouse gas emissions. As a result, staff is releasing a placeholder target range of one to seven percent reduction for both the 2020 and 2035 targets in

⁴ Council of Fresno County Governments, Madera County Transportation Commission, Merced County Association of Governments, Kern Council of Governments, Kings County Association of Governments, San Joaquin Council of Governments, Stanislaus County Council of Governments, and Tulare County Association of Governments

⁵ See Appendix for MPO descriptions of scenarios. Full MPO data submittals can be viewed on ARB's website: <http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/sb375/data/data.htm>

the San Joaquin Valley, reflecting the portion of the Valley MPOs' submitted ranges that result in per capita greenhouse gas emission reductions.

**Table 3. San Joaquin Valley MPOs
Placeholder Greenhouse Gas Reduction Targets for 2020 and 2035
(Percent Reduction in Per Capita Emissions Relative to 2005)***

MPO Regions	2020 Placeholder Targets	2035 Placeholder Targets
Council of Fresno County Governments Madera County Transportation Commission Merced County Association of Governments Kern Council of Governments Kings County Association of Governments San Joaquin Council of Governments Stanislaus County Council of Governments Tulare County Association of Governments	1-7%	1-7%

* Percent reduction numbers do not include emission reductions expected from Pavley Greenhouse Gas Vehicle Standards and Low Carbon Fuel Standard measures.

Remaining Six MPOs

Collectively, the remaining six MPOs⁶ represent about five percent of both the State's greenhouse gas emissions and vehicle miles traveled from passenger vehicles. They have the most limited resources, staffing, and technical expertise to bring to the target-setting process.

For these MPOs, ARB staff is proposing to use the most current greenhouse gas per capita projections from each MPO, adjusted for the impacts of the recession, as the basis for individual MPO targets for this first target-setting cycle. This approach allows the focus of this first target-setting cycle to appropriately remain on the largest and fastest growing regions of the state.

ARB staff will continue to work closely with these six MPOs to ensure the most current projections from each region are used. Based on the MPO submittals to date from this group, ARB staff anticipates some will identify greenhouse gas emission reductions beyond what is currently reflected in their adopted RTPs.

NEXT STEPS

These proposed draft targets will be revised after a public workshop process. A final staff proposal will be released in August and the Board will consider adoption of targets in September.

⁶ Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments, Butte County Association of Governments, San Luis Obispo County Council of Governments, Santa Barbara County Association of Governments, Shasta County Regional Transportation Planning Agency, and Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization