

SEPTEMBER

2025



FINAL PROPOSAL

Assembly Bill 744

Prepared by:

Sheila Ennes

Transportation Data Program Manager

Advancing Data-Driven Transportation
Planning in California



catc.ca.gov



AB744@catc.ca.gov

Executive Summary

Assembly Bill 744 (AB 744), enacted in 2023, directs the California Transportation Commission (Commission) to develop a proposal to procure and implement advanced data, modeling, and analytic software tools to support California's sustainable transportation and climate objectives. This initiative is designed to enhance data-driven decision-making and policy development, as well as support public agencies in delivering transportation infrastructure that better aligns with the state's environmental, economic, and housing priorities.

The bill mandates the integration of these tools to address key concerns, including:

- Congestion Management – Reducing traffic congestion and improving mobility through data-driven solutions.
- Affordable Housing & Efficient Land Use – Supporting planning efforts that balance transportation infrastructure with sustainable urban development.
- Air Quality Improvement – Leveraging analytics to monitor and reduce transportation-related emissions.
- Economic Development – Facilitating infrastructure investments that enhance economic growth and job creation.
- Climate Goal Advancement – Implementing the state's climate goals of reducing greenhouse gas emissions.

Proposal Development

This proposal outlines the Commission's efforts to fulfill the requirements of AB 744 through stakeholder engagement, needs assessments, and program development. Key activities in developing this proposal included surveys, public workshops, and one-on-one meetings. A list of participants involved in these activities is provided in Appendix A.

Key Findings

- Data Gaps and Inconsistencies: Agency capacity to implement advanced data analytic software and tools varies widely across the state, with some agencies actively using cutting-edge platforms, and others lacking capacity or resources to implement such tools.
- Workforce and Procurement Barriers: Many agencies lack staff expertise, face budget constraints, and report complex procurement processes as barriers to adoption.
- Equity in Access: Smaller and rural agencies often rely on consultants and cannot afford high-cost tools or licenses, underscoring the need for statewide support.
- Stakeholder Support for Centralization: Agencies expressed interest in collaborative procurement, shared services, and centralized data platforms to promote efficiency and consistency.

Commission Recommendation

To meet the goals of AB 744, the Commission recommends advancing a hybrid funding and procurement strategy that combines direct funding to agencies with optional access to centrally procured tools through master contracts. This approach ensures:

- Equitable access to high-quality data tools,
- Streamlined procurement and training support,

- Regional coordination and peer learning opportunities.

The recommended hybrid approach integrates the strengths of the previously considered options (competitive grant funding and centralized procurement) to create a more flexible and scalable solution. This model has received strong stakeholder support due to its ability to balance local autonomy with statewide coordination, thereby improving access for underserved agencies while promoting consistency in tool adoption and use.

By leveraging advanced technology and fostering cross-jurisdictional collaboration, AB 744 positions California as a leader in sustainable and data-driven transportation planning. This proposal offers a practical roadmap for effective implementation, ensuring that the state continues to advance its long-term mobility, safety, equity, economic, and environmental goals.

Table of Contents

I. Introduction and Background.....	5
II. Outreach and Engagement Activities.....	6
III. Stakeholder Engagement Results: Agency Practices and Challenges.....	7
IV. Analysis of Gaps and Challenges	9
V. Summary of Recommended Hybrid Option.....	11
VI. Conclusion and Next Steps	12
VII. Contact Information.....	13
VIII. Resources	13
IX. Appendix.....	13

I. Introduction and Background

California has long been at the forefront of integrating sustainable transportation planning with environmental and economic policy. As the state continues to address the challenges of climate change, urban growth, and transportation efficiency, advanced data analytics and transportation modeling tools have become essential for informed decision-making within every public transportation agency.

To guide environmentally responsible growth and reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, California's transportation and environmental policies have evolved. Executive Order N-19-19 (2019) required state transportation agencies to align transportation investments with state climate goals, taking measurable steps toward reducing vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and advancing sustainable mobility options. Building on this directive, the Climate Action Plan for Transportation Infrastructure (CAPTI) established a comprehensive framework to ensure that transportation investments advance equity, sustainability, and resilience. Together, these policies highlight the growing need for data-driven solutions that align transportation improvements with the state's broader sustainability and climate goals.

Despite existing policies and planning efforts, California has experienced gaps in data integration and analysis when addressing transportation and climate challenges. Traditional forecasting models often fail to capture real-time data, limiting the ability of agencies to make proactive, evidence-based decisions, such as traffic operations management. Additionally, regional disparities in access to advanced modeling tools may contribute to inconsistent transportation planning across the state.

AB 744 was introduced in 2023 to address these gaps by directing the Commission to develop a proposal to procure state-of-the-art data, modeling, and analytic software tools or provide a process for direct allocation of funding to agencies for data procurement. These tools will enhance transportation efficiency, congestion reduction, and sustainable land-use planning while supporting broader climate action goals.

AB 744 emphasizes collaboration among state, regional, and local agencies, ensuring that transportation planners across California have equitable access to advanced analytical resources. In compliance with the legislation, this proposal outlines the key actions required to implement its directives, meet statutory obligations, and advance the state's broader transportation and climate objectives. To effectively carry out these initiatives, the following steps have been pursued:

- Assess Existing Tools
Evaluate current data, modeling, and analytic software tools used by state, regional, and local agencies. Additional details are provided in Appendix B.
- Identify Data Needs
Determine the types of data sources, desired data outputs, and modeling parameters necessary for consistent data usage.
- Identify Path Forward
Develop a process for procuring these tools and granting access to them, which may include:
 - developing a process to procure data, modeling, and analytic software tools and a process to grant access to the data procured directly; or
 - developing a process to provide direct allocation of funding to agencies for data procurement; or
 - both.

This initiative aligns with the state’s broader transportation and climate strategies, ensuring that California remains a leader in sustainable infrastructure development. The proposal outlined in this document provides a roadmap for implementing AB 744 efficiently, ensuring that data-driven decision-making remains at the core of California’s transportation future.

II. Outreach and Engagement Activities

The Commission conducted a series of targeted engagement efforts designed to gather input, identify challenges, and align cross-agency coordination efforts. These engagement efforts included surveys, virtual meetings, and public workshops that involved state, regional, and local agencies, as well as subject matter experts within the transportation industry. The Commission designed engagement activities to ensure diverse perspectives were represented, to identify resource and data gaps, and to promote transparency throughout the implementation process. Details on participating agencies and engagement activities are included in Appendix A.

Meetings

The Commission hosted a series of virtual meetings with transportation planning agencies, transportation and housing-related state agencies, and other stakeholders. These sessions served as open forums to discuss challenges related to data procurement, identify common goals, and explore opportunities for shared tools or services. Meeting feedback helped shape the direction of survey questions.

Surveys

The Commission conducted three surveys to collect structured feedback from agencies at different levels of state and local government:

- Survey 1 (December 2023): Distributed to Metropolitan Planning Organizations to identify existing data tools, modeling capabilities, and estimated spending on analytics platforms.
- Survey 2 (February 2025): Distributed to Regional Transportation Planning Agencies and members of the Rural Counties Task Force, this survey focused on agencies’ use of data tools for project evaluation, performance measurement, and policy alignment.
- Survey 3 (March 2025): Distributed to state agency partners to assess state-level engagement, tool usage, and interagency coordination needs.

Workshops

The Commission held three formal workshops to present findings, facilitate dialogue, and gather additional input:

- Workshop 1 (December 17, 2024): Introduced AB 744 requirements and initiated discussion on data tool challenges and statutory milestones. This foundational session helped align participants on key objectives.
- Workshop 2 (May 6, 2025): Highlighted survey findings and meeting feedback, focused on collaborative solution development, identified resource needs, and validated proposed implementation strategies.
- Workshop 3 (July 23, 2025): Presented previously shared draft implementation options alongside the recommended option for stakeholder consideration and input, shared a summary of stakeholder feedback received to date, and encouraged attendees to provide additional input and ask questions to inform final proposal development.

Public Comment Period

The Commission published a full draft of the proposal on June 13, 2025, initiating a 30-day public comment period. Comments received were reviewed and relevant feedback was incorporated into the final Proposal.

III. Stakeholder Engagement Results: Agency Practices and Challenges

This section summarizes the key findings that emerged from the Commission's engagement efforts, including surveys, virtual meetings, and public workshops conducted between December 2023 and May 2025. Input was gathered from state, regional, and local agencies, with the goal of identifying current practices, challenges, and opportunities related to data, modeling, and interagency coordination in support of AB 744. The following analysis reflects patterns, gaps, and strategic insights drawn from both quantitative survey results and qualitative feedback shared through stakeholder engagement.

Direct engagement from Metropolitan Planning Organizations was limited during the first survey. The Commission incorporated supplementary data from Caltrans, including information from an inventory of reporting data points, modeling software, and other tools used by Metropolitan Planning Organizations that Caltrans compiled in response to AB 744. This information was used to better understand the role of Metropolitan Planning Organizations and fill gaps where direct engagement data was limited.

A. Agency Familiarity and Engagement with AB 744

A primary goal of the Commission was to explore the level of agency familiarity and engagement in AB 744. The information gathered highlights a varying level of awareness and involvement.

Awareness Levels

- Among Regional Transportation Planning Agencies and the Rural Counties Task Force, 75% were "somewhat familiar" with AB 744, and 25% were "very familiar".
- By contrast, 50% of responding state agencies reported no familiarity with AB 744.

Commission Engagement

- 62.5% of Regional Transportation Planning Agencies had been involved in discussions or collaborations with the Commission.
- None of the state agencies surveyed indicated engagement occurred with the Commission.

To increase awareness and foster collaboration, we implemented a targeted outreach strategy focused on key stakeholders within the transportation planning community. We initiated direct communications with Metropolitan Planning Organizations and Regional Transportation Planning Agencies to ensure they were informed about the project's objectives, progress, and opportunities for involvement. In parallel, we formally requested input from the Housing and Transportation Subcommittee, which includes subject matter experts from a diverse group of agencies specializing in transportation planning, housing policy, environmental justice, and data analysis. This group includes key state agencies such as Housing and Community Development (HCD), California Air Resources Board (CARB), California State Transportation Agency (CalSTA), California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), Office of Land Use and Climate Innovation (LCI), Strategic Growth Council (SGC), Department of Finance (DOF), and Business Consumer

Services and Housing Agency (BCSH). Their expertise and insights were instrumental in shaping the project's direction and ensuring alignment with statewide priorities.

B. Use of Data and Modeling Tools

Engagement with agencies highlighted a growing reliance on data and modeling tools to inform decision-making and improve operational efficiency (see Appendix B for details). According to stakeholders, agencies are utilizing advanced data analytics and modeling software to guide planning, prioritize investments, and forecast future needs. However, responses also indicate that agencies face challenges in fully leveraging these tools, such as limited access to data, insufficient training, and resource constraints. Despite these challenges, there is recognition of the value these tools provide in optimizing transportation strategies and planning for long-term sustainability.

Most Utilized Tools Across All Agencies (see Appendix B for details)

- GIS Tools (e.g., ESRI/ArcGIS, QGIS) emerged as the most widely used across Metropolitan Planning Organizations, Regional Transportation Planning Agencies, and state agencies.
- Replica, INRIX, and StreetLight were popular among Metropolitan Planning Organizations for mobility analytics.
- Traffic Simulation Software and Data Analytics Platforms were mentioned frequently by Regional Transportation Planning Agencies.

How Agencies Utilize These Tools

- Planning (most common among all groups)
- Grant Applications
- Public Engagement
- Statewide Policy Analysis (especially at the state level)
- Compliance Evaluation with climate and housing mandates

Specialized Tools & Analytical Platforms (see Appendix B for details)

- Metropolitan Planning Organizations rely more on travel demand modeling tools like Bentley Cube, TransCAD, and EMME.
- State agencies use tools such as Google Earth Engine, R Studio, PostGIS, and FME for environmental analysis and spatial data integration.

C. Identified Workforce Challenges and Barriers

Throughout the Commission's engagement efforts, stakeholders expressed several challenges facing the transportation industry, including regulatory hurdles and financial constraints. A common theme was there are significant gaps in skill levels, as well as a lack of resources and agency staffing. Addressing these barriers and skill gaps is essential to ensuring the workforce is prepared for future needs.

Workforce Challenges

- Limited staff capacity and technical/programming expertise were the most cited challenges across Regional Transportation Planning Agencies and Metropolitan Planning Organizations.
- State agencies also cited procurement hurdles and data standardization issues (i.e., Department of General Services mechanisms).

- Regulatory and compliance knowledge gaps were mentioned, particularly among Regional Transportation Planning Agencies.

Other Barriers

- Cost and procurement limitations, particularly for smaller agencies.
- State agencies noted interagency coordination and knowledge sharing could be strengthened.
- A lack of real-time operational use of tools, as many agencies remain focused on long-term planning and grant preparation.

D. Estimated Annual Spending

Agencies provided insight into their estimated annual spending patterns, providing context for their capacity to implement the goals of AB 744. While it appears that many agencies continue to allocate substantial resources to long-term planning and grant preparation, only a portion of their budget is directed toward the enhancement of data systems and modeling capability. Responses revealed variations in spending priorities, with some agencies facing financial constraints that limit their ability to carry out AB 744's requirements for data-driven transportation and housing planning.

Metropolitan Planning Organizations

- Annual average per agency (among 16 surveyed agencies): \$414,735.
- 50% of responding agencies reported using both modeling and data tools, suggesting an emerging best practice.

Regional Transportation Planning Agencies and Rural Counties Task Force

- Average annual budget: \$207,857.
- Median budget: \$200,000.
- Budgets ranged from \$10,000 to \$650,000.

State Agencies

- No budget data reported.
- Only one agency reported a new procurement (ArcGIS and ParcelQuest in 2023), indicating limited investment in new tools since AB 744's enactment. Note, significant investment in data occurred pre-AB 744.

IV. Analysis of Gaps and Challenges

Engagement with stakeholders identified key elements related to the use, accessibility, and future needs of data and modeling tools across California's transportation planning agencies. Please see the findings below, summarized by category.

A. Inconsistencies in Data and Modeling Tools

- Adoption of Tools Vary Across Agencies – While GIS mapping is widely used, adoption of more advanced tools like data analytics platforms, simulation software, and real-time traffic operations tools remains inconsistent, especially among smaller or rural agencies.
- Inconsistent Technical Skills and Lack of Staff – Stakeholders noted that they are unable to effectively use data tools due to a lack of technical, programming, and analytical skills, along

with limited staff resources. As a result, the ability to conduct complex analysis or apply modeling in decision-making is limited.

- Tools Primarily Used to Support Transportation Planning – Most agencies reported using tools for transportation planning, grant writing, and public engagement. Fewer agencies apply tools to traffic operations or real-time analytics. Agencies expressed interest in enhanced onboarding or implementation-phase training to help bridge this gap.

B. Funding Challenges

- Wide Budget Variability – Reported annual budgets ranged from \$10,000 to \$650,000, with a median of \$200,000. Smaller agencies often cannot sustain high-cost tools. These disparities were emphasized by multiple agencies, including those in the Rural Counties Task Force, who noted rural agencies' reliance on consultants due to lack of internal resources.
- Cost Barriers for Smaller Agencies – Agencies with limited budgets often struggle to justify or sustain purchases of expensive platforms. Purchasing or maintaining data tools is often infeasible without external funding or cost-sharing.
- Calls for Clearer Procurement Guidance – Agencies cited the need for structured support, simplified procurement processes, and technical assistance to navigate licensing and contracting for tools and platforms.

C. Need for Centralized Procurement and Access

- Interest in Collaborative Purchasing Models – Some agencies have successfully implemented group purchasing and cost-sharing strategies, which help reduce costs and improve access, especially for smaller agencies.
- Desire for Statewide Data Sharing – A centralized, standardized data sharing platform was identified as a priority to help reduce redundancy, streamline workflows, and provide all agencies with equitable access to high-quality datasets and technical assistance. However, concerns were raised that such systems can become fragmented or underutilized without careful coordination and consistent structure.
- Calls for Clearer Procurement Guidance – Agencies cited the need for structured support, simplified procurement processes, and technical assistance to navigate licensing and contracting for tools and platforms. Some agencies expressed interest in hybrid models that balance competitive funding with a baseline allocation to ensure equitable access.

D. Other Key Insights

- Need for Technical Training – Agencies emphasized the value of state-supported training programs to build internal capacity and bridge skill gaps related to data management and modeling. Stakeholders suggested that onboarding support at the time of rollout, such as implementation phase training workshops, would improve the adoption and effectiveness of new tools. To support this need, vendors will be expected to provide onboarding and ongoing technical assistance as part of tool implementation, ensuring agency staff are prepared to use and sustain the new systems effectively.
- Peer Learning and Workshops Are Valuable – Stakeholders appreciate interactive forums, such as workshops, that promote peer-to-peer sharing of best practices and help identify scalable solutions.
- Real-Time Tools Underutilized – Despite interest in expanding analytical capabilities, real-time data tools remain underutilized, particularly among smaller agencies. Stakeholders expressed

concern that resource constraints and staff limitations limit the exploration of more advanced applications such as traffic operations or on-demand forecasting.

- Interest in Rural Resource Sharing Models – Rural stakeholders expressed strong interest in forming consortiums or shared-service models, potentially through the Rural Counties Task Force, to collectively access and manage tools, data, and training resources. This was identified as a key strategy to address regional inequities in technical capacity and procurement power.
- Importance of Clear Funding Guidelines and Minimum Allocations – Agencies requested more transparency around how funding alternatives might be structured and stressed the importance of establishing minimum funding thresholds to ensure baseline access for all regions.

V. Proposal Recommendation

The following section outlines the recommended hybrid implementation strategy, designed to address the key findings and opportunities identified in this proposal. This approach is grounded in best practices, shaped by stakeholder input and practical experience, and is intended to support the successful implementation of the proposal's objectives. Aligned with the overarching goals of the initiative, the hybrid option includes actionable steps to achieve measurable outcomes and sustained impact. This strategy reflects the priorities and requirements set forth in AB 744, ensuring compliance while advancing efforts to improve program transparency, strengthen local and state partnerships, and enhance the overall effectiveness of transportation planning and projects.

Recommended Hybrid Implementation Strategy: Competitive Funding with Centralized Procurement Support

The Commission recommends that Legislature pursue a hybrid implementation strategy that combines the strategic benefits of a competitive funding program with the efficiency and equity of centralized procurement. Under this model, the state agency would allocate funds to eligible agencies through a structured, competitive process, allowing agencies the flexibility to procure data and modeling tools that best meet their specific needs.

The designated state agency would also coordinate with the Department of General Services to establish master contracts or software license agreements that participating agencies could leverage. This would streamline procurement, reduce administrative burdens, and ensure compliance with state procurement requirements. Agencies would retain the option to utilize these centralized agreements or pursue individual purchases, depending on what best suits their technical and operational contexts.

This hybrid approach balances local autonomy with state-level coordination and purchasing power, making data and modeling tools more accessible while preserving flexibility and efficiency across jurisdictions. To further enhance collaboration and cost-effectiveness, the designated state agency could also explore the establishment of a mechanism that allows multiple agencies to apply jointly as a consortium, fostering collaboration, cost-sharing, and more equitable access to advanced tools.

Benefits

- Agencies will have the choice to either procure tools independently using awarded funds or opt into centrally procured tools, depending on their capacity and needs.

- Master contracts through the Department of General Services can be leveraged, which will reduce administrative burden and speed up procurement.
- Shared licenses and centralized purchasing can reduce costs and promote efficient use of public funds.
- Allows agencies to apply jointly, enabling small or resource limited jurisdictions to collaborate, share costs, and improve access to advanced tools.
- Smaller and underserved communities can benefit from group procurement opportunities and technical support, helping close the technology gaps.

Challenges

- Administering both individual funding and centralized procurement structures may increase program complexity and require clear guidance and coordination mechanisms.
- This option could still result in varied tool adoption across agencies, limiting data standardization.
- Managing Department of General Services master agreements while concurrently overseeing a grant program may require additional staff capacity and administrative oversight.
- Agencies forming consortiums will need to designate leads, share deliverables, and coordinate implementation.
- Less experienced agencies may require ongoing support to navigate both the application and procurement processes, especially when participating in consortium models.

VI. Conclusion and Next Steps

The findings from stakeholder engagement revealed persistent gaps in data accessibility, funding support, and the standardization of tools and practices across the state. To address these challenges in alignment with the goals of AB 744, the Commission recommends advancing policy and funding strategies that supports a hybrid implementation approach that combines the strategic benefits of competitive grants with the efficiency and equity of centralized procurement. This approach is designed to offer flexibility while ensuring statewide consistency and support, better meeting the diverse needs of state, regional, and local agencies.

The hybrid approach best reflects the input received and presents the most balanced path forward. By leveraging the strengths of both funding and procurement models, the recommended hybrid option provides a practical and scalable framework for reducing barriers, supporting underserved agencies, and strengthening transportation planning statewide.

It is recommended that the State consider:

- Allocating funding to support statewide access to transportation data, modeling programs, and analytic tools.
- Authorizing the implementation of flexible procurement and modeling frameworks, with standards and support structures tailored to the adopted approach.
- Facilitating continued stakeholder engagement to refine and adapt the selected implementation strategy and ensure a successful rollout.

This draft proposal reflects a commitment to transforming California's transportation system into a sustainable, equitable, and technology-forward network. With appropriate funding and support, California can enhance transportation planning and decision-making across all jurisdictions.

The Commission welcomes the opportunity to collaborate further and provide technical assistance as needed to support implementation.

VII. Contact Information

For further inquiries, please contact:

Sheila Ennes
Transportation Data Program Manager
California Transportation Commission
Sheila.Ennes@catc.ca.gov or AB744@catc.ca.gov
(916) 832-3878

VIII. Resources

Assembly Bill 744
Climate Action Plan for Transportation Infrastructure (CAPTI)
Executive Order N-19-19 (2019)

IX. Appendix

Appendix A – Stakeholder Engagement Summary

A.1 Overview

This appendix provides details of stakeholder engagement efforts conducted by the Commission as part of the AB 744 implementation process. These efforts included conducting virtual meetings, distributing surveys, and facilitating public workshops to ensure inclusive and informed public participation.

A.2 Summary of Engagement Activities

Engagement Type	Date(s)	Purpose	Participants	Key Outcomes
Survey 1	December 2023	Identify data tools, modeling capabilities, and spending	Metropolitan Planning Organizations	Established baseline of data tool usage and funding gaps
Survey 2	February 2025	Understand use cases, tool performance, and agency needs	Regional Transportation Planning Agencies and Rural Counties Task Force	Collected value-based feedback and tool application insights
Survey 3	March 2025	Assess state-level collaboration and tool gaps	Transportation and housing-related state agencies	Identified awareness gaps and cross-agency coordination needs

Virtual Meetings	Ongoing (2024–2025)	Share updates, discuss challenges, gather feedback	Metropolitan Planning Organizations, Regional Transportation Planning Agencies, State Agencies, and other stakeholders	Helped refine survey focus and validated planning assumptions
Workshop 1	December 17, 2024	Introduce AB 744 and align on statutory requirements	State, Regional, and Local Agencies, Vendors, and State Legislative Staff	Developed a shared understanding of legislative intent
Workshop 2	May 6, 2025	Share findings and discuss implementation strategies	State, Regional, and Local Agencies, Vendors, and State Legislative Staff	Shared key findings and identified next-step priorities
Workshop 3	July 23, 2025	Reviewed draft implementation options and Commission recommended option, request additional stakeholder input, share stakeholder engagement to date, and review next steps.	State, Regional, and Local Agencies, Vendors, and State Legislative Staff	Reviewed and discussed draft implementation options, including the recommended hybrid approach, shared a summary of stakeholder feedback received to date, invited attendees to ask questions and offer additional input to inform the final proposal.

A.3 Respondents by Engagement Type

Engagement Type	Responding Agency	Agency Type
Survey 1	Fresno Council of Governments Kern County of Governments Riverside County Transportation Commission San Diego Association of Governments San Luis Obispo Council of Governments Siskiyou County Local Transportation Commission Tehama County Transportation Commission	Metropolitan Transportation Organizations
Survey 2	Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments Butte County Association of Governments Del Norte Local Transportation Commission El Dorado County Transportation Commission Fresno Council of Governments Glenn County Transportation Commission	Regional Transportation Planning Agencies, Rural Counties Task Force, Self-Help Agencies, Congestion Management Agencies

Survey 2 (Continued)	Madera County Transportation Commission Merced County Association of Governments Sacramento Area Council of Governments San Bernardino County Transportation Authority San Francisco County Transportation Authority San Luis Obispo Council of Governments Santa Barbara County Association of Governments Shasta Regional Transportation Agency Siskiyou County Local Transportation Commission Stanislaus Council of Governments	
Survey 3	Housing and Community Development (HCD) Department of Finance (DOF) Strategic Growth Council (SGC) Office of Land Use and Climate Innovation (OPR)	State Agencies
Virtual Meetings	Glenn County Transportation Commission Humboldt County Association of Governments Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority Madera County Association of Governments Metropolitan Transportation Commission Orange County Transportation Association Riverside County Transportation Commission San Luis Obispo Council of Governments San Mateo County Transportation Authority Santa Barbara County Council of Governments Shasta Regional Transportation Agency Sonoma County Transportation Authority Southern California Association of Governments	Metropolitan Transportation Organizations, Regional Transportation Planning Agencies, Self-Help Agencies, Congestion Management Agencies
Workshop 1	Attended by 80 members of the public.	Transportation Agencies, State Legislative Staff, Vendors, Consultants, Caltrans Staff, and CTC Staff
Workshop 2	Attended by 58 members of the public.	Transportation Agencies, State Legislative Staff, Vendors, Consultants, Caltrans Staff, and CTC Staff
Workshop 3	Attended by 24 members of the public	Transportation Agencies, State Legislative Staff, Vendors, Consultants, Caltrans Staff, and CTC Staff
Comment Letters (five received total)	Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments California Association of Councils of Governments Orange County Transportation Authority	Metropolitan Planning Organizations, Association of Councils of Governments,

Comment Letters (Continued)	Sacramento Area Council of Governments Southern California Association of Governments	Regional Transportation Planning Agencies, and Rural Counties Task Force members
--------------------------------	--	--

Appendix B – Data and Modeling Tools Identified

B.1 Overview

This appendix provides details of data and modeling tools reported as being utilized based on recent stakeholder surveys conducted during the AB 744 implementation process. The engagement process revealed a diverse range of analytical platforms, including GIS-based mapping tools, travel demand models, and scenario planning software. It is important to note that these lists are not exhaustive and do not include all vendors or tools available in the market.

B.2 Data Tools Identified Through Stakeholder Input

Data Tools	Key Features
Replica	Urban planning, economic development, policy making
ArcGIS	Mapping, spatial analysis, urban planning
INRIX	Congestion analysis, travel times, predictive analytics
StreetLight	Transportation planning, traffic impact studies, corridor analysis
StreetSaver	Infrastructure maintenance, budget planning
NPMRDS / National Performance Management Research Data Set	Primarily used for federal and state reporting. But agencies often export NPMRDS data and use other tools (ArcGIS, Tableau, Python, R) to analyze travel time patterns.
Teralytics	Mobility behavior insights, transportation demand analysis
Placer.ai	Retail site selection, tourism analysis
RITIS / Regional Integrated Transportation Information System	Traffic management, emergency response, real-time operations
PeMS / Performance Measurement System	Traffic monitoring, congestion tracking
LOCUS	Market analysis, real estate strategy

B.3 Modeling Tools Identified Through Stakeholder Input

Modeling Tools	Key Features
Bentley Cube	Urban and regional travel demand forecasting, land use planning, network optimization
Caliper TransCAD	Network planning, travel demand modeling, freight modeling
Modeling Tools (Continued)	Key Features
Equilibre Multimodal Multimodal Equilibrium (EMME)	Traffic assignment, transit modeling, multimodal analysis