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Demand Influences are Closely Related

### Housing
- Strong Population Growth
- Demographic/Employment Change
- Inadequate Housing Supply
- Declining Affordability

### Transportation
- Population/Increase VMT
- Proximity housing to Jobs
- Travel Behavior
- Sufficient Housing Near Transit
- Patterns of Low-density Development
- State of the Economy
Major Focus of CTP 2030

- Consideration of environmental issues early in the planning process

- Key: “Bridging Disciplines”
CTP 2030 Addendum
SAFETEA-LU Compliance

• Linking Transportation Planning & Resource/Environmental Planning
• Consultation & Comparison
• Environmental Mitigation
“Building Bridges”

- Developing, Sharing, and Accessing Data
- Blueprint Planning
- Scenario Planning
- Integrated Planning
Developing, Sharing, and Accessing Data

Comparing Plans

- Land development proposal
- Road improvement proposal
- Wetlands identification
- Habitat or historic places to preserve

Land Use System
Transportation System
Water Resources System
Other Natural, Cultural Resource Systems

2009*

- SHP
- CTP
- CWP

* Statewide Housing Plan, California Transportation Plan, California Water Plan
Comparing plans, maps, and data

Identify watersheds that are impacted by the State’s transportation corridors and housing development.
Welcome to the California Transportation Plan

The California Transportation Plan
Transportation Planning

Environmental Planning
If you are a transportation planner familiar with GIS, we recommend you contact your in-house GIS staff to see if you already have some of this data available in your office. Please note these links are frequently updated by their respective sources, while we update this page regularly, some links may have changed.

Data Collection, Libraries, and Clearinghouses
The URLS in this collection link to a variety of California State map data sources that may prove useful to transportation planners. Most of the websites provide access to geographic as downloadable geographic information systems (GIS) files, or they permit you to browse GIS file calendars.

Regional GIS Analysis Examples in California
The URLS in this collection link to a variety of state projects that utilize GIS analysis.

Interactive Mapping Sites
GIS display pages permit you to build a view of a region using data layers held on the host machine, but not necessarily available for download.

Related Helpful Links

www.ice.ucdavis.edu/CTP/Resources.htm
Blueprint Planning
Blueprint Planning:
Comprehensive, Collaborative, Integrated

Public Engagement

Land Use Planning

Transportation Planning

Environmental Planning

Housing & Development Planning

& Better Tools

Regional Blueprint Plan
# Scenario Planning

## Scenario Description

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>C2</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>D2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description</strong></td>
<td>Same as existing Regional Transportation Plan</td>
<td>Better job in each area, but requires more funds</td>
<td>More roads, maintenance, transit. Requires more funds</td>
<td>Major shift in emphasis from road improvements to alternative modes</td>
<td>Expansion of alternative modes, but not at cost of road improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional Cost</strong></td>
<td>$582,000,000</td>
<td>$855,210,000</td>
<td>$1,038,210,000</td>
<td>$582,000,000</td>
<td>$1,010,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost Change from B:</strong></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$273,210,000</td>
<td>$456,210,000</td>
<td>($158,000,000)</td>
<td>$208,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Transportation Mode

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transportation Mode</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>C2</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>D2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Roads &amp; Highways</strong></td>
<td>8 major improvements to highways 152, 59, 140 and 99 and regional roads</td>
<td>11 major improvements to highways and regional roads</td>
<td>22 major improvements to highways and regional roads</td>
<td>Only 3 projects: 152 Bypass, Existing 59, 140 Bradley Overhead</td>
<td>15 major improvements to highways and regional roads.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional Cost:</strong></td>
<td>$242,000,000</td>
<td>$375,000,000</td>
<td>$535,000,000</td>
<td>$84,000,000</td>
<td>$450,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost Change from B:</strong></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$133,000,000</td>
<td>$293,000,000</td>
<td>($158,000,000)</td>
<td>$208,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Road Maintenance</strong></td>
<td>Continues at existing levels. Roads deteriorate.</td>
<td>Much more funding for maintenance</td>
<td>Much more funding for maintenance</td>
<td>More funding for maintenance</td>
<td>Much more funding for maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional Cost:</strong></td>
<td>$209,000,000</td>
<td>$331,000,000</td>
<td>$354,000,000</td>
<td>$290,000,000</td>
<td>$352,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost Change from B:</strong></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$122,000,000</td>
<td>$145,000,000</td>
<td>$81,000,000</td>
<td>$143,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transit (Bus)</strong></td>
<td>Transit service meets the needs of the transit dependent.</td>
<td>Some improvement: 30 minute frequency in urban areas, 60 minute between areas.</td>
<td>Some improvement: 30 minute frequency in urban areas, 60 minute between areas.</td>
<td>Transit is a viable trip choice. Greater coverage, higher frequencies (15/30), aggressive marketing</td>
<td>Transit is a viable trip choice. Greater coverage, higher frequencies (15/30), aggressive marketing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional Cost:</strong></td>
<td>$130,000,000</td>
<td>$143,000,000</td>
<td>$143,000,000</td>
<td>$195,000,000</td>
<td>$195,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost Change from B:</strong></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$13,000,000</td>
<td>$13,000,000</td>
<td>$65,000,000</td>
<td>$65,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pedestrian</strong></td>
<td>Considered a local issue.</td>
<td>Local jurisdictions encouraged to require pedestrian-friendly development.</td>
<td>Local jurisdictions encouraged to require pedestrian-friendly development.</td>
<td>New communities are walkable and transit-friendly. Financial incentives are provided.</td>
<td>New communities are walkable and transit-friendly. Financial incentives are provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional Cost:</strong></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost Change from B:</strong></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bicycle</strong></td>
<td>Bicycle improvements are consistent with plans but dependent on grants.</td>
<td>Bike paths are well-planned and have connectivity. Several priority projects are funded.</td>
<td>Bike paths are well-planned and have connectivity. Several priority projects are funded.</td>
<td>More priority bike projects are funded. New communities are planned to be bike-friendly.</td>
<td>More priority bike projects are funded. New communities are planned to be bike-friendly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional Cost:</strong></td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$6,000,000</td>
<td>$6,000,000</td>
<td>$11,000,000</td>
<td>$11,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost Change from B:</strong></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
<td>$10,000,000</td>
<td>$10,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Passenger Rail</strong></td>
<td>No projects</td>
<td>“Commute by Rail” program. Rail schedules are adjusted to meet northern commutes.</td>
<td>“Commute by Rail” program. Rail schedules are adjusted to meet northern commutes.</td>
<td>Rail is also promoted for recreational trips and vacations.</td>
<td>Rail is also promoted for recreational trips and vacations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional Cost:</strong></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost Change from B:</strong></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aviation</strong></td>
<td>Same as today: Merced to Las Vegas four times a day.</td>
<td>Expanded air service to Los Angeles and San Francisco.</td>
<td>Expanded air service to Los Angeles and San Francisco.</td>
<td>Air is a viable alternative to auto for long trips: service to LA, SF, other hubs, a variety of airlines, good transit to airports.</td>
<td>Air is a viable alternative to auto for long trips: service to LA, SF, other hubs, a variety of airlines, good transit to airports.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Funding Assumption

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>C2</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>D2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assumption</strong></td>
<td>Existing Funding</td>
<td>1/2 cent Transportation Measure</td>
<td>New Development Fee and 1/2 cent Transportation Measure</td>
<td>Existing Funding</td>
<td>New Development Fee and 1/2 cent Transportation Measure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Consultation and Comparison

California Tri-Agency Partnership Subcommittee on Collaborative Planning
Environmental Mitigation

Elkhorn Slough Pilot Project: An Innovative Approach to Early Mitigation for Future State and Local Transportation Projects within a Watershed

In 2001, Caltrans District 5 collaborated with the Elkhorn Slough Association and the Nature Conservancy to develop a partnership that would integrate regional transportation needs with those of the region’s conservation goals for the Elkhorn Slough watershed and northern Monterey County.

The Elkhorn Slough Pilot Project builds on District 5’s previous efforts and dovetails with the statewide goal to consider mitigation on a regional or watershed level.

Using a Geographic Information System (GIS) tool being developed statewide, the team will identify an inventory of specific habitat types impaired by future transportation projects with suitable properties that would be available for compensatory mitigation.

The Elkhorn Slough Pilot Project focuses on collaborative planning and regulatory and planning organizations, relying on the best available science to develop mitigation agreements that meet the needs for transportation mitigation and promote resource conservation.

Goal: To develop conservation agreements and conservation area management plans that could provide for regional-scale mitigation that could be implemented prior to traditional transportation project milestones.
Key Opportunities to Enhance Existing Planning Processes

A. Integrated planning principles.
B. Coordinate plans associated with the State's infrastructure.
C. Transportation planning to better address regional impacts of multiple projects.
D. Incentives for efficient land use.
E. State role as a provider of data, information, and education for local planning.
Looking Ahead: Next Steps

• Kickoff full update of CTP 2035 with California Transportation Futures Symposium—September 2008

Detailed “follow-on” goals, policies, and strategies to address early consultation and comparison efforts, greenhouse gas (GHG) emission reductions, the State’s water issues, etc.

• Identify watersheds that are impacted by the State’s transportation corridors and housing development.
Statewide Housing Plan

Questions?

For more Information contact

Katie_Benouar@dot.ca.gov
Del_Deletetsky @dot.ca.gov
GCampora@hcd.ca.gov
Why Housing is Important

The Housing Industry Contributes to California’s Economy:

- Contributes $218 billion per year to economy
- Generates 935,000 jobs
- Accounts for approximately 10% of all economic activity in the state
- Housing industry is the second largest industry group in the state, when all economic multipliers are considered

Source: Sacramento Regional Research Institute: The Economic Benefits of Housing in California
State Role in Land Use & Housing

Tools to Create Vibrant, Livable Communities:

(1) Regional Housing Need Planning

(2) Housing Element
Regional Housing Need Planning Process  
(approximates 7 years)

• State (HCD) Determination
  - quantify region & jurisdiction housing needs (based on Department of Finance population & household projections)
  - coordinate with intergovernmental entities (state, region & local)

• Regional Housing Need Allocation Plan Must be Consistent with State Goals & Objectives of Increasing:
  – housing supply, mix of housing types, and affordability
  – infill and efficient development patterns and protection of agricultural and environmental resources
  – intraregional relationship between jobs and housing
  – equitable distribution of lower income housing need among jurisdictions within counties

• Examples of Local Factors Required to be Considered in Allocations:
  – jobs/housing projections, market demand for housing, transportation planning
  – land availability (developable, agricultural, preserved, protected, etc.)
  – Infrastructure/service capacity (water/sewer, etc.)
Housing Element Planning Process (approximates 5 years)

• Local governments update Housing Element to plan for housing need projection/allocation, particularly these components:

  – Land Inventory & Resources: adequate sites (mitigations for flood hazard, etc.) & capacity (adequate infrastructure, service levels, e.g. water availability, etc.)

  – Analysis of Constraints to Development (inadequate infrastructure and service levels, e.g. insufficient water availability in Monterey Peninsula to meet housing demand)

  – Action Plans to Mitigate Constraints, for example:
    • water conservation and efforts to increase availability & supply
    • More efficient development such as infill, higher densities

• HCD reviews housing element and certifies compliance
Recent Statutory Changes
Dealing with Water & Flood Matters

• SB 1087 (2005):
  – Local governments must immediately forward adopted housing element to water and sewer providers.
  – Water and sewer providers must establish specific procedures to grant priority service for affordable housing.
  – Water and sewer providers can not deny or condition the approval of, or reduce service level for an affordable housing development without specific written findings.

• AB 162 (2007):
  – Jurisdictions must revise the Land Use Element, Conservation Element, & Safety Element to address specific water & flood issues when next updating the Housing Element
  – Evaluate location of new development in consideration of flood hazards and methods to minimize flood damage which may result in excluding sites with inadequate flood infrastructure from being used to meet the regional housing need allocation.

• SB 5 (Sacramento/San Joaquin Valley) (2007):
  – Amend General Plan and zoning ordinance to address SB 5 requirements
  – Restrict local government approval (development agreement, map, permits, etc.) for areas in a flood hazard zone unless specific findings can be made.