



JAN 18 2017

CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

**Adoption of the 2017 Regional Transportation Plan Guidelines for Metropolitan Planning Organizations and Regional Transportation Planning Agencies**

**Resolution G-17-02**

- 1.1 WHEREAS,** California statute requires each of California's 18 Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) to adopt and submit an updated Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) to the California Transportation Commission (Commission) and the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) every four years for MPOs located in air-quality non-attainment areas, and at least every five years for MPOs located in air-quality attainment areas. Regional Transportation Planning Agencies (RTPAs) must submit an updated RTP every five years; and
- 1.2 WHEREAS,** the Commission, in cooperation with MPOs and RTPAs, is authorized per Government Code Section 14522 to prescribe study areas for analysis and evaluation by such agencies and guidelines for the preparation of RTPs; and
- 1.3 WHEREAS,** RTP Guidelines (RTP Guidelines) promote consistency through an integrated statewide approach to the transportation planning process and set forth a uniform transportation planning framework throughout the state that identifies federal and state requirements for the development of RTPs; and
- 1.4 WHEREAS,** Government Code Section 14522.1(a) requires the Commission, in consultation with Caltrans and the California Air Resources Board, to maintain RTP Guidelines for travel demand models used in the development of RTPs by MPOs; and
- 1.5 WHEREAS,** Government Code Section 14522.1(a) requires the Commission to consult with various agencies, to form an advisory committee, and to hold two workshops on the RTP Guidelines, one in Northern California and one in Southern California before amending the RTP Guidelines; and
- 1.6 WHEREAS,** Government Code Section 14522.1(b) requires that the RTP Guidelines shall, at a minimum and to the extent practicable, taking into account such factors as the size and available resources of the MPO, account for all of the following:

  - (1) The relationship between land use density and household vehicle ownership and vehicle miles traveled in a way that is consistent with statistical research;
  - (2) The impact of enhanced transit service levels on household vehicle ownership and vehicle miles traveled;
  - (3) Changes in travel and land development likely to result from highway or passenger rail expansion;
  - (4) Mode splitting that allocates trips between automobile, transit, carpool, and bicycle and pedestrian trips. If a travel demand model is unable to forecast bicycle and pedestrian trips, another means may be used to estimate those trips;

(5) Speed and frequency, days, and hours of operation of transit service; and

- 1.7 WHEREAS**, the Commission, recognizing the need for a timely update of the RTP Guidelines, in consultation with Caltrans and various state agencies, on June 30, 2016 held a “Kick-Off” meeting with approximately 250 participants to begin the process of updating the RTP Guidelines; and
- 1.8 WHEREAS**, the Commission formed the RTP Guidelines Workgroup (Workgroup) from the stakeholders that attended the June 30, 2016 Kick-Off to serve as an advisory committee for RTP Guidelines development while representing their constituencies’ perspectives and reporting back to their respective agencies and organizations; and
- 1.9 WHEREAS**, since June 30, 2016 the Workgroup devoted a substantial amount of time and effort toward developing the necessary technical and policy guidance set forth in the proposed revised RTP Guidelines for MPOs and RTPAs; and
- 1.10 WHEREAS**, the RTP Guidelines revisions include but are not limited to;
- (1) Separating the RTP Guidelines into two versions, one for MPOs and one for RTPAs to better address the specific requirements for metropolitan and non-metropolitan areas;
  - (2) Updating federal requirements to reflect changes resulting from implementation of the Fixing America’s Surface Transportation (FAST) Act;
  - (3) Providing a summary of policies, practices, projects, tools, and resources that have been employed by MPOs to promote health and health equity as required by Government Code Section 14522.3 pursuant to AB 441 (Monning, 2012);
  - (4) Enhancing guidance and information related to climate change mitigation and adaptation resulting from Governor’s Executive Order B-30-15 and state legislation including AB 1482 (Gordon, 2015), SB 246 (Wieckowski, 2015), and SB 379 (Jackson, 2015);
  - (5) Updating the Regional Travel Demand Modeling chapter in collaboration with regional agencies and the Air Resources Board (ARB) to clearly convey requirements, enhance planning practice examples, and identify a statewide forum for continued discussion of modeling issues;
  - (6) Expanding the Consultation and Collaboration chapter to highlight Title VI and Environmental Justice considerations in the regional transportation planning process;
  - (7) Describing SB 743 (Steinberg, 2013) and the anticipated future change to transportation impact analysis in the California Environmental Quality Act;
  - (8) Highlighting the California Freight Mobility Plan and the California Sustainable Freight Action Plan that was prepared per Governor’s Executive Order B-32-15;
  - (9) Adding information regarding emerging technologies such as transportation electrification as well as connected and autonomous vehicles;
  - (10) Creating a new chapter on Transportation Performance Management to highlight new federal requirements for performance-based planning;
  - (11) Establishing a comprehensive appendix of planning practice examples; and



- 1.11 **WHEREAS**, the Workgroup members worked together to reach general consensus where possible on the guidance reflected in the 2017 Final Draft Regional Transportation Plan Guidelines for MPOs and RTPAs presented at workshops held by the Commission at its regularly scheduled Commission meetings on December 7, 2016 in Southern California (Riverside) and January 18-19, 2017 in Northern California (Sacramento).
- 2.1 **NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED**, that the Commission adopts the attached 2017 RTP Guidelines for MPOs and RTPAs; and
- 2.2 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, that the Commission recognizes and expresses appreciation to the Caltrans staff and Workgroup members that devoted many hours writing text, reviewing and commenting on multiple drafts, participating in numerous meetings, and working collaboratively to develop guidelines that set forth a uniform, statewide long-range regional transportation planning framework; promote an integrated, multi-modal, and cooperative planning process; and facilitate the efficient delivery of transportation projects that meet local, regional, state, and federal goals; and
- 2.3 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, that the Commission directs staff to post the 2017 RTP Guidelines for MPOs and RTPAs on the Commission's website, and requests that Caltrans assist Commission staff in making any technical corrections needed and making copies available to MPOs, RTPAs, and other stakeholders as necessary.

# 2017 Regional Transportation Plan Guidelines for Metropolitan Planning Organizations



**California Transportation Commission**





**2017**  
**Regional Transportation Plan**  
**Guidelines for**  
**Metropolitan Planning Organizations**

Adopted by the California Transportation Commission  
On January 18, 2017

Pursuant to California Government Code Section 14522

Commissioners  
Bob Alvarado – Chair  
Fran Inman – Vice Chair  
Yvonne B. Burke  
Lucetta Dunn  
James Earp  
James C. Ghielmetti  
Carl Guardino  
Christine Kehoe  
James Madaffer  
Joseph Tavaglione

Senator Jim Beall – Ex Officio  
Assembly Member Jim Frazier– Ex Officio  
Susan Bransen – Executive Director

Page Left Intentionally Blank

## **Table of Contents**

Page#

### **Chapter 1 - Introduction**

1.0	Applicability of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Guidelines	3
1.1	Why Conduct Long-Range Transportation Planning	4
1.2	RTPs & the California Transportation Plan	7
1.3	Background & Purpose of the RTP Guidelines	8
1.4	Metropolitan Planning Organizations in California	10
1.5	Purpose of the RTP	13
1.6	California Transportation Planning & Programming Process	15
1.7	MAP-21/FAST Act Items Impacting the Development of RTPs	16
1.8	Key Additions to the 2017 RTP Guidelines	17

### **Chapter 2 – RTP Process**

2.1	State Requirements	21
2.2	Background on State Climate Change Legislation & Executive Orders	22
2.3	Promoting Public Health & Health Equity	26
2.4	Federal Requirements	28
2.5	Relationship Between the RTP, OWP, FTIP, STIP, & FSTIP	29
2.6	Consistency with Other Planning Documents	30
2.7	Coordination with Other Planning Processes	32
2.8	RTP Development Sequencing Process	38
2.9	Adoption – Update Cycles & Amendments	40
2.10	RTP Checklist	42

### **Chapter 3 – RTP Analysis & Modeling**

3.0	Introduction	45
3.1	Modeling in the RTP Development Process Transportation & Land Use Models	45
3.2	Requirements for RTP Analysis	46
3.3	Travel Demand Modeling Quality Control & Consistency	47
3.4	RTP Modeling Improvement Program/Planning Practice Examples	52
3.5	RTP Travel Analysis Groupings – Federal/State Laws	56

### **Chapter 4 – RTP Consultation & Coordination**

4.1	Consultation and Coordination	73
4.2	Title VI & Environmental Justice Considerations in the RTP	74
4.3	Social Equity Factors	79
4.4	Participation Plan	80
4.5	Private Sector Involvement	83
4.6	Consultation with Interested Parties	84
4.7	Input & Consultation on Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) Development	85
4.8	Interagency Coordination on SCS Development	87
4.9	Native American Tribal Government Consultation & Coordination	88
4.10	Consultation with Resource Agencies	89

4.11	Coordinated Public Transit/Human Services Transportation Plans	91
------	--	----

## **Chapter 5 – RTP Environmental Considerations**

5.0	Introduction	95
5.1	Environmental Documentation	96
5.2	FHWA/FTA Planning Final Rule - Federal Environmental Requirements	98
5.3	FHWA/FTA Planning Final Rule - Federal Environmental Recommendations	99
5.4	Key Resource Areas for Avoidance & Mitigation	100
5.5	Project Intent Statements/Plan Level Purpose & Need Statements	104
5.6	Air Quality & Transportation Conformity	105
5.7	Analysis of Greenhouse Gas (GHG) & Achievement of SB 375 GHG Targets	109

## **Chapter 6 - RTP Contents**

6.1	Summary of RTP Components	113
6.2	Financial Overview	116
6.3	Fiscal Constraint	118
6.4	Listing of Constrained & Un-Constrained Projects	119
6.5	Revenue Identification & Forecasting	119
6.6	Estimating Future Transportation Costs	120
6.7	Asset Management	121

### **Modal Discussion**

6.8	Highways	124
6.9	Local Streets & Roads	125
6.10	Transit	126
6.11	Bicycle & Pedestrian – Including AB 1396 California Coastal Trail	127
6.12	Goods Movement (Maritime, Rail, Trucking, Aviation)	128
6.13	Regional Aviation System	131

### **Programming/Operations**

6.14	Transportation System Operations & Management	134
6.15	Coordination with Programming Documents	134
6.16	Transportation Projects Exempted from SB 375	135
6.17	Regionally Significant Projects	136
6.18	Regional ITS Architecture	137
6.19	Future of Transportation & New Technology	138
6.20	Transportation Safety	139
6.21	Transportation Security	141
6.22	Assessment of Capital Investment & Other Strategies	142
6.23	Congestion Management Process	143

### **Regional GHG Emissions Requirements & Considerations in the RTP**

6.24	GHG Emissions & Targets Background	145
6.25	Contents of the SCS	145

6.26	SCS Development	147
6.27	SCS Process, Review & Acceptance	155
6.28	Land Use & Transportation Strategies to Address Regional GHG Emissions	156
6.29	Alternative Planning Strategy (APS) Overview	158
6.30	Adaptation of the Regional Transportation System to Climate Change	158

## **Chapter 7 – Transportation Performance Management**

7.0	Introduction	165
7.1	Federal Performance Goals & Measures	165
7.2	Federal Performance-Based Approach & RTP Requirements	169
7.3	State Goals & Performance Measures	170
7.4	Performance Monitoring	172

## **Appendices**

A	Federal and State Transportation Planning Process Flowchart	177
B	State and Federal Programming Process Flowchart	181
C	Regional Transportation Plan Checklist	185
D	Title 23 CFR Part 450 Appendix A – Linking the Transportation Planning and NEPA Processes	193
E	Integration of the Planning and NEPA Processes	209
F	MPO Air Quality Conformity Checklist	229
G	Senate Bill 375 and Senate Bill 575 Statutory Language	235
H	Alternative Planning Strategy (APS)	255
I	Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) and RTP Development Information	259
J	Glossary of Transportation Terms	263
K	AB 441, MPO Health Policies, Practices, or Projects Reflected in RTP	273
L	Planning Practice Examples	309



Page Left Intentionally Blank

# Chapter 1

## Introduction

Page Left Intentionally Blank

# INTRODUCTION

## **1.0 Applicability of the Regional Transportation Plan Guidelines**

Every Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) is required by law to conduct long range planning to ensure that the region's vision and goals are clearly identified and to ensure effective decision making in furtherance of the vision and goals. The long range plan, known as the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), is an important policy document that is based on the unique needs and characteristics of a region, helps shape the region's economy, environment and social future, and communicates regional and vision to the state and federal government. As fundamental building blocks of the State's transportation system, the RTP should also support state goals for transportation, environmental quality, economic growth, and social equity (California Government Code Section 65041.1).

The California Transportation Commission (Commission or CTC) is authorized to develop guidelines by Government Code Section 14522, which reads:

*In cooperation with the regional transportation planning agencies, the commission may prescribe study areas for analysis and evaluation by such agencies and guidelines for the preparation of the regional transportation plans.*

These eighteen MPOs, in alphabetical order, are:

Association of Monterey Bay Governments, Butte County Association of Governments, Fresno Council of Governments, Kings County Association of Governments, Kern Council of Governments, Merced County Association of Governments, Madera County Transportation Commission, Metropolitan Transportation Commission, Sacramento Area Council of Governments, San Diego Association of Governments, San Joaquin Council of Governments, San Luis Obispo Council of Governments, Santa Barbara County Association of Governments, Shasta Regional Transportation Agency, Southern California Association of Governments, Stanislaus Council of Governments, Tulare County Association of Governments, and Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization.

While the guidelines include both state and federal requirements, MPOs have the flexibility to be creative in selecting transportation planning options that best fit their regional needs. The guidelines recognize that "one size does not fit all." Solutions and techniques used by a larger MPO will be different than those used by a smaller MPO.

The 2017 RTP Guidelines continue to use the words "Shall" and "Should", a convention established by the previous RTP Guidelines. Where the RTP Guidelines reflect a state or federal statutory or regulatory requirement, the word "Shall" is used with a statutory or regulatory citation. The word "Should" is used where the Guidelines reflect a permissive or optional statutory reference such as "May" or "Should." Each section ends with federal and state requirements (Shalls), federal and state recommendations (Shoulds), and refers to Appendix L for Planning Practices Examples where appropriate. Planning practice examples are intended to highlight exemplary, state of the art planning practices that MPOs can seek to emulate as financial and technical resources allow.

Changes to federal statute are implemented by the Code of Federal Regulations (CFRs) that are also known as the "final rules". On May 27, 2016, the Statewide and Nonmetropolitan

Transportation Planning *and* Metropolitan Transportation Planning Final Rule was issued, with an effective date of June 27, 2016, for Title 23 CFR Parts 450 and 771 and Title 49 CFR Part 613. The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)/Federal Transit Administration (FTA) are still in the process of finalizing the remaining rules for implementation of the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century (MAP-21) and the Fixing America's Surface Transportation (FAST) Acts. Unless otherwise noted, the RTP Guidelines will show the CFRs for MAP-21/FAST Act. The majority of citations in these guidelines refer to the implementing regulations, i.e., the CFR section.

MPO RTPs are updated every four years (or five years in attainment regions); however, many MPOs begin the next RTP update immediately upon adoption of the current RTP. As RTP development is a continuous process, consideration is given to MPOs that will be too far along in the planning process to conform their RTPs to the 2017 RTP Guidelines. All RTP updates started after the 2017 RTP Guidelines are adopted by the CTC must use the new RTP Guidelines. Furthermore, federal regulations outline the timeline for complying with MAP-21/FAST Act transportation planning requirements. Prior to May 27, 2018, an MPO may adopt an RTP that has been developed using the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU) requirements or the provisions of the Statewide and Nonmetropolitan Transportation Planning *and* Metropolitan Transportation Planning Final Rule (23 CFR Part 450 and 771 and 49 CFR Part 613). On or after May 27, 2018, an MPO may not adopt an RTP that has not been developed according to the provisions of MAP-21/FAST Act as specified in the Planning Final Rule. MPOs are encouraged to communicate with Caltrans and FHWA/FTA to discuss schedules for RTP adoption.

## **1.1 Why Conduct Long-Range Transportation Planning?**

The long range transportation planning process in metropolitan areas is uniquely suited to address a number of federal, state, regional, and local goals, from supporting economic growth to achieving environmental goals and promoting public health and quality of life. Not only does the transportation system provide for the mobility of people and goods, it also influences patterns of growth and economic activity through accessibility to land. Furthermore, the performance of this system affects such public policy concerns as air quality, greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, natural resources, environmental protection and conservation, social equity, smart growth, housing affordability, jobs/housing balance, economic development, safety, and security. Transportation planning recognizes the critical links between transportation and other societal goals. The planning process is more than merely a listing of multimodal capital investments; it requires developing strategies for operating, managing, maintaining, funding, and financing the area's transportation system in such a way as to advance the area's long-term goals.

Over the past ten years, combating climate change has emerged as a key goal for the state of California. Starting with the passage of Assembly Bill 32 – The California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 (AB 32, Chapter 488, Statutes of 2006), the state has set aggressive goals to reduce GHG emissions responsible for climate change. AB 32 requires a reduction in state GHG emission by limiting state GHG emissions in 2020 to no more than the 1990 state emission levels. On September 8, 2016, the California Global Warming Act of 2006 was amended by Senate Bill 32 (SB 32, Chapter 249, Statutes of 2016) to require a further reduction of GHG emissions to achieve at least a 40 percent reduction below 1990 levels by 2030. Governor Schwarzenegger's Executive Order S-3-05 and Governor Brown's Executive Order B-

30-15 target a reduction of GHG emission to achieve a reduction of 80 percent below 1990 levels by 2050. Enacted legislation, SB 391 (Chapter 585, Statutes of 2009) directs Caltrans to model how to achieve the 80 percent reduction in GHG emissions by 2050, and that modeling was included in the California Transportation Plan 2040, which was released in June 2016. According to the California Air Resources Board (ARB) 2016 Mobile Source Strategy, the transportation sector accounts for nearly 50 percent of GHG emissions in California<sup>1</sup>. As such, the long-range transportation planning process in metropolitan areas has evolved to address climate change amongst many other goals in the balance.

In 2008, transportation planning and land use planning became further linked following the passage of SB 375 (Chapter 728, Statutes of 2008). SB 375 requires the MPOs to develop a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) or Alternative Planning Strategy (APS) to demonstrate meeting regional GHG emissions reduction targets established by ARB through the planned transportation network, forecasted development patterns, and transportation measures and policies within the RTP. In 2013, the connection between higher-density development and GHG reduction was strengthened further yet with the passage of SB 743 (Chapter 386, Statutes of 2013), which requires an update in the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) transportation metrics to align with climate and planning goals.

In addition, Executive Order B-30-15 directs State agencies to take climate change into account in planning and investment decisions, and employ full life-cycle cost accounting to evaluate and compare infrastructure investments and alternatives. Planning and investment shall be guided by the following principles:

- Priority should be given to actions that both build climate preparedness and reduce GHG emissions;
- Where possible, flexible and adaptive approaches should be taken to prepare for uncertain climate impacts;
- Actions should protect the state's most vulnerable populations; and,
- Natural infrastructure solutions, as defined in Public resources code 71154(c)(3) (e.g., flood plain and wetlands restoration or preservation, combining levees with restored natural systems to reduce flood risk, and urban tree planning to reduce high heat days), should be prioritized.

The RTP, also called a Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) or Long-Range Transportation Plan is the mechanism used in California for MPOs to conduct long-range (minimum of 20 years) transportation planning, integrated with local jurisdiction's land use planning, in their regions to achieve local and regional goals, in consideration of state and federal goals. Because transportation infrastructure investments have effects on travel patterns, smart investments play a key role in meeting climate targets. As a result of state legislation, as well as executive orders, GHG emission reduction, transportation electrification, climate resilience, improving transportation mobility, addressing federal air quality criteria pollutants, and ensuring that the statewide regional transportation system addresses tribal, local, regional, and statewide

---

<sup>1</sup> This number reflects a wheel-to-well GHG estimate from aviation, construction and mining equipment, buses, heavy duty trucks, passenger vehicles, light duty trucks, rail, ships and commercial harbor craft, and the petroleum refining for transportation fuel. Federal and State law provide limited authority to MPOs. Collaborative planning between the state and MPOs is needed to meet the state's GHG reduction goals.

mobility and economic needs are key priorities in the statewide and regional transportation planning process.

Equally important to consider in long-range transportation planning is how transportation can affect human health in many ways, for example: safety – reduction of collisions; air quality – reduction of vehicle emissions; physical activity – increasing biking and walking; access to goods, services, and opportunities – increasing livability in communities; and noise – designing road improvements to decrease sound exposure. A timely opportunity to address public health outcomes is early during the RTP development process. MPOs can consider health priorities in selection of projects for the RTP and FTIP. MPOs also can play a significant role in engaging residents and stakeholders in the regional transportation planning process to ensure the improvement of health outcomes for all segments of the population.

As interest in the link between transportation and health has grown, much cross-sector coordination and collaboration between transportation professionals and health practitioners has occurred at all levels of government, with input from public health and equity advocates, as well as active transportation stakeholders. The optimal result of this process is to improve transportation decisions and thereby improve access to healthy and active lifestyles. Recent legislation geared at achieving this, AB 441 Monning (Chapter 365, Statutes of 2012), was passed to capture the work that MPOs are doing in their RTPs to promote health and health equity. Pursuant to AB 441, the 2017 RTP Guidelines includes a new attachment, Appendix K, that highlights the various health and health equity-promoting projects, programs, and policies currently employed in MPO RTPs in California. Public health is further discussed in Section 2.3.

Lastly, long-range transportation planning provides the opportunity to compare alternative improvement strategies, track performance over time, and identify funding priorities. The CTP defines this as performance management that helps ensure efficient and effective investment of transportation funds by refocusing on established goals, increasing accountability and transparency, and improving project decision-making. To further reach this end, MAP-21/FAST Act require States and MPOs to implement a performance-based approach in the scope of the statewide and nonmetropolitan *and* metropolitan transportation planning process. In addition to federal performance based planning, the State of California has articulated through statute, regulation, executive order, and legislative intent language, numerous state goals for the transportation system, the environment, the economy, and social equity. RTPs are developed to reflect regional and local priorities and goals, but they are also instruments that can be used by federal and state agencies to demonstrate how regional agency efforts contribute to those federal and state agencies meeting their own transportation system goals. Inclusion of goal setting in RTPs allows the federal and state governments to both understand regional goals, and track progress toward federal and state goals.



Performance-based planning is the application of performance management within the planning process to help the federal government, states and regional agencies achieve desired outcomes for the multimodal transportation system. The benefits of well-designed and appropriately used performance measures are transparency about the benefits of the RTP, not only for transportation system performance, but also for other regionally important priorities such as improved public health, housing affordability, farmland conservation, habitat preservation, and cost-effective infrastructure investment. As the performance-based approach is implemented at the federal and State levels, performance measures will continue to develop over the years to come. Transportation performance management and the performance-based approach are further discussed in Chapter 7.

## **1.2 RTPs & the California Transportation Plan**

Similar to the SB 375 requirements for Regional Transportation Plans (RTPs), SB 391 adds new requirements to the State's long-range transportation plan to meet California's climate change goals under AB 32. The bill requires the California Transportation Plan (CTP) to address how the state will achieve maximum feasible emissions reductions in order to attain a statewide reduction of GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020 and 80% below 1990 levels by 2050. The bill also requires the CTP to identify the statewide integrated multimodal transportation system needed to achieve these results and specifies that the plan take into consideration the use of alternative fuels, new vehicle technology, tail pipe emission reductions, and the expansion of public transit, commuter rail, intercity rail, bicycling, and walking. In addition, SB 391 required Caltrans to update the CTP by December 31, 2015, and every 5 years thereafter.

The CTP is a core document that addresses the applicable federal statewide and non-metropolitan transportation planning regulations and helps tie together several internal and external plans and programs to help define and plan transportation in California. Unlike the RTP, it is not project specific or subject to both federal air quality conformity regulations and CEQA, but it does look at how SCS implementation will influence the statewide multimodal transportation system, as well as how the state will achieve sufficient emission reductions in order to meet AB 32 and SB 391. While the CTP is prepared by Caltrans, it is developed in collaboration with various stakeholders and public involvement. Furthermore, the CTP is a fiscally unconstrained aspirational policy document that integrates and builds upon six Caltrans modal plans (Interregional Plan, Freight Plan, Rail Plan, Aviation Plan, Transit Plan, and Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan) as well as the fiscally constrained RTPs prepared by the MPOs and the Regional Transportation Planning Agencies (RTPAs). RTPAs and MPOs address transportation from a regional perspective, while the CTP, building on regional plans, addresses the connectivity and/or travel between regions and applies a statewide perspective for transportation system. Therefore, integration of CTP and RTP goals (where applicable and consistent with federal and state fiscal restraint requirements) may provide greater mobility choices for travelers not only within their regions but across the state. The CTP and the RTP can be developed in a cyclical pattern aligning one with another using comprehensive, cooperative and continuing planning. This should result in delivering better projects and using resources more efficiently. The following diagrams illustrate the relationship between the CTP and RTP.





### 1.3 Background & Purpose of the RTP Guidelines

The purposes of these RTP Guidelines are to:

1. Promote an integrated, statewide, multimodal, regional transportation planning process and effective transportation investments;
2. Set forth a uniform transportation planning framework throughout California by identifying federal and state requirements and statutes impacting the development of RTPs;
3. Promote a continuous, comprehensive, and cooperative transportation planning process that facilitates the rapid and efficient development and implementation of projects that maintain California's commitment to public health and environmental quality; and,
4. Promote a planning process that considers the views of all stakeholders.

The purpose of RTPs is to encourage and promote the safe and efficient management, operation and development of a regional intermodal transportation system that, when linked with appropriate land use planning, will serve the mobility needs of goods and people. The RTP Guidelines are intended to provide guidance so that MPOs will develop their RTPs to be consistent with federal and state transportation planning requirements. This is important because state statutes require that RTPs serve as the foundation of the Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP). The FTIPs are prepared by MPOs and identify the next four years of transportation projects to be funded for construction. The California Transportation Commission (CTC) cannot program projects that are not identified in the RTP.

Since the mid-1970s, with the passage of AB 69, (Chapter 1253, Statutes of 1972) California state law has required the preparation of RTPs to address transportation issues and assist local and state decision-makers in shaping California's transportation infrastructure. SB 375 requires that the RTP Guidelines are to be developed pursuant to California Government Code Sections 14522 and 65080 which state:

*“14522. In cooperation with the regional transportation planning agencies, the commission may prescribe study areas for analysis and evaluation by such agencies and guidelines for the preparation of the regional transportation plans.”*

*“14522.1. (a) (1) The commission, in consultation with the department and the State Air Resources Board, shall maintain guidelines for travel demand models used in the development of regional transportation plans by federally designated metropolitan planning organizations.*

*(2) Any revision of the guidelines shall include the formation of an advisory committee that shall include representatives of the metropolitan planning organizations, the department, organizations knowledgeable in the creation and use of travel demand models, local governments, and organizations concerned with the impacts of transportation investments on communities and the environment. Before amending the guidelines, the commission shall hold two workshops on the guidelines, one in northern California and one in southern California. The workshops shall be incorporated into regular commission meetings.*

*(b) The guidelines shall, at a minimum and to the extent practicable, taking into account such factors as the size and available resources of the metropolitan planning organization, account for all of the following:*

*(1) The relationship between land use density and household vehicle ownership and vehicle miles traveled in a way that is consistent with statistical research.*

*(2) The impact of enhanced transit service levels on household vehicle ownership and vehicle miles traveled.*

*(3) Changes in travel and land development likely to result from highway or passenger rail expansion.*

*(4) Mode splitting that allocates trips among automobile, transit, carpool, and bicycle and pedestrian trips. If a travel demand model is unable to forecast bicycle and pedestrian trips, another means may be used to estimate those trips.*

*(5) Speed and frequency, days, and hours of operation of transit service.”*

*“65080 (d) Except as otherwise provided in this subdivision, each transportation planning agency shall adopt and submit, every four years, an updated regional transportation plan to the California Transportation Commission and the Department of Transportation. A transportation planning agency located in a federally designated air quality attainment area or that does not contain an urbanized area may at its option adopt and submit a regional transportation plan every five years. When applicable, the plan shall be consistent with federal planning and*

*programming requirements and shall conform to the regional transportation plan guidelines adopted by the California Transportation Commission. Prior to adoption of the regional transportation plan, a public hearing shall be held after the giving of notice of the hearing by publication in the affected county or counties pursuant to Section 6061."*

The California RTP Guidelines were first adopted by the CTC in 1978 and subsequently revised in 1982, 1987, 1991, 1992, 1994, 1999, 2007, and 2010.

The 1999 revision of the Guidelines was prepared to achieve conformance with state and federal transportation planning legislation and was based on the Federal Transportation Equity Act for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century (TEA-21) and California SB 45 (Chapter 622 Statutes 1997). A 2003 Supplement was also prepared that was based on a 2003 RTP Evaluation Report completed for the CTC. The federal surface transportation reauthorization bill called the SAFETEA-LU was signed into law in 2005. The 2007 revision of the RTP Guidelines was prepared in order to address changes in the planning process resulting from SAFETEA-LU.

Subsequent to the passage of AB 32 (California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006), an addendum to the 2007 RTP Guidelines was adopted by the CTC in May 2008 to address a request from the California Legislature to ensure climate change issues were incorporated in the RTP process. That addendum was adopted by the CTC prior to the September 2008 passage of SB 375.

The 2010 update was prepared to incorporate new planning requirements as a result of SB 375 and to incorporate the addendum to the 2007 RTP Guidelines. SB 375 requires the 18 MPOs in the state to identify a forecasted development pattern and transportation network that, if implemented, will meet GHG emission reduction targets specified by the California Air Resources Board (ARB) through their RTP planning processes.

Since the 2010 update, two federal surface transportation reauthorization bills have been signed into law. First, the two-year bill with numerous extensions, MAP-21, was signed on July 6, 2012. Most recently, a longer term five-year funding bill, FAST, was signed on December 4, 2015.

## **2015 MPO RTP Review Report**

The 2017 RTP Guidelines update was prepared to incorporate Recommendations that were included in the December 2015 MPO RTP Review Report. This Report can be found at: <http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tpp/offices/orip/rtp/index.html>. One of these Recommendations called for an MPO focused RTP Guidelines document addressing just the requirements for MPOs when developing, completing, adopting and implementing an RTP. In addition, the 2017 update reflects the data and analysis needs of the ARB to evaluate the Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) component of an MPO's RTP.

## **1.4 MPOs in California**

In cooperation with the Governor, there are 18 federally designated MPOs that prepare RTPs in California. MPOs must adhere to federal planning regulations during the preparation of their RTPs. California statutes and the RTP Guidelines identify the RTP requirements for MPOs.

Federal legislation passed in the early 1970's required the formation of an MPO for any urbanized area with a population greater than 50,000. MPOs were created in order to ensure that existing and future expenditures for transportation projects and programs were based on a continuing, cooperative and comprehensive (3-C) planning process. One of the core functions of an MPO is to develop an RTP through the planning process.

An MPO has five core functions:

1. Maintain a setting for regional decision-making;
2. Prepare an Overall Work Program (OWP);
3. Involve the public in this decision-making;
4. Prepare an RTP; and,
5. Develop a Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).


MPOs federally required responsibilities are identified in Title 23 U.S.C. Section 134 and Title 23 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 450.300. To carry out various transportation planning functions, MPOs receive annual federal metropolitan planning funds from the FHWA and FTA.

The California Government Code sets forth the requirements for an RTP to be an internally consistent document that contains a SCS in addition to the policy, action and financial elements. With the added requirement for an SCS in 2008, state law placed new emphasis on the RTP as an integrated planning document that promotes sustainable land use and increases mobility options. This heightens the importance of the MPOs as regional leaders to bring together local governments in a collaborative discussion about alternate scenarios for the region's future.

The map below identifies the 18 MPOs (in darker shade) and the 26 RTPAs that prepare RTPs (in lighter shade or dot pattern).

# CALIFORNIA

## Metropolitan Planning Organizations(MPOs) and Regional Transportation Planning Agencies (RTPAs)



## **1.5 Purpose of the RTP**

RTPs are planning documents developed by MPOs in cooperation with FHWA, FTA, Caltrans and other stakeholders, including system users. Following the passage of SB 375, MPOs also need to work closely with the California Air Resources Board (ARB) and the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) (Government Code Section 65080 et seq.). MPOs are required to prepare these long-range plans per federal statute (Title 23 U.S.C. Section 134). The purpose of the RTP is to establish regional goals, identify present and future needs, deficiencies and constraints, analyze potential solutions, estimate available funding, and propose investments.

California statute refers to these documents as “Regional Transportation Plans” or RTPs. In California planning circles, these long range planning documents normally use the term “RTP”. However several California MPOs refer to RTPs using the term “Metropolitan Transportation Plan or MTP” which is used in federal planning regulations. “RTP” or “MTP” are terms used to describe the same document.

Pursuant to Title 23 CFR Part 450.324 et seq. FHWA describes the development and contents of RTPs as follows:

*“The transportation plan is the Statement of the ways the region plans to invest in the transportation system. The plan shall “include both long-range and short-range program strategies/actions that lead to the development of an integrated intermodal transportation system that facilitates the efficient movement of people and goods.” The plan has several elements, for example: Identify policies, strategies, and projects for the future; Determine project demand for transportation services over 20 years; Focus at the systems level, including roadways, transit, non-motorized transportation, and intermodal connections; Articulate regional land use, development, housing, and employment goals and plans; Estimate costs and identify reasonably available financial sources for operation, maintenance, and capital investments); Determine ways to preserve existing roads and facilities and make efficient use of the existing system; be consistent with the Statewide transportation plan; and Be updated every five years or four years in air quality nonattainment and maintenance areas. MPOs should make special efforts to engage interested parties in the development of the plan. In cases where a metropolitan area is designated as a nonattainment or maintenance area, the plan must conform to the State Implementation Plan (SIP) for air quality.”*

The regional transportation planning led by the MPOs is a collaborative process that is widely participated by the federal, state, local and tribal governments/agencies, as well as other key stakeholders and the general public. The process is designed to foster involvement by all interested parties, such as the business community, California Tribal Governments, community groups, environmental organizations, the general public, and local jurisdictions through a proactive public participation process conducted by the MPO in coordination with the state and transit operators. It is essential to extend public participation to include people who have been traditionally underserved by the transportation system and services in the region. Neglecting public involvement early in the planning stage can result in delays during the project stage.

While new federal MAP-21/FAST Act requirements are addressed in Section 1.7 of these guidelines, the traditional steps undertaken during the regional planning process include:

1. Providing a long-term (20 year) visioning framework;
2. Monitoring existing conditions;
3. Forecasting future population and employment growth;
4. Assessing projected land uses in the region and identifying major growth corridors;
5. Identifying alternatives and needs and analyzing, through detailed planning studies, various transportation improvements;
6. Developing alternative capital and operating strategies for people and goods;
7. Estimating the impact of the transportation system on air quality within the region; and,
8. Developing a financial plan that covers operating costs, maintenance of the system, system preservation costs, and new capital investments.

The overall scope of the RTP prepared by MPOs has expanded as a result of SB 375 to require the inclusion of a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS):

1. Transportation projects, non-auto mobility strategies, and the forecasted development pattern in the RTP must be modeled to determine their impacts on regional GHG emissions. Current travel models are not always sensitive to the land use and transportation strategies in an SCS; therefore, MPOs have had to find alternative methods to quantify the GHG emissions reduction benefits of these strategies. Off-model methods are discussed further in Chapter 3.
2. The RTP must contain an SCS that includes a forecasted development pattern for the region, which, when integrated with the transportation network, and other transportation measures and policies, will reduce the GHG emissions from automobiles and light trucks to achieve, if feasible, the GHG emission reduction target approved for the region by the ARB. The MPO will need to coordinate with cities and counties within the region to work towards strategies that will reduce regional GHG emissions.
3. The MPO must prepare an Alternative Planning Strategy (APS) if the SCS is unable to reduce GHG emissions to achieve the GHG emissions reduction targets established by the ARB. The APS shall be a separate document from the RTP, but it may be adopted concurrently with the RTP.

The RTPs are developed to provide a clear vision of the regional transportation goals, objectives and strategies. This vision must be realistic and within fiscal constraints. In addition to providing a vision, the RTPs have many specific functions, including:

1. Providing an assessment of the current modes of transportation and the potential of new travel options within the region;
2. Projecting/estimating the future needs for travel and goods movement;
3. Identification and documentation of specific actions necessary to address regional mobility and accessibility needs;
4. Identification of guidance and documentation of public policy decisions by local, regional, state and federal officials regarding transportation expenditures and financing and future growth patterns;

5. Identification of needed transportation improvements, in sufficient detail, to serve as a foundation for the: (a) Development of the Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP), and the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), (b) Facilitation of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)/404 integration process and (c) Identification of project purpose and need;
6. Employing performance measures that demonstrate the effectiveness of the system of transportation improvement projects in meeting the intended goals;
7. Promotion of consistency between the CTP, the regional transportation plan and other plans developed by cities, counties, districts, California Tribal Governments, and state and federal agencies in responding to statewide and interregional transportation issues and needs;
8. Providing a forum for: (1) participation and cooperation and (2) facilitation of partnerships that reconcile transportation issues which transcend regional boundaries; and,
9. Involving community-based organizations as part of the public, Federal, State and local agencies, California Tribal Governments, as well as local elected officials, early in the transportation planning process so as to include them in discussions and decisions on the social, economic, air quality and environmental issues related to transportation.

## **1.6 California Transportation Planning & Programming Process**

The State of California and federal transportation agencies allocate millions of dollars of planning funds annually to help support California's transportation planning process. The RTP establishes the basis for programming local, state, and federal funds for transportation projects within a region. State and federal planning and programming legislation has been in place and is periodically revised to provide guidance in the use of these funds to plan, maintain and improve the transportation system.

The RTP Guidelines include recommendations and suggestions for providing documentation that is needed to meet the requirements of the Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP) and the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). Because there are a variety of names used for the programming document that is prepared by an MPO, the RTP Guidelines refer to the programming document that accompanies an RTP as the FTIP. The FTIP is defined as a constrained four-year prioritized list of regionally significant and non-regionally significant transportation projects that are proposed for federal, state and local funding. The FTIP is developed and adopted by the MPO and is updated every two years. It is consistent with the RTP and it is required as a prerequisite for federal funding. In this document the words FTIP and Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) are used interchangeably.

The planning and programming process is the result of state and federal legislation to ensure that:

1. The process is as open and transparent as possible;
2. Environmental considerations are addressed; and,
3. Funds are allocated in an equitable manner to address transportation needs.

The chart in Appendix A attempts to provide a simple diagram of a complex process. Each entity in the chart reflects extensive staff support and legislative direction. The result is the planning and programming process that reflects the legislative and funding support of the



California transportation system. Additional information regarding the programming process is available in Sections 2.5 and 6.15.

## **1.7 MAP-21/FAST Act Items Impacting the Development of RTPs**

This section is intended to outline the new federal requirements resulting from MAP-21/FAST Act and the Final Rule issued May 27, 2016 with an effective date of June 27, 2016 for Statewide and Nonmetropolitan Transportation Planning *and* Metropolitan Transportation Planning. Only the items that have a direct impact on RTP development are listed. Other sections may contain optional requirements that could have impacts to the overall regional transportation planning *process*.

As specified in 23 CFR 450.340(a), prior to May 27, 2018, an MPO may adopt an RTP that has been developed using the SAFETEA-LU requirements or the provisions and requirements of 23 CFR 450. On or after May 27, 2018, an MPO may not adopt an RTP that has not been developed according to the provisions of 23 CFR 450. MPOs are encouraged to communicate with Caltrans and FHWA/FTA to discuss schedules for RTP adoption.

**Two New Planning Factors (Section 2.4)** – MPOs shall consider and implement two new planning factors added to the scope of the transportation planning process: Improve resiliency and reliability of the transportation system and reduce or mitigate stormwater impacts of surface transportation; and enhance travel and tourism. 23 CFR 450.306 (b)(9) and (10)

**Performance-Based Planning Approach (Section 7.2)** – MPOs are required to integrate the goals, objectives, performance measures, and targets described in other performance-based plans into their RTPs. The implementation timeline for MPOs to satisfy the new requirements is two years from the effective date of each rule establishing performance measures under 23 U.S.C. 150(c), 49 U.S.C. 5326, and 49 U.S.C. 5329 FHWA/FTA. A future update of the RTP Guidelines will capture any “shoulds” or “shalls” resulting from the rulemaking process. 23 CFR 450.306; 23 CFR 450.324 (f)(3) and (4)

**Assessment of Capital Investment and Other Strategies (Section 6.22)** – RTPs are required to include an assessment of capital investment and other strategies to: (1) preserve the existing and projected future transportation infrastructure, (2) provide for multimodal capacity increases based on regional needs and priorities, and (3) reduce vulnerability of the existing infrastructure to natural disasters. 23 CFR 450.324 (f)(7)

**Consideration of Public Transportation Facilities and Intercity Bus Facilities (Section 6.10)** – RTPs must also consider the role of intercity bus systems, including systems that are privately owned and operated, in reducing congestion, and including transportation alternatives. 23 CFR 450.324 (f)(8)

**Interested Parties, Public Participation, and Consultation (Sections 4.4, 4.6, and 6.21)** – In addition to the interested parties listed, MPOs must also provide public ports with a reasonable opportunity to comment on the RTP. MPOs should also consult with officials responsible for tourism and natural disaster risk reduction when developing RTPs and FTIPs. 23 CFR 450.316(a) and (b); 23 CFR 450.324(j)

**Optional Scenario Planning** – MPOs may use scenario planning during the development of RTPs. Many California MPOs already employ scenario planning as an analytical framework to inform decision-makers about the implications of various investments and policies on transportation system condition and performance during the development of their plan. 23 CFR 450.324(i)

## **1.8 Key Additions to the 2017 RTP Guidelines**

Key Additions to the 2017 RTP Guidelines include the following items:

1. Separating RTP Guidelines, one for the MPOs and one for the RTPAs to better address the specific requirements for their RTPs.
2. Appendix C – Adds questions to the RTP Checklist for Title VI compliance.
3. Appendix K, AB 441 Monning – For the first time in the RTP Guidelines, this Appendix highlights the various public health and health equity-promoting policies incorporated within the MPO RTPs.
4. Appendix L, Planning Practice Examples – aggregates the former Appendix I, Land Use and Transportation Strategies to address Regional GHG Emissions, and the “Best Practices” component of RTP Guidelines as a new appendix, accessible by topic.
5. Updates for the MAP-21/FAST Act throughout the RTP Guidelines.
6. Section 1.0 – Provides guidance on applicability of the RTP Guidelines and defines “shalls” and “shoulds.”
7. Section 1.2 – Defines the relationship between the RTP and the CTP.
8. Section 1.7 – Outlines MAP-21/FAST Act items with a direct impact on RTP development.
9. Section 2.2 – Includes updates to State Climate Change Legislation and Executive Orders.
10. Section 2.3 – Provides an introduction to Appendix K, the public health and health equity-promoting policies that are found throughout the MPO RTPs.
11. Section 2.6 – Adds local, regional, and State prepared plans that MPOs should consult with during RTP preparation.
12. Section 2.7 – Includes Planning and Environmental Linkages, updates Context Sensitive Solutions, and additional System Planning documents that are used in partnership with MPOs in the transportation planning process.
13. Chapter 3 – Updates the Modeling Chapter from the 2010 version.
14. Chapter 4 – Includes new legislation highlighting the required Native American Tribal Government Consultation and Coordination process.
15. Section 4.2 – Describes Title VI considerations in the RTP, Principles of Environmental Justice (EJ), and Title VI Analysis & EJ Analysis.
16. Section 4.4 – Includes Periodic Evaluation of the Public Participation Plan to evaluate the effectiveness of the procedures and strategies for developing the RTP.
17. Section 4.6 – Adds public ports to the list of interested parties.
18. Chapter 5 – Describes SB 743 (Chapter 386, Statutes of 2013) and the anticipated future change to transportation analysis for transit priority areas.
19. Section 5.4 – Adds Cultural Resources, Habitat Connectivity, and Air Quality Impacts to the list of environmental resources that typically require avoidance alternative and mitigation.
20. Chapter 6 – Introduces the California Freight Mobility Plan and the California Sustainable Freight Action Plan.

21. Chapter 6 – Provides preliminary information on MAP-21/FAST Act impacts on Asset Management.
22. Section 6.8 – Adds items to consider in the highways discussion of the RTP, including zero-emission vehicles, widespread transportation electrification, community impacts their participation in project development.
23. Section 6.10 – Adds first/last mile transit connectivity to the transit discussion of the RTP as well as the MAP-21/FAST Act requirement to discuss the role of intercity buses in reducing congestion, pollution, and energy consumption.
24. Section 6.12 – Adds supporting the State's freight system efficiency target and identification of opportunities/innovations that reduce freight emissions to the goods movement discussion of the RTP.
25. Section 6.19 – New Section 6.19 provides a summary of federal and State legislation to prepare for new technologies and innovations for the future of transportation.
26. Section 6.20 – Updates Transportation Safety for MAP-21/FAST Act.
27. Section 6.21 – Updates Transportation Security for the MAP-21/FAST Act requirement to consult with agencies and officials responsible for natural disaster risk reduction.
28. Section 6.22 – Adds new RTP requirement for an Assessment of Capital Investment & Other Strategies.
29. Section 6.23 – Updates Congestion Management Process for the MAP-21/FAST Act framework for developing a Congestion Management Plan.
30. Section 6.26 – Updates addressing housing needs and adds a new subsection, Considering Rural Communities in the SCS.
31. Section 6.28 – Adds many transportation strategies to address regional GHG emissions, including employer-sponsored shuttle services, active transportation plans, and coordinating with school district plans and investments.
32. Section 6.30 – Updates for Climate Adaptation background, State legislation, executive orders, and planning resources for MPOs.
33. Chapter 7 – A new chapter, Transportation Performance Management, provides the appropriate emphasis on the RTP as a performance-driven plan for which performance measures must be developed and used by the MPO for plan development, implementation, and monitoring. This chapter includes updates for MAP-21/FAST Act requirements for MPOs to implement the performance based approach into the scope of the metropolitan planning process, including the RTP.

# Chapter 2

## RTP Process

Page Left Intentionally Blank

# RTP PROCESS

## 2.1 State Requirements

California statute relating to the development of the RTP is primarily contained in Government Code Section 65080.

Just like federal legislation, Government Code Section 65080 also requires that MPOs located in nonattainment regions update their RTPs at least every four years. State statute provides MPOs located in air quality attainment regions the option to update their RTPs every five years.

When applicable, RTPs shall be consistent with federal planning and programming requirements and shall conform to the RTP Guidelines adopted by the California Transportation Commission (CTC) pursuant to Government Code Section 65080(d). In addition, the CTC cannot program projects in the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) that are not identified in an RTP. Section 65080 states RTPs shall include the following:

1. Policy Element
2. Sustainable Communities Strategy
3. Action Element
4. Financial Element

The following California Government Code Sections apply to the development of RTPs:

**Government Code Section 65080.1** – Each MPO whose jurisdiction includes a portion of the California Coastal Trail, or property designated for the trail shall coordinate with the State Coastal Conservancy, the California Coastal Commission and Caltrans regarding the development of the trail. The trail must be identified in the RTP.

**Government Code Section 65080.3** - An MPO with a population exceeding 200,000 persons may prepare at least one “alternative planning scenario” during the development of the RTP. The purpose of the alternative planning scenario is to address attempts to reduce growth in traffic congestion, make more efficient use of existing transportation infrastructure, and reduce the need for costly future public infrastructure.

**Government Code Section 65080.5** - Prior to adoption of the RTP, a public hearing shall be held after publishing notice of the hearing. After the RTP is adopted by the MPO, the plan shall be submitted to the CTC and Caltrans. One copy should be sent to the CTC. Two copies should be submitted to the appropriate Caltrans district office. The Caltrans district office will send one copy to the headquarters Division of Transportation Planning.

**Government Code Section 65081.1** - Regions that contain a primary air carrier airport (defined by the Federal Aviation Administration as an airport having at least 10,000 annual scheduled passenger boardings) shall work collaboratively to include an airport ground access improvement program within the RTP. This program shall address airport access improvement projects, including major arterial and highway widening and extension projects, with special consideration given to mass transit.

### **Requirements (Shalls)**

**State:** Government Code Sections 65080, 65080.1, 65081.1

## **2.2 Background on State Climate Change Legislation & Executive Orders**

This section provides background for State climate change legislation and related executive orders. First, a description is provided for AB 32, SB 32, and SB 375 which have direct implications for MPOs in the development of RTPs. Next, other state legislation that impacts State agencies is outlined to provide important context for MPOs to consider in development of RTPs. Lastly, executive orders on climate change are discussed to provide a critical framework for MPOs. While the executive orders are directed at State agencies, MPOs are encouraged to integrate policies and strategies that support these state policies in the development of RTPs.

### **AB 32 – The California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006**

California established itself as a national leader in addressing climate change issues with the passage of AB 32, the Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006. As a result of AB 32, California statute specifies that by the year 2020, GHG emissions within the state must be at 1990 levels. The ARB is the primary state agency responsible for implementing the necessary regulatory and market mechanisms to achieve reductions in GHG emissions to comply with the requirements of AB 32.

AB 32 identifies GHGs as specific air pollutants that are responsible for global warming and climate change. This is particularly relevant to the RTP Guidelines because, according to the ARB Mobile Source Strategy, the transportation sector represents nearly 50 percent of GHG emissions in California<sup>2</sup>. California has focused on six GHGs (CO<sub>2</sub>, Methane, Nitrous Oxide, Hydro fluorocarbons, perfluorocarbons, and Sulfur Hexafluoride). CO<sub>2</sub> is the most prevalent GHG. All other GHGs are referenced in terms of a CO<sub>2</sub> equivalent.

AB 32 directed the ARB to develop actions to reduce GHGs, including the preparation of a scoping plan to identify how best to reach the 2020 goal. According to the scoping plan, the framework for achieving GHG emissions reductions from land use and transportation planning includes implementation of SB 375.

### **SB 32 – California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006: Emissions Limit**

In recognition that GHG reduction is critical for the protection of all areas of the state, but especially for the state's most disadvantaged communities, as those communities are most affected by the adverse impacts of climate change, SB 32 (Chapter 249, Statutes of 2016) was signed into law on September 8, 2016. SB 32 extends the AB 32 required reductions of GHG emissions by requiring a GHG reduction of at least 40 percent of 1990 levels no later than December 31, 2030. Furthermore, SB 32 authorizes ARB to adopt rules and regulations to achieve the maximum technologically feasible and cost-effective GHG emissions reductions. ARB shall carry out the process to achieve GHG emissions reductions in a manner that benefits the state's most disadvantaged communities and is transparent and accountable to the public and Legislature.

---

<sup>2</sup> This number reflects a wheel-to-well GHG estimate from aviation, construction and mining equipment, buses, heavy duty trucks, passenger vehicles, light duty trucks, rail, ships and commercial harbor craft, and the petroleum refining for transportation fuel. Federal and State law provide limited authority to MPOs. Collaborative planning between the state and MPOs is needed to meet the state's GHG reduction goals.

## **SB 375 – The Sustainable Communities and Climate Protection Act of 2008**

SB 375 was signed into law in September 2008. The bill addressed five primary areas:

1. Requires the ARB to develop regional GHG emission reduction targets for cars and light trucks for each of the 18 MPOs in California.
2. Through their respective planning processes, each of the MPOs is required to prepare a sustainable communities strategy (SCS) that will specify how the GHG emissions reduction target set by ARB for 2020 and 2035 can be achieved for the region. If the target cannot be met through the SCS, then an Alternative Planning Strategy (APS) shall be prepared.
3. Provides streamlining of California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requirements for specific residential and mixed-use developments that are consistent with an SCS or APS that has been determined by ARB to achieve the regional GHG emissions reduction target.
4. Synchronizes the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) process with the RTP process; requires local governments to update the housing element of their general plans and to rezone consistent with the updated housing element generally within three years of adoption; and provides that RHNA allocations must be consistent with the development pattern in the SCS. Housing element updates are moved from five year cycles to eight year cycles for member jurisdictions of all MPOs, classified as nonattainment or maintenance (required to adopt an updated RTP every four years) and for jurisdictions within other MPOs and RTPAs that elect to change the RTP adoption schedule from five years to every four years pursuant to Government Code Section 65080 (b)(2)(M). MPOs should carefully estimate a realistic RTP adoption date in providing the 12 month notice to HCD and not adopt a RTP at a later date. RTP adoption past the estimated adoption date relied on by HCD in determining new housing unit allocation for a specific planning period creates a conflict and shifts the housing element planning period to an ending period that lacks a requisite housing unit allocation.
5. Requires the California Transportation Commission (CTC) to maintain guidelines for the use of travel demand models used in the development of regional transportation plans that, taking into consideration MPO resources, account for: 1.) the relationship between land use density, household vehicle ownership, and vehicle miles traveled (VMT), consistent with statistical research, 2.) the impact of enhanced transit service on household vehicle ownership and VMT, 3.) likely changes in travel and land development from highway or passenger rail expansion, 4.) mode splitting that allocates trips between automobile, transit, carpool, bicycle and pedestrian trips, and 5.) speed and frequency, days, and hours of operation of transit service. (Government Code Section 14522.1)

### **Requirements (Shalls)**

**State:** Government Code Section 65080



The following State legislation is directed at State agencies. MPOs are encouraged to consider and incorporate, where applicable and appropriate, the policies and strategies that support requirements placed on the State.

## **AB 1482 – Climate Adaptation**

AB 1482 (Chapter 603, Statutes of 2015) addresses two areas:

1. Requires the Natural Resources Agency to update the state's Climate Adaptation Strategy (Safeguarding California) by July 1, 2017, and every three years thereafter.
2. Requires the Strategic Growth Council to identify and review activities and funding programs of State agencies that may be coordinated, including those that:
  - a. Increase the availability of affordable housing, improve transportation, encourage sustainable land use planning, and revitalize urban and community centers in a sustainable manner.
  - b. Meet the goals of the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 and the strategies and priorities developed in the Safeguarding California Plan, the state's climate adaptation strategy.
  - c. At a minimum, review and comment on the five-year infrastructure plan.

## **SB 246 – Climate Change Adaptation**

SB 246 (Chapter 606, Statutes of 2015) establishes the Integrated Climate Adaptation and Resiliency Program through the Office of Planning and Research (OPR) to coordinate regional and local adaptation efforts with state climate adaptation strategies.

## **SB 350 - Clean Energy and Pollution Reduction Act of 2015**

SB 350 (Chapter 547, Statutes of 2015) describes the importance of widespread transportation electrification for meeting climate goals and federal air quality standards. SB 350 focuses on "widespread" transportation electrification. The term "widespread" is important because adhering to existing patterns of investment in wealthier communities relative to low- or moderate-income communities would result in underinvestment in low-income communities and overinvestment in wealthier communities. SB 350 notes that "widespread transportation electrification requires increased access for disadvantaged communities, low- and moderate-income communities, and other consumers of zero-emission and near-zero-emission vehicles."

Pursuant to PUC 740.12(a)(2), it is the policy of the state and the intent of the legislature to encourage transportation electrification as a means to achieve ambient air quality standards and the state's climate goals. Agencies designing and implementing regulation, guidelines, plans, and funding programs to reduce GHG emissions shall take the findings described in paragraph (1) of PUC Section 740.12 into account. MPOs are encouraged to support widespread transportation electrification and partner with state agencies to advance California toward the standards and goals outlined in Public Utilities Code Section 740.12(a)(1). These include:

- Reducing emissions of GHGs to 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030 and to 80 percent below 1990 levels by 2050.
- Achieving the goals of the Charge Ahead California Initiative (Chapter 8.5 (commencing with Section 44258) of Part 5 of Division 26 of the Health and Safety Code).
- Meeting air quality standards, reducing petroleum use, improving public health, and achieving GHG emission reduction goals.
- Attracting investments and high quality jobs.

## Executive Orders on Climate Change Issues

The executive orders on climate change below are discussed to provide a critical framework for MPOs. While these Executive Orders are directed at State agencies, integration of climate change policies in the RTP supports the State's effort to reduce per capita GHG emissions and combat the effects of climate change.

Three Governor Executive Orders were issued from 2005-2008 to address climate change: S-3-05 (June 1, 2005) that calls for a coordinated approach to address the detrimental air quality effects of GHGs; S-20-06 (October 17, 2006) that requires State agencies to continue their cooperation to reduce GHG emissions and to have the Climate Action Team develop a plan to outline a number of actions to reduce GHG; and S-13-08 (November 14, 2008) that directs the Natural Resources Agency to develop the State's first Climate Adaptation Strategy (CAS) guide. Information on climate change and California climate change activities can be found at the following links:

<http://www.climatechange.ca.gov/>

<http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/facts/facts.htm>

More recently, Governor Executive Orders were issued in 2012 and 2015. Executive Order B-16-12 sets a 2050 GHG emissions reduction goal for the transportation sector to achieve 80 percent less than 1990 levels. Executive Order B-32-15 works toward achieving GHG reduction targets with the California Sustainable Freight Action Plan, an integrated plan that establishes clear targets to improve freight efficiency, transition to zero-emission technologies, and increase competitiveness of California's freight system.

In addition, Executive Order B-30-15 established a new interim statewide GHG emission reduction target to reduce GHG emissions to 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030 to ensure California meets its target of reducing GHG emissions to 80 percent below 1990 levels by 2050. All State agencies with jurisdiction over sources of GHG emissions shall implement measures, pursuant to statutory authority, to achieve reductions of GHG emissions to meet the 2030 and 2050 GHG emissions reductions targets. Furthermore, State agencies shall take climate change into account in their planning and investment decisions, and employ full life-cycle cost accounting to evaluate and compare infrastructure investments and alternatives. State agencies' planning and investment shall be guided by the following principles:

- Priority should be given to actions that both build climate preparedness and reduce GHG emissions;
- Where possible, flexible and adaptive approaches should be taken to prepare for uncertain climate impacts;
- Actions should protect the states most vulnerable populations;
- Natural infrastructure solutions, as defined in Public resources code 71154(c)(3) (e.g., flood plain and wetlands restoration or preservation, combining levees with restored natural systems to reduce flood risk, and urban tree planning to reduce high heat days), should be prioritized; and,
- Lastly, the State Five-Year Infrastructure Plan will take current and future climate change impacts into account in all infrastructure projects.

These Executive Orders are available at:

B-16-12: <https://www.gov.ca.gov/news.php?id=17472>

B-30-15: <https://www.gov.ca.gov/news.php?id=18938>

B-32-15: <https://www.gov.ca.gov/news.php?id=19046>

## **2.3 Promoting Public Health & Health Equity**

Health-promoting policies are found throughout Regional Transportation Plans (RTPs). RTPs often incorporate many or all of the following: safe routes to school programs; complete streets strategies; equity considerations; transportation safety; and policies to promote transit, bicycling and walking. These kinds of transportation-related policies and programs, and others as well, foster more accessible, more livable, and healthier communities. Explicitly identifying their public health benefits can reinforce the role of RTPs in building stronger communities and regions. In addition, local health departments and other public health stakeholders can be valuable partners in RTP development, to increase understanding of the relationship between transportation and health. Their participation can help to maximize the RTP's public health and equity benefits and ensure that the RTP is responsive to community needs.

Appendix K provides a summary of policies, practices, and projects that have been employed by MPOs in their RTPs to promote health and health equity. This is in fulfillment of requirements set forth by AB 441, Gov. Code 14522.3. Appendix K focuses on examples from existing RTPs, in keeping with the legislative intent of AB 441 as expressed in Section 1(a)(d) of the bill: "The Legislature intends that projects, programs, and practices that promote health and health equity in regional transportation plans that are employed by metropolitan planning organizations be shared in the voluntary state guidance on regional transportation planning." It is important to note that Appendix K is not intended to provide a "one size fits all" approach. In light of the diversity of California MPOs, and the varying level of financial resources and technical capabilities to undertake the long range regional transportation planning process, Appendix K outlines direct and indirect effects of transportation projects and policies, provides key terms and definitions, offers examples from both rural and urban regions, and recognizes the importance of a regionally-appropriate approach to addressing health and health equity in the RTP. It is also important to acknowledge that improving the built environment is one of many factors in improving public health. Appendix K is meant to provide examples of how the RTP can contribute to improved public health and is not meant to imply that by implementing these recommendations, all public health needs will be addressed.

The role of transportation in public health is increasingly recognized by health advocates and transportation providers alike. Federal, state, regional, and local transportation agencies have long focused on improving both air quality and safety, which are very important to public health. More recently, the understanding of the relationship of transportation and health has been expanding to include a much broader range of community needs. One fundamental example is the way in which transportation can encourage physical activity, such as walking and biking, often referred to as active transportation. There is a demonstrated relationship between increased physical activity and a wide range of health benefits. If a higher level of investment is made on active transportation, the walk and bike mode shares could be increased, which could help a community to lower its rates of obesity, hypertension, and other chronic diseases. MPOs can play an important role in setting regional priorities and providing access to funding to local jurisdictions for active transportation projects. In addition, they can provide resources and technical assistance to access statewide funding such as the Active Transportation Program. Finally, they can encourage local cities to develop land use patterns that are supportive of walkable and bikeable communities by providing planning funding and including supportive policies or guidance in their SCS.

Another role of the RTP, in addressing public health, is to demonstrate transportation air quality conformity (further described in Sections 2.4 and 5.7), and to set goals and strategies that

encourage implementing agencies to make investments that benefit public health in federally designated air quality nonattainment and maintenance areas. Of particular note are strategies that address criteria pollutants, which are scientifically shown to be detrimental to health. Key strategies controlled by local implementing agencies include carpooling, transit, signal synchronization, and other Transportation Demand Management/Transportation System Management (TDM/TSM) improvements. At the federal and state levels, key strategies include vehicle emission and fuel standards, as well as incentive programs to expedite the adoption of clean technologies. These have been shown to be by far the most effective strategies for reducing the public's exposure to harmful pollutants, as well as for reducing GHG emissions.

Transportation is also being seen not as an end in itself, but as a means of providing access to important destinations: access to jobs, education, healthy food, recreation, worship, community activities, healthcare, and more. Improved access to key destinations is especially critical for disadvantaged and underserved communities. The design of the transportation system, in combination with land use and housing decisions, also plays a role in public health. Coordinated planning of transportation and land use can promote public health through the development of livable, walkable, accessible communities. And as nations, states and regions shift away from fossil fuel dependent transportation modes, the benefits of reducing the effects of climate change will also help to reduce the public health risks from climate change effects such as extreme heat, storms, and drought. Transportation and public health providers can help one another to address all of these factors, learning from each other and joining their skills to improve transportation for better health outcomes for everyone.

Improving transportation infrastructure in ways that encourages walking and cycling is one of several effective ways to improve physical activity, decrease traffic collisions, and improve one's health status. But, transportation planning also has a tremendous impact on community health, safety, and neighborhood cohesion. For instance, health-focused transportation plans can help reduce the rate of injuries and fatalities from collisions. Some research suggests that there is a multiplier effect: when streets are designed to safely accommodate walking and biking, more people do so, and as more people walk and bike the rate of collisions actually goes down as pedestrians and bicyclists become more visible to motorists.<sup>3</sup> In addition, more people out walking and biking in a neighborhood has an important public safety benefit, as it means there are more "eyes on the street" to deter criminal activity. Taking this a step further, studies have shown that people who live in neighborhoods with less traffic and higher rates of walking, bicycling, and transit use know more of their neighbors, visit their neighbor's homes more often, and are less fearful of their neighbors.<sup>4</sup> When streets are inhospitable to pedestrians and bicyclists, residents don't feel safe walking or biking to nearby transit and their ability to access regional educational and employment opportunities is hampered. In short, improving traffic safety results in better public health beyond simply reduced injuries and fatalities.

Additional examples of how transportation planning can promote health include:

- Transportation planning can help residents reach jobs, education, social services, and medical care by walking, biking or public transportation in a timely manner.

---

<sup>3</sup> At the Intersection of Active Transportation and Equity." Safe Routes to School National Partnership. 2015. <[http://saferoutespartnership.org/sites/default/files/resource\\_files/at-the-intersection-of-activetransportation-and-equity.pdf](http://saferoutespartnership.org/sites/default/files/resource_files/at-the-intersection-of-activetransportation-and-equity.pdf)>.

<sup>4</sup> At the Intersection of Active Transportation and Equity." Safe Routes to School National Partnership. 2015. <[http://saferoutespartnership.org/sites/default/files/resource\\_files/at-the-intersection-of-activetransportation-and-equity.pdf](http://saferoutespartnership.org/sites/default/files/resource_files/at-the-intersection-of-activetransportation-and-equity.pdf)>.

- Reducing commute times and increasing public transportation reliability can reduce stress and improve mental health.
- Affordable transportation options enables low income households to invest in savings, education, and healthier food options—all factors that contribute to greater individual and community health.

**Planning Practice Examples:** Available in Appendix K

## **2.4 Federal Requirements**

Federal requirements for the development of RTPs are directed at the federally designated MPOs. The primary federal requirements regarding RTPs are addressed in the metropolitan transportation planning rules – Title 23 CFR Part 450 and 771 and Title 49 CFR Part 613. These federal regulations incorporating both MAP-21/FAST Act changes were updated by FHWA and FTA and published in the May 27, 2016 Federal Register.

The final guidance is commonly referred to as the Final Rule. In the Final Rule, the metropolitan transportation planning process provides for consideration of the following federal planning factors:

1. Support the economic vitality of the metropolitan area, especially by enabling global competitiveness, productivity, and efficiency;
2. Increase the safety of the transportation system for motorized and non-motorized users;
3. Increase the security of the transportation system for motorized and non-motorized users;
4. Increase accessibility and mobility of people and freight;
5. Protect and enhance the environment, promote energy conservation, improve the quality of life, and promote consistency between (regional) transportation improvements and State and local planned growth and economic development patterns;
6. Enhance the integration and connectivity of the transportation system, across and between modes, for people and freight;
7. Promote efficient system management and operation;
8. Emphasize the preservation of the existing transportation system;
9. Improve the resiliency and reliability of the transportation system and reduce or mitigate stormwater impacts of surface transportation; and
10. Enhance travel and tourism.

It is important to note that failure to consider any factor specified in Title 23 CFR 450.306 (b) or (d), shall not be reviewable by any court under Title 23 U.S.C., Title 49 U.S.C. Chapter 53, Subchapter II of Title 5 U.S.C. Chapter 5, or Title 5 U.S.C. Chapter 7 in any matter affecting an RTP, TIP, a project or strategy, or the certification of a metropolitan transportation planning process.

Federal Clean Air Act conformity requirements pursuant to the Amendments of 1990, apply in all MPO nonattainment and maintenance areas. Section 176(c) of the Clean Air Act (CAA), as amended (Title 42 U.S.C. 7506(c), and the related requirements of Title 23 U.S.C. 109(j), “transportation conformity” requirement ensures that federal funding and approval are given to transportation plans, programs and projects that are consistent with the air quality goals established by a State Implementation Plan (SIP). For MPO nonattainment regions, the MPO,

FHWA, and FTA are responsible for making the RTP conformity determination. Under the U.S. Department of Transportation (U.S. DOT) Metropolitan Planning Regulations (Title 23 CFR Part 450 and 771 and Title 49 CFR Part 613) and EPA's Transportation Conformity Rule (Title 40 CFR Part 93) requirements, the RTP needs to meet four requirements: 1.) Regional emissions analysis, 2.) Timely implementation of Transportation Control Measures, 3.) Financial constraints analysis, and 4.) Interagency consultation and public involvement. The transportation conformity rule (Title 40 CFR Part 93 Subpart A) sets forth the policy, criteria, and procedures for demonstrating and assuring conformity of transportation activities.

Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 ensures that all people have equal access to the transportation planning process. It is important that MPOs comply with this federal civil rights requirement during the RTP development process. Title VI states that: all people regardless of their race, sexual orientation or income level, will be included in the decision-making process. Additional information regarding equal access to the transportation planning process is available in Sections 4.2, 4.3, and 4.4.

### **Requirements (Shalls)**

**Federal:** Title 23 CFR Part 450 and 771; 49 CFR Part 613; Title 40 CFR Part 93; and Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964

## **2.5 Relationship between the RTP, OWP, FTIP, STIP (RTIP & ITIP), & FSTIP**

The key planning documents produced by the MPOs, RTPAs, County Transportation Commissions (CTCs), and Caltrans are:

1. Regional Transportation Plan – Looks out over a 20 plus-year period providing a vision for future demand and transportation investment within the region.
2. Overall Work Program – The OWP lists the transportation planning studies and tasks to be performed by the MPO, RTPA or member agency during that fiscal year. The OWP is also referred to as a Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) in federal regulations.

Federal Program - MPOs Only:

3. Federal Transportation Improvement Program – The FTIP is a financially constrained four-year program listing all federally funded and regionally significant and non-regionally significant projects in the region.

State Program – RTPAs, County Transportation Commissions (CTCs) and Caltrans:

4. State Transportation Improvement Program – The STIP is a biennial program adopted by the California Transportation Commission. Each STIP covers a five year period and includes projects proposed by regional agencies in their regional transportation improvement programs (RTIPs) and by Caltrans in its interregional transportation improvement program (ITIP).
  - a. Regional Transportation Improvement Program – The RTIP is a five year program of projects prepared by the RTPAs and County Transportation Commissions. Each RTIP should be based on the regional transportation plan and a region wide assessment of transportation needs and deficiencies.

- b. Interregional Transportation Improvement Program – The ITIP is a five year list of projects that is prepared by Caltrans, in consultation with MPOs and RTPAs. Projects included in the interregional program shall be consistent with the Interregional Transportation Strategic Plan and relevant adopted regional transportation plan(s).

State & Federal Program – MPOs, RTPAs, and Caltrans:

5. State Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FSTIP) - The FSTIP is a constrained four-year prioritized list of regionally significant transportation projects that are proposed for *federal, state and local* funding. The FSTIP is updated every four-years and is developed by Caltrans in coordination with MPOs/RTPAs and approved by the FHWA/FTA. It is consistent with the RTP and it is required as a prerequisite for federal programming of funding.

**Key Planning & Programming Documents Produced by MPOs/RTPAs & County Transportation Commissions (CTCs)/Caltrans**

	<i>Time/Horizon</i>	<i>Contents</i>	<i>Update Requirements</i>
<b><i>RTP</i></b>	20+ Years	<i>Future Goals, Strategies &amp; Projects</i>	<i>Nonattainment MPOs – Every 4 Years Attainment MPOs – Optional Every 5 Years RTPAs – Optional Every 5 Years (State law allows option to change from 5 to 4 years)</i>
<b><i>OWP</i></b>	1 Year	<i>Planning Studies and Tasks</i>	<i>Annually</i>
<b><i>FTIP</i> (MPOs Only)</b>	4 Years	<i>Transportation Projects</i>	<i>At least every 4 Years</i>
<b><i>RTIP</i> (RTPAs/CTCs)</b>	5 Years	<i>Transportation Projects</i>	<i>Every 2 Years</i>
<b><i>ITIP</i> (Caltrans)</b>	5 Years	<i>Transportation Projects</i>	<i>Every 2 Years</i>
<b><i>FSTIP</i></b>	4 years	<i>Transportation Projects</i>	<i>At least every 4 years</i>

**Requirements (Shalls)**

**Federal:** Title 23 CFR Part 450.326(a) requires MPOs to prepare a transportation improvement program (TIP)

**State:** California Government Code Sections 65082, 14526, 14527 and 14529 require the preparation of the STIP, RTIPs and ITIP.

## **2.6 Consistency with Other Planning Documents**

It is very important that the RTP be consistent with other plans prepared by local, state, federal agencies and Native American Tribal Governments. Consistency can be described as a balance and reconciliation between different policies, programs, and plans. This consistency will ensure that no conflicts would impact future transportation projects. MPOs depend upon the

collaborative process described in Chapter 4 for the numerous plans below to be incorporated or consulted with. MPOs also rely on the aforementioned stakeholders to contribute to RTP development, according to their plans and areas of expertise. While preparing an updated RTP, MPOs should, as appropriate, incorporate or consult such local/regionally prepared documents as:

1. General Plans (especially the Circulation and Housing Elements);
2. Airport Land Use Compatibility Plans;
3. Air quality State Implementation Plans (SIPs);
4. Short- and Long-Range Transit Plans;
5. Habitat Conservation Plans/Natural Community Conservation Plan including an integrated regional mitigation strategy (if applicable);
6. Urban Water Management Plans;
7. Local Coastal Programs (if applicable);
8. Public Agency Trail Plans (if applicable);
9. Local Public Health Plans;
10. Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans
11. Americans with Disabilities Act Transition Plans;
12. Master Plans, Specific Plans;
13. Impact Fee Nexus Plans;
14. Local Capital Improvement Programs;
15. Mitigation Monitoring Programs;
16. Countywide Long-Range Transportation Plans (if applicable); and,
17. Tribal Transportation Plans.

MPOs also should consult State/Federal prepared transportation planning documents such as:

1. California Transportation Plan;
2. California Rail Plan;
3. Interregional Transportation Strategic Plan;
4. Transportation Concept Reports;
5. District System Management Plans;
6. California Aviation System Plan;
7. Goods Movement Action Plan;
8. Sustainable Freight Action Plan;
9. California Freight Mobility Plan;
10. Strategic Highway Safety Plan;
11. California Strategic Highway Safety Plan, and Corridor System Management Plans; and,
12. Federal Lands Management Plans.

MPOs should also consult State prepared environmental planning documents such as:

1. Draft Environmental Goals and Policy Report;
2. State Wildlife Action Plan;
3. Vulnerability Assessments;
4. California Climate Adaptation Planning Guide;
5. Safeguarding California Plan; and,
6. Safeguarding California: Implementation Action Plans.

Federal regulations require MPOs to consult with resource agencies during the development of the RTP. This consultation should include the development of regional mitigation and identification of key documents prepared by those resource agencies that may impact future transportation plans or projects (See Chapter 5 RTP Environmental Considerations). MPO staff



should make a concerted effort to ensure any actions in the RTP do not conflict with conservation strategies and goals of the resource agencies. Chapter 4 provides the federal requirements for resource agency consultation.

## **2.7 Coordination with Other Planning Processes**

RTPs are prepared within the context of many other planning processes conducted by federal, tribal, state, regional and local agencies. This section provides background information, along with planning practice examples in Appendix L, for how MPOs can integrate the planning processes associated with the Smart Mobility Framework, Complete Streets, Context Sensitive Solutions, Planning and Environmental Linkages, and system planning documents specifically Transportation Concept Reports (TCRs), Corridor System Management Plans (CSMPs), District System Management Plans (DSMPs), the Interregional Transportation Strategic Plan (ITSP), and other transportation plans into development of the RTP. These initiatives and implementation tools work toward achieving the California Transportation Plan goals. They also align with the principles of the federal Partnership for Sustainable Communities. As the RTP is bound to fiscal constraints, the strategies, actions, and improvements described in this section are intended to provide guidance and should be considered to the maximum extent feasible in the development of the RTP.

### **Smart Mobility Framework**

The Caltrans Smart Mobility Framework<sup>5</sup> (SMF) is a key strategic tool for integrating transportation with land-use, to develop healthy and livable communities through multi-modal travel options, reliable travel times, and safety for all users of the transportation system. The SMF supports the goals of climate change intervention and energy security while supporting the goals of the CTP, and the federal Livability Principles for Sustainable Communities<sup>6</sup>.

The SMF integrates transportation and land use by applying principles of location efficiency, complete streets, connected and integrated multimodal networks, housing near destinations for all income levels, and protection of parks and open space. This framework is designed to help keep California communities livable and supportive of healthy life styles while allowing each to maintain its unique community identity.

The CTP reflects the understanding that a full set of transportation strategies includes initiatives to address land use and development. The SMF provides a framework to plan for the challenges of increased demands on an aging transportation system, climate change, and current and future generations' demands for multi-modal transportation choices.

In addressing the need for access to destinations for people and goods, the SMF provides guidance to incorporate new concepts and tools alongside well-established ones. It calls for participation and partnership by agencies at all levels of government, as well as private sector and community involvement.

---

<sup>5</sup> Smart Mobility Framework: <http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tpp/offices/ocp/smf.html>

<sup>6</sup> Livability Principles for Sustainable Communities:  
<https://www.sustainablecommunities.gov/mission/livability-principles>

One method for supporting the implementation of SMF is the SMF Learning Network, a series of educational forums and webinars designed to extend the reach of SMF to internal and external partners. The network serves as an opportunity to share examples of Smart Mobility applications and strengthen strategic partnerships between Caltrans and other agencies. The information sharing and feedback that results from these forums will shape the future integration of Smart Mobility principles into Caltrans processes.

## **Complete Streets**

The term “Complete Streets” refers to a transportation network that is planned, designed, constructed, operated and maintained to provide safe mobility for all users, including bicyclists, pedestrians, transit and rail riders, commercial vehicles and motorists appropriate to the function and context of the facility.

The California Complete Streets Act of 2008 (AB 1358) ensures that the general plans of California cities and counties meet the needs of all users, including pedestrians, transit, bicyclists, the elderly, motorists, movers of commercial goods, and the disabled. AB 1358 requires cities and counties to identify how the jurisdiction will provide accommodation of all users of roadways during the revision of the circulation element of their general plan. The Governor’s Office of Planning and Research amended guidelines for the development of the circulation element to accommodate all users. A comprehensive update of the General Plan Guidelines in 2016 includes guidance on how cities and counties can modify the circulation element to plan for a balanced, integrated, multimodal transportation network that meets the needs of all users of the streets, roads, and highways for safe and convenient travel in a manner that is suitable to the rural, suburban, or urban context of the general plan.

The benefits of Complete Streets can include: Safety; Health; GHG Emission Reduction; and Economic Development and Cost Savings.

Multimodal transportation networks, using complete streets planning practice examples, can lead to safer travel for all roadway users. Designing streets and travel routes that consider safe travel for all modes can reduce the occurrence and severity of vehicular collisions with pedestrians and bicyclists. Streets and other transportation facility design considerations that accommodate a variety of modes and users abilities can contribute to a safer environment that makes all modes of travel more appealing.

Planning for Complete Streets will enable local governments to provide healthier lives by encouraging physical activity. Public health studies have demonstrated that people are more likely to walk in their neighborhood if it has sidewalks. Also, studies have found that people with safe walking environments within a 10 minute walking radius are more likely to meet recommended physical activity levels. The integration of sidewalks, bike lanes, transit and rail amenities, and safe crossings into initial design of projects is more cost-effective than making costly retrofits later. Complete Streets is also a key strategy in the reduction of GHG emissions. Providing community residents with an option that gets them out of their cars is a proven strategy for improving communities, reducing air pollution, and generating local business. Similarly, Complete Streets consider Safe Routes to School, a public health strategy connecting communities to schools, includes but is not limited to child safety, reducing traffic congestion, sidewalks, crosswalks and bicycle lanes.

Creating integrated, multimodal transportation networks can improve economic conditions for both business owners and residents. A network of Complete Streets can be safer and more appealing to residents and visitors, which can benefit retail and commercial development. Multimodal transportation networks can improve conditions for existing businesses by helping revitalize an area attracting new economic activity. Equally important to sustain economic vitality are commercial vehicles and their operational needs. Vibrant urban environments cannot function without commercial vehicles delivering goods that sustain the economic activities that take place.

Integrating the needs of all users can also be cost-effective by reducing public and private costs. Accommodating all modes reduces the need for larger infrastructure projects, such as additional vehicle parking and road widening, which can be more costly than Complete Streets retrofits.

While AB 1358 provides no statutory requirement for MPOs, integration of Complete Streets policies support local agencies' requirements to address Complete Streets in circulation elements of their general plans.

MPOs should also integrate Complete Streets policies into their RTPs, not only as a means to develop a SCS, but also to identify the financial resources necessary to accommodate such policies, and should consider accelerating programming for projects that retrofit existing roads to provide safe and convenient travel by all users.

MPOs should encourage all jurisdictions and agencies within the region to ensure that their circulation elements and street and road standards, including planning, design, construction, operations, and maintenance procedures address the needs of all users. Streets, roads and highways should also be safe for convenient travel in a manner that is suitable within the context of Complete Streets. To the maximum extent feasible, MPO funded transportation system projects, corresponding Complete Street facilities, and improvements should meet the needs in project areas to maximize connectivity, convenience and safety for all users.

Along the shoreline of coastal counties, one element of the Complete Streets program should be the California Coastal Trail (CCT). For additional information regarding the CCT see Section 6.11.

### **Recommendations (Shoulds)**

**Federal:** FAST Act Section 1442. Safety for users, encourages each State and Metropolitan Planning Organization to adopt standards for the design of Federal surface transportation projects that provide for the safe and adequate accommodation (as determined by the State) of all users of the surface transportation network, including motorized and non-motorized users, in all phases of project planning development and operation.

Investing in development of Complete Streets Policy Guides that assist member agencies in the adoption of Complete Streets policy for their jurisdictions. A policy guide can function as a template. It can provide flexibility and be revised to accommodate individual agency's needs.

### **Recommendations (Shoulds)**

**State:** According to Government Code 65040.2 Section (2)(h)(h), it is the intent of the Legislature to require in the development of the circulation element of a local government's general plan that the circulation of users of streets, roads, and highways be accommodated in a manner suitable for the respective setting in rural, suburban, and urban contexts, and that users

of streets, roads, and highways include bicyclists, children, persons with disabilities, motorists, movers of commercial goods, pedestrians, public transportation, and seniors.

**Planning Practice Examples:** Available in Appendix L

## **Context Sensitive Solutions**

Context Sensitive Solutions is the process of engaging stakeholders in addressing transportation goals with the community, economic, social and environmental context. It is an inclusive approach used during planning, designing, constructing, maintaining, and operating the transportation system. It integrates and balances community and stakeholder values with transportation safety, maintenance, and performance goals. Context sensitive solutions are reached through a collaborative, interdisciplinary process involving all stakeholders and requires careful, imaginative, and early planning, and continuous stakeholder involvement.

Goals, issues, and values of California Tribal Governments and tribal communities, if applicable, should also be defined identified and addressed through outreach, collaboration and consultation. This would assist with identification and protection of cultural resources, historic sites, and environmental justice issues as well as, transportation needs and strategies. The evolution of economic development for some California Tribes has created increased demand for improved transportation infrastructure (i.e. roads, traffic control, access, etc.) and increased need for collaboration and consensus building with these stakeholders to address these new demands.

In towns and cities across California, the State highway may also function as a community street. These communities may desire that their main street be an economic, social, and cultural asset as well as provide for the safe and efficient movement of people and goods. Addressing all these needs throughout the planning and development process will help ensure that transportation solutions meet more than transportation objectives.

More information is available at the following links:

[http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/16\\_livability/css/index.htm](http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/16_livability/css/index.htm)

<http://www.contextsensitivesolutions.org/>

## **Planning and Environmental Linkages**

Federal statute and regulations outline an optional process for incorporating transportation planning documents or other source material directly or by reference into subsequent environmental documents that are prepared in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). Appendix A to 23 CFR §450 provides additional information to explain the linkage between the transportation planning and project development/NEPA processes; it supports congressional intent that statewide and metropolitan transportation planning should be the foundation for highway and transit project decisions. The results or decisions of transportation planning studies may be used as part of the overall project development process consistent with NEPA and associated implementing regulations. Federal law specifically states that this does not subject transportation plans and programs to NEPA.

Publicly available documents or other source material produced by, or in support of the transportation planning process, may be incorporated directly or by reference into subsequent

NEPA documents in accordance with federal regulations. If an MPO and its project delivery partner(s) decide to take advantage of this opportunity to streamline and simplify the overall project delivery process, they should coordinate regarding the conditions that must be met during regional transportation planning. Most of the conditions, though perhaps not all, are routinely met during preparation of the RTP.

Additional information to further explain the linkages between the transportation and project development/NEPA processes is provided in Section 5.3 and Appendix D.

NCHRP Report 541, Consideration of Environmental Factors in Transportation Systems Planning, is an additional resource, at:

[http://environment.transportation.org/pdf/RT\\_1\\_RM\\_7.pdf](http://environment.transportation.org/pdf/RT_1_RM_7.pdf).

The FHWA's Environmental Review Toolkit, Program Overview for Planning and Environmental Linkages, also provides information, available at:

<https://www.environment.fhwa.dot.gov/inteq/index.asp>

### **Recommendations (Shoulds)**

**Federal:** Title 23 U.S.C. 168 Integration of planning and environmental review; Title 23 CFR 450.318 Transportation planning studies and project development; Appendix A of 23 CFR Part 450 – Linking the Transportation Planning and NEPA Processes (Appendix D of this document).

## **System Planning Documents**

### **District System Management Plans (DSMPs)**

The DSMP is a long-range, 20-25 year, policy planning document that describes how the District envisions the transportation system will be maintained, preserved, managed, operated, and developed within the planning horizon. It provides a vehicle for the development of multimodal, intermodal, and multijurisdictional system strategies. These strategies are developed in partnership with related Caltrans functional units, Divisions, and Districts, as well as external partners, such as MPOs, cities, counties, tribal governments, other partner agencies, and the public. The DSMP plays a major role in guiding the development of both the Transportation Concept Reports (TCRs) and the Corridor System Management Plans (CSMPs).

### **Interregional Transportation Strategic Plan (ITSP)**

The ITSP is a Caltrans planning document that provides guidance for the identification and prioritization of interregional transportation projects identified on the State's Interregional Transportation System. The ITSP provides an overview of the interregional transportation system, including identification of the major Strategic Interregional Corridors and Priority Interregional Facilities, which are the corridors and transportation facilities that have the greatest impact on interregional travel. Concepts have been created for each Strategic Interregional Corridor that will be used by public agencies to plan and program transportation improvements.

### **Transportation Concept Reports (TCRs)**

Caltrans prepares TCRs, long-range transportation planning documents, that guide the development of California's State Highway System (SHS) as required by Government Code

65086, Title 23 CFR Part 450 Subpart B, and the transportation needs of the public, stakeholders, and SHS users. The comprehensive planning document for each highway route and the corresponding transportation corridor provides a focused look at the existing conditions and performance of the route, future transportation needs and demands, integrates and aligns with the State Wildlife Action Plan (SWAP), habitat conservation plans and regional green-prints (where applicable), and articulates improvements necessary to address those needs within the context of the communities and rural areas the highways traverse. Caltrans meets this need through the development of the TCRs. Each Caltrans District is delegated the responsibility to create a TCR for the SHS routes within their respective district boundaries.

## **Corridor System Management Planning (CSMP)**

A CSMP is a comprehensive, integrated management plan for optimizing efficient, effective multimodal system performance within a transportation corridor. A CSMP includes all travel modes in a defined corridor - highways and freeways, parallel and connecting roadways, public transit (bus, bus rapid transit, light rail, intercity rail) and bikeways and pedestrian facilities. A CSMP results in a listing and phasing plan of recommended operational improvements, Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) strategies, and system expansion projects to preserve or improve performance measures within the corridor. CSMPs are developed and implemented by Caltrans in partnership with regional and local transportation agencies and other partners.

A CSMP incorporates both capital and operational improvements and is developed through the following steps:

- 1) Corridor limits defined.
- 2) Corridor team established.
- 3) Performance objectives defined; preliminary assessment performed.
- 4) Comprehensive performance assessment performed; causation of performance issues identified.
- 5) Simulate and test improvement scenarios and alternatives for most effective mix of projects, strategies and actions.
- 6) Alternatives selected and CSMP prepared. The Plan should be accepted or adopted by Caltrans, the MPO/RTPA, cities and counties as a guide for corridor management.

Completed CSMPs and other Caltrans system planning documents can be viewed at:

<http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tpp/corridor-mobility/>

With regard to corridor system planning, the RTP should:

- Include by corridor all strategies, actions and improvements identified in system planning documents taking into consideration statewide and regional objectives which can include but are not limited to: multi-modal mobility, accessibility, environmental protection, and GHG reduction.
- Describe how the corridor will be managed across jurisdictions and modes to preserve corridor productivity based upon performance measurement.
- Include a reasonable time-line for each corridor to determine the need for each region to consider multiple objectives regarding corridor mobility.
- Describe roles and relationships among units of local government, modal agencies, Caltrans and related agencies for managing the corridor for highest mobility benefits and for measuring and evaluating performance.

## **2.8 RTP Development Sequencing Process**

Following the passage of SB 375 in 2008, MPOs will need to continue to coordinate with the ARB and HCD. MPOs are encouraged to continue to communicate with ARB as early in the RTP development as possible to obtain input. ARB must review the SCS and possibly an APS after the documents are prepared. Communication between the MPO and HCD should also take place as early in the RTP process as possible to ensure the RHNA is coordinated with the development of the SCS. SB 375 amended the law to require regional planning agencies to estimate the RTP adoption date and provide HCD a notice at least 12 months before the estimated adoption date.

In summary, early communication and coordination with all appropriate levels of government, elected officials and the public is very important to avoid delays that may impede the final federal air quality conformity determination, the determination by ARB whether the SCS or APS, if implemented, would achieve the regional GHG emission reduction target, or successful coordination of the RHNA with the SCS.


The following flowchart entitled: “RTP Development/Approval Process for MPOs” was prepared to help summarize the overall steps that MPOs must undertake to ultimately adopt an RTP with a transportation air quality conformity report that has been found in conformity with the applicable air quality state implementation plan (for nonattainment and maintenance regions) and that has received acceptance by ARB that the SCS/APS, if implemented, would achieve the region’s GHG emissions reduction target. The process outlined in this flowchart is very complex and may take several years from RTP inception to RTP adoption, SCS/APS acceptance/rejection, and federal conformity determination.

### **Requirements (Shalls)**

**Federal:** Title 23 CFR Part 450

**State:** Government Code Section 65080 and 65588(e)(5)







## **2.9 Adoption - Update Cycles & Amendments**

Regional transportation planning is a dynamic process requiring continuous monitoring and periodic updating. Updating an RTP ensures the MPOs planning process is valid and consistent with current and forecasted transportation and land use conditions and trends for at least a 20-year planning horizon.

MPOs may revise the transportation plan at any time using the procedures in this section without a requirement to extend the horizon year. Regional planning agencies should consult with local governments well in advance of adopting an RTP to ensure an RTP adoption date facilitates alignment of the RTP schedule, RHNA schedule and planning period, and local government housing element update schedule and planning period, pursuant to SB 375 amendments. The transportation plan (and any revisions or amendments) shall be approved by the MPO's Board and submitted for informational purposes to the CTC and Caltrans. Copies of any revised or amended transportation plans must be provided to the FHWA and the FTA.

California state law, (Government Code Section 65080(d)) mirrors the federal update requirement and states that nonattainment MPOs must update their RTPs at least every four years and attainment MPOs at least every five years. Title 23 CFR Part 450.322(a) states that in nonattainment and maintenance areas, the effective date of the RTP shall be the date of a conformity determination issued by FHWA and FTA. In attainment areas, the effective date of the RTP shall be its date of adoption by the MPO. An MPO that is required to adopt a RTP not less than every five years, may elect to adopt the plan not less than every four years in order that their member cities and counties can revise their housing elements every 8 years pursuant to Government Code Sections 65080 (b)(2)(M) and 65588(b).

Failure of an MPO to adhere to the State and Federal required update period could result in the FHWA not approving the region's FTIP. Failure of an MPO to adhere to the required update period could result in a lack of state and federal funding as projects that are programmed for state or federal funding in the STIP and FTIP must be included in the approved RTP.

RTPs can be amended or modified. The U.S. DOT identified two types of revision methods for an RTP (1) A major revision that is an "amendment" and, (2) A minor revision that is an "administrative modification." The definitions in Title 23 CFR Part 450.104 clarify major and minor amendments to RTPs. It is recommended that MPOs coordinate with Caltrans district regional planners on reviewing, commenting and at times facilitating the determination of what constitutes an RTP Amendment or Administrative modification.

### **RTP Amendment (major)**

RTPs must be amended whenever a plan revision takes place such as the addition or deletion of a project or a major change in project scope, cost and schedule. Other potential triggers for an RTP Amendment could include changing programmed project phases or any major change in design concept or design scope (e.g. changing project termini or the number of through traffic lanes). Amendments require public review for possible comments, demonstration of fiscal constraint and conformity determination (for MPOs located in nonattainment and maintenance areas).

## **RTP Administrative Modification (minor)**

Federal regulations define Administrative Modification as a minor revision to an RTP that includes minor changes to project/project phase costs, minor changes to funding sources of previously included projects, and other minor changes to projects/project phase initiation dates.

An RTP administrative modification is much more flexible and open to wide interpretation. An administrative modification is a revision that does not require public review and comment, re-demonstration of fiscal constraint, or a conformity determination (in nonattainment and maintenance areas).

## **Re-Adopting Existing RTPs**

Re-adopting the existing RTP is an option if no significant factors have occurred within the region that would impact the existing RTP. However, this option would require close evaluation of the current status of the RTPs fiscal constraint, conformity determination and any changes to the project scope, cost and schedule of the RTPs. Re-adopting an RTP could mean that no new projects are presented in the document, nor will there be new projects in the current update cycle of the RTP.

## **Conformity Considerations**

When an MPO Board prepares an RTP amendment or update, they also need to be aware that a conformity determination may need to be conducted, depending on the type of changes, modifications or amendments. An amendment that makes any of the following changes to the RTP would require a new conformity determination for the RTP:

- 1) The amendment adds or deletes a non-exempt project;
- 2) The amendment significantly changes the design concept or scope of a regionally significant project; or
- 3) The amendment changes the implementation year such that it affects a transportation conformity analysis year.

## **Requirements (Shalls)**

**Federal:** Title 23 CFR Part 450.324(a) and (c), mandatory RTP update cycles for MPOs.

## **2.10 RTP Checklist**

The RTP Checklist is contained in Appendix C of this document. The purpose of the RTP Checklist is to establish a minimum standard for developing the RTP. The checklist of transportation planning requirements has been updated in order to conform to federal and state RTP requirements.

MPOs should include the page numbers indicating where the Checklist items are addressed in the region's RTP. This requirement of identifying page numbers will assist the general public, federal, state and local agencies to locate the information contained in the RTP.

The checklist should be completed by the MPO/RTPA and submitted to the CTC and Caltrans along with the draft and final RTP. This checklist is available electronically from Caltrans planning staff. Each MPO is encouraged to complete the checklist electronically. Following its completion, the MPO Executive Director (or designated representative) must sign the checklist to indicate that the information is complete and correct.

### **Requirements (Shalls)**

**Federal:** None

**State:** Pursuant to California Government Code Section 14032(a), which authorizes the CTC to request an evaluation of all RTPs statewide to be conducted by Caltrans. All MPOs are required to submit an RTP Checklist with their **Draft** and **Final** RTP when the document is submitted to Caltrans and the CTC.

# Chapter 3

## RTP Analysis and Modeling

*(MPOs Only)*

**Page Left Intentionally Blank**

## RTP ANALYSIS & MODELING

### 3.0 Introduction

The purpose of this guidance is to provide MPOs clear and relevant travel development model development (TDM) direction for supporting RTP analysis, determine federal air quality conformity, and for SB 375 SCS development.

The 2017 RTP guidelines builds upon the 2010 guidelines, reflects changes in federal and state law, current modeling information, and the experience gained with the application of travel demand modeling during the development of the first round of SCSs. The guidelines also links to the most recent and relevant “living documents” such as the Recommendations of the Regional Targets Advisory Committee (RTAC) Pursuant to SB 375, the Description of Methodology for CARB Staff Review of GHG Reductions from SCS Pursuant to SB 375, and to input received from various agencies.

#### **Organization of this Chapter**

- Sections 3.0 to 3.4 - Provides the background and context of regional transportation planning analysis as well as general descriptions of terminology, technical and policies tool, and planning practice examples.
- Section 3.5 – Lists federal and state statutory or regulatory requirements and recommendations that MPO Modeling practitioners need to implement.

#### **Federal/State Requirements, Recommendations, and Planning Practice Example Terminology**

This chapter follows the convention for “Shalls,” “Shoulds,” and “Planning Practice Examples” as defined in Section 1.0 of this document.

**“Shalls”:** reflect a federal or state statutory or regulatory requirement and are used with a statutory or regulatory citation.

**“Shoulds”** reflect a federal or state permissive, optional, or recommended statutory reference such as “may” or “should” and are used with a statutory or regulatory citation.

**“Planning Practice Examples”:** reflect federal/state guidelines, the state of the practices, and good modeling practices. They are not federal or state statutory or regulatory requirements or recommendations. Where Chapter 3 reflects “planning practice examples,” the words “encouraged to,” “consider,” and “can” are used.

### 3.1 Modeling in the RTP Development Process Transportation & Land Use Models

Transportation planners and engineers utilize analytical tools to assist in the policy formation and decision-making process during the regional transportation planning process.

#### **Policy Tools:**

- Improve the decision-making process by assisting the public and decision-makers in evaluating and identifying strategies that best address the transportation needs of their jurisdiction.

- Used to present market strategies to the public/stakeholders. Some models such as Geographic Information Systems (GIS) have excellent graphical and animation displays that can show “what if” scenarios.

### **Technical Tools:**

- Provide a clear explanation of the modeling and analytical techniques applied in assessing the implications of the land use scenarios or other alternates studied.
- Demonstrate how various policy assumptions impact the forecast results. For example, they provide estimates of the elasticities and cross-elasticities of demand for various modes of travel with respect to critical variables such as access time, travel time, reliability, safety, and cost.
- Assist with the evaluation and prioritization of planning and operational alternatives.
- Assist in the operation and management of existing roadway capacity. Some models provide optimization capabilities, recommending the best design or control strategies to maximize the performance of a transportation facility.

## **3.2 Requirements for RTP Analysis**

Federal legislation requires each MPO to develop an RTP as part of its transportation planning process [23 U.S.C. 134(g) and 49 U.S.C. 5303(f)]. The plan is required to cover a minimum 20-year horizon, include long and short-range strategies and actions, and describe the ways the region intends to invest in the transportation system (23 CFR §450.322).

State law aligns with federal law and requires each MPOs to prepare a SCS subject to the requirements of 23 CFR §450 and 40 CFR §93, including the requirements to utilize the most recent planning assumptions considering local general plans and other factors (Gov. Code, § 65080(b)(2)(B)).

### **Travel Demand Models (TDM)**

Transportation planners and engineers utilize TDMs to comply with federal and state requirements identified (see Section 3.5), for evaluating alternative strategies as part of an RTP, and to quantify GHG emission reductions associated with SCSs (*See Chapter 6, Regional GHG Emissions Requirements and Considerations in the RTP*).

A TDM utilizes a series of mathematical equations that forecast travel behavior and transportation service demand in a given region. The inputs include but are not limited to population, employment, land use, and the transportation network. The outputs of a TDM are used to assist decision-makers in developing policies and strategies, to inform the public, and for the National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA) and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) analysis. For additional guidance see the latest CARB, Methodologies for Review of GHG Reduction for SCSs Pursuant to SB 375 Document.

### **California Statewide Travel Demand Model (CSTDM)**

Interregional travel is the sum of the following:

1. Trips beginning outside a given MPO’s boundary and ending within it (X-I trip)
2. Trips beginning inside a given MPO’s boundary and ending outside it (I-X trip)
3. Trips beginning outside a given MPO’s boundary, traveling across some portion of the region and ending outside the boundary (X-X trip)

For MPOs to account for the emissions from interregional travel and share responsibly for reducing those emissions with bordering regions, it is critical that they have the ability to accurately capture VMT associated with interregional travel trips. The CSTDM is used to forecast interregional trips and other travel types. MPOs can use this model to assist in capturing interregional VMT and as a point of reference in instances where adjacent MPO models produce dissimilar interregional volumes. Regional transportation planning agencies can use this data if they do not have access to a TDM.

Close collaboration is urged between bordering MPOs and Caltrans in developing interregional trip estimates. In those instances where MPO models produce dissimilar interregional volumes, the CSTDM may act as a point of reference that the MPO regional models should reasonably consider. Caltrans can act as the facilitator in these situations to help reach consensus. (For more information see, [http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tpp/offices/omsp/statewide\\_modeling/cstdm.html](http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tpp/offices/omsp/statewide_modeling/cstdm.html))

## **Visualization Techniques & Sketch Modeling of Scenarios**

Pursuant to 23 CFR 450.316(a)(1)(iii) MPOs are required to employing visualization techniques to describe regional transportation plans and TIPs. Examples include GIS-based information, maps, charts, and other visual aids that are useable and understandable by the public. Furthermore, MPOs are required under California Government Code 65080(b)(2)(F)(iii) to the extent practical use urban simulation computer modeling to create visual representations of the SCS or APS during their public workshops. See *Chapter 6, Regional GHG Emissions Requirements and Consideration in the RTP, and Visualization and Mapping* for additional information related to SCS development.

## **EMFAC Model**

California Air Resources Board (ARB) developed the EMFAC emissions model to assess emissions from on-road vehicles including cars, trucks, and buses, to support CARB's regulatory and air quality planning, and by MPOs to meet the federal Clean Air Act (CAA) requirements. The most recent approved current version located in the Federal Register. The mobile source emissions inventory is CARB's tool for assessing vehicle population, activity, and emissions from mobile sources. These inventories are constantly being updated to support the latest air quality plans and regulations.

[http://www.arb.ca.gov/msei/categories.htm#onroad\\_motor\\_vehicles](http://www.arb.ca.gov/msei/categories.htm#onroad_motor_vehicles)

## **3.3 TDM Quality Control & Consistency**

Regional travel demand modeling consistency and quality control are essential for creating confidence in modeling results.

### **Model Inputs & Assumptions**

Model inputs and assumptions are a necessary part of running a TDM. Although it is not required under the transportation conformity rule, the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the United States Department of Transportation (U.S. DOT) encourage MPOs in nonattainment and maintenance areas to review and update their planning assumptions (especially population, employment, and vehicle registration) at least every five years or to justify in the conformity determination why the planning assumptions have not been updated.



## Data

Modeling results are only as good as the data that goes into them. If travel survey samples are limited to a given region, other available sources of data including the National Household Travel Survey, the American Community Survey, and trip rates associated with a region that is similar in size (such as demographic and socioeconomic characteristics) can be used. For statewide consistency, and if feasible, MPOs are encouraged to use common data definitions and sources. As new technology and new data sources become available (e.g. “big data”), MPOs are encouraged to consider ways to incorporate them into their analysis and modeling practices.

For additional guidance, see the latest ARB, Methodologies for Review of GHG Reduction for SCSs Pursuant to SB 375.

## Model Calibration & Validation

Calibration is used to adjust the model parameters until the model matches observed regional travel patterns and demand. Validation involves testing the model's predictive capabilities (ability to replicate observed conditions (within reason)) before it is used to produce forecasts. The outputs and observed or empirical travel data are compared, and the model's parameters are adjusted until the outputs fall within an acceptable range of error. Static validation tests compare the model's base year traffic volume estimates to traffic counts using statistical measures and threshold criteria.

Because emission estimates are sensitive to vehicle speed changes, the U.S. EPA and U.S. DOT suggest that areas using network-based travel models compare the speeds estimated in the validation year with speeds empirically observed during the peak and off-peak periods. The significant sensitivity of emissions to highway speeds emphasizes the need to monitor and maintain the ability of the transportation model to provide accurate speed estimates.<sup>7</sup>

The U.S. EPA and U.S. DOT also suggest that every component of a model, as well as the entire model system, validated.<sup>8</sup> Nonattainment and maintenance areas using network-based travel models are encouraged by the U.S. EPA and U.S. DOT to establish criteria for validating the congestion speeds predicted by the transportation model with the observed speed data.

## Static Validation Criteria

- Volume-to-count ratio – is computed by dividing the volume assigned by the model and the actual traffic count for individual roadways model-wide. It provides a general context for the relationship (i.e., high or low) between model volumes and counts.
- Percent of links with volume-to-count within Caltrans deviation allowance – the deviation is the difference between the model volume and the actual count divided by the actual count. The Caltrans deviation thresholds recognize that allowances shrink as the count increases (i.e., lower tolerance for differences between the model volume estimates and counts).
- Correlation coefficient – estimates the correlation (strength and direction of the linear relationship) between the actual traffic counts and the estimated traffic volumes from the model.
- Percent root mean square error (RMSE) – is the square root of the model volume minus the actual count squared divided by the number of counts. It is a measure similar to standard deviation in that it assesses the accuracy of the entire model.

---

<sup>7</sup> Guidance for the Use of Latest Planning Assumptions in Transportation Conformity Determinations, Revision to January 18, 2001 Guidance Memorandum, EAP, December 2008, page 9

<sup>8</sup> Travel Model Validation and Reasonableness Checking Manual second edition, page 1-6, September 24, 2010

MPOs are encouraged to meet the recommended static validation and transit assignment validation thresholds listed below. Where a model does not meet the thresholds, the MPO is encouraged to clearly document impediments.

### Recommended Static Validation Thresholds

Validation Metric	Thresholds
Percent of links with volume-to-count ratios within Caltrans deviation allowance	At Least 75%
Correlation Coefficient	At Least 0.88
Percent Root Mean Squared Error (RMSE)	Below 40%

The table below specifies possible transit assignment validation criteria.

### Recommended Transit Assignment Validation Thresholds

Validation Metric	Thresholds
Difference between actual counts and model results for a given year by route group (e.g. local bus, express bus, etc.)	+/- 20%
Difference between actual counts and model results for a given year by Transit Mode (e.g., light rail, bus, etc.)	+/- 10%

For additional guidance, see the FHWA's, The Travel Model Validation and Reasonableness Checking Manual, II Second Edition, September 2010, and the latest ARB, Methodologies for Review of GHG Reduction for SCSs Pursuant to SB 375 Document.

### Model Sensitivity Analysis

Sensitivity testing is the application of the model and the model set using alternative input data or assumptions. Sensitivity analysis of individual model components can include the estimation of the elasticities and cross-elasticities of model coefficients. Sensitivity analysis can also be applied to the entire set of models using alternative assumptions regarding the demographic and socioeconomic input data, or changes in transportation system to determine if the model results are plausible and reasonable<sup>9</sup>.

Sensitivity testing includes both disaggregate and aggregate checks. Disaggregate checks, such as the determination of model elasticities, are performed during model estimation. Aggregate sensitivity testing results from temporal validation. During sensitivity testing, reasonableness and logic checks can be performed. These checks also include the comparison of estimated (or calibrated) model parameters against those estimated in other regions with similar models. "Reasonableness and logic checks can also include "components of change" analyses and an evaluation of whether or not the models "tell a coherent story" as recommended by the FTA for New Starts analysis." (*Travel Model Validation and Reasonableness Checking Manual Second Edition, September 2010, 1-7*)

The output of sensitivity tests can include total VMT, mode share, the number of the person and vehicle trips by purpose, average trip length by mode, and transit boardings. Each MPO is encouraged to improve model sensitivity and accuracy related to measuring GHG emissions associated with both land use or transportation network decisions. However, the application of these quality control criteria will vary based on the size of the MPO, severity of non-attainment status, the sophistication of transit system, the degree of model sophistication, and the presence of pricing variables, among other characteristics.

<sup>9</sup> *Travel Model Validation and Reasonableness Checking Manual Second Edition, September 2010, 1-5*  
2017 RTP Guidelines for MPOs

The following inputs can be changed as part of sensitivity tests:

Highway Network: Add or delete lanes to a link, change link speeds, and change link capacities

Land use: Residential and employment density (households and number of jobs), proximity to transit, regional accessibility, and land use mix

Pricing: Increase/decrease auto operating costs, parking price, and toll rates

Demand Management (if included in the model): Increase/decrease telecommute and vanpooling, and change HOV lanes/policy

Transit: Increase/decrease transit fares, transit capacity - (BRT, express bus, regular bus, and a combination of all bus types), and transit frequency

Socioeconomic: Changes in demographic and in economic growth, and household income distribution

For additional guidance see the Federal Highway Administration's, The Travel Model Validation and Reasonableness Checking Manual, II Second Edition, 10.2 Sensitivity Testing September 2010, the latest CARB, Methodologies for Review of GHG Reduction for SCSs Pursuant to SB 375 Document, and the Recommendations RTAC Pursuant to SB 375, September 2009.

### **Calculating Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)**

Vehicle miles traveled (VMT) is key data for highway planning and management and a common measure of roadway use and travel demand. MPOs use VMT, along with other data, in estimating congestion, air quality, and potential gas-tax revenues. They also use VMT or VMT stratified by speed, as inputs in the development of SCSs, NEPA and CEQA (SB 743) documents, and for purposes other than RTP development.

### **Performance Indicators**

Performance indicators are critical for tracking the progress of SCSs. They are sets of real world data that are tracked over time and used for system performance evaluation. The RTAC Committee recommended performance indicators in funding, land use, transportation, pricing and TDM/TSM to keep track of the progress of land use and transportation changes after the implementation of the SCSs (*See the Recommendations of the RTAC Pursuant to SB 375 pp. 44-46 and the latest CARB, Methodologies for Review of GHG Reduction for SCSs Pursuant to SB 375 Document*).

### **Co-benefits of SCS**

MPOs are encouraged to quantify, to the extent possible, the co-benefits associated with the achievement of their GHG reduction targets, as a means of increasing public understanding and support (*See the Recommendations of the RTAC Pursuant to SB 375 pp. 42-44 for addition guidance*).

### **Documentation**

Quality documentation is key to providing planners, engineers, and decision-makers with a better understanding of the reliability of the tools used to produce the forecast. In addition to documentation, the key modeling processes (model estimation, calibration, and validation), it is also important to identify model limitations and document how they are addressed within the post-processing model (if an off-model strategy is used). For more guidance see, the California Air Resource Board's Off-Model Strategies Adopted by California in Sustainable Communities Strategies as of April 29, 2016. [http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/sb375/mpo\\_off-model\\_strategies.pdf](http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/sb375/mpo_off-model_strategies.pdf)

## **Model Peer Review / Peer Advisory Committee**

MPOs are encouraged to formally seek out peer reviews from Californian transportation modelers from other agencies of similar size during model development or after a major modeling enhancement. In addition to the review by peers, agencies can utilize FHWA's Travel Model Improvement Program peer review process or use the FHWA/FTA certification review to verify that the travel forecasting methods the agencies are using support the applications.

In addition to the committee, transportation modeling agencies are also encouraged to participate statewide, regional, and local modeling forums and user groups as a way to share ideas, review model inputs and methodologies, and coordinate modeling activities.

### California Interagency (CIA) Modeling Forum

Analytical and forecasting tools, as well as transportation technologies, are dynamic and evolving; therefore, it is important that state, regional, local, and air quality agencies have on-going dialogue that supports model improvement activities by focusing on increasing model accuracy, policy sensitivity, data development and acquisition, and transparency. As a result, Caltrans will enhance the CIA Modeling Forum to facilitate an on-going dialogue between state and regional agencies, and other modeling practitioners. The CIA Modeling Forum will be organized and facilitated by Caltrans, with an additional objective of developing recommendations for the RTP Guidelines. Caltrans will share any existing information/research reports with the group and the public.

Transportation modelers from state, regional, and local agencies including Caltrans, ARB, California Energy Commission, MPOs, and RTPAs will meet to discuss modeling topics of general interest and to learn about new developments in the field. This forum will also be used for education, collaboration, consensus building, for encouraging MPO model improvement activities (consistent with current professional practice), and for recommending areas for future research.

This group will provide a memo to the California Transportation Commission (CTC) on an annual basis with recommended changes to the RTP Analysis and Modeling Chapter of the RTP Guidelines, status of work, on-going efforts. In areas where consensus is not reached, the group will provide the CTC a summary of the perspectives. During the applicable RTP Guidelines update, the RTP guidelines may be updated, as appropriate and applicable. MPO Model improvement programs must be developed to meet MPO needs and fit within their available modeling resources. All recommendations from the CIA forum shall take into account factors such as the size and available resources of the MPO, consistent with California Government Code Section 14522.1.

To ensure recommendations from the CIA forum are consistent with regional, state, and federal policy direction, Caltrans will coordinate with MPO planning directors and other state agencies in the development of study areas for consideration by the CIA modeling forum.

Initial areas recommended for discussion include, but are not limited to (not in priority order):

- The calculation and forecasting of auto operating cost
- Should vehicle ownership models be developed for all MPOs?
- Induced travel demand modeling
- The role of backcasting and sensitivity testing in model development
- The impact of changing vehicle and transportation technologies on model development
- Guidance for activity-based modeling
- Model validation and calibration criteria

- Guidance for peer review process of MPO models
- External travel/visitor model
- Freight forecasting
- Integration with other models
- Guidance on transferable parameters
- Statewide data collection to support MPO modeling efforts
- Additional items as deemed appropriate and applicable by the group

### **3.4 RTP Modeling Improvement Program (MIP) / Planning Practice Examples**

Analysis and forecasting tools, as well as transportation technologies, are not static; therefore it is important that state, regional, local, and air quality agencies have on-going model improvement programs that support model calibration and validation activities by focusing on increasing model accuracy, policy sensitivity, and data development and acquisitions.

The RTP MIP includes planning practice examples that take into account factors such as the MPO's size and available resources and considers all modeling related to RTP development (e.g. federal air quality conformity and SCS analysis).

✱For all federal and state statutory and regulatory requirements and recommendations please refer to Section 3.5 - RTP Travel Analysis Groupings.

**Category 1 –MPOs with attainment Air Quality (AQ), slow growth in population and jobs, little or no congestion, and no significant capacity-enhancing projects or limited transit expansion plans or areas of non-attainment due to transport**

**MPOs with attainment AQ, slow to moderate growth, population under 200,000, and no urbanized area or transit having more than a minimal potential impact on VMT, plus rural isolated non-attainment areas due to transport**

- These counties are not federally recognized MPOs subject to federal air quality conformity analysis as part of RTP development. They do not need to run a network travel model.

**Category 2 - MPOs with moderate to rapid growth, nonattainment, and maintenance -AQ, or the potential for transit to reduce VMT.**

Consider the planning practice examples listed below.

#### **Travel Demand Models:**

- The number of residents per travel analysis zone (TAZ) is encouraged to be greater than 1,200, but less than 3,000; each TAZ is encouraged to yield less than 15,000 person trips per day; and the size of each TAZ is encouraged to range from one-quarter to one square mile in area (NCHRP 716, page 14)
- If an MPO uses a gravity model in their trip distribution step, a different friction factor can be used for each trip purpose. For example, home-based school trips can consider the school district areas in developing the friction factors and can be calibrated based on the local household travel survey
- MPOs are encouraged to have a minimum of three trip purposes in their model (home-based work (HBW), home-based other (HBO), and nonhome-based (HHB) trips). MPOs are

encouraged to include more trip purposes such as home-based school (HBS), home-based university (HBU), home-based shopping (HBSH) and other trip purposes as appropriate.

- Each MPO model is encouraged to account for auto operating costs in forecasting the travel. Auto operating cost is a key parameter in various steps of the TDM and can consist of fuel (primarily gasoline) costs and non-fuel-related (repair, maintenance, tires, and accessories) costs. This can also include the effective fuel efficiency of the vehicle fleet.
- The models can have sufficient temporal resolution (at least three time periods) to adequately model peak and off-peak periods.
- MPOs can consider developing a logit based destination choice model as part of their trip distribution step.
- Consider including a percentage share of all trips (work and non-work) made by all single occupant vehicles, multiple occupant vehicles, or carpool, transit, walking, and bicycling in the measures of means of travel.
- MPOs can model the entire regional transit network when modeling the transit mode.
- Mode choice models can be segmented by vehicle availability or household income.
- Because such variables as walking time and parking costs are important elements in mode choice, walking and auto access to transit modes can be modeled separately, unless there is little demand for transit where people drive or are driven to the transit stop (*NCHRP 716, page 54*).
- Consider using several employment types along with several trip purposes.

#### Visualization Techniques and Sketch Modeling of Scenarios:

- Consider developing GIS capabilities such as creating a parcel and land use data layers.
- Consider using an urban scenario model to calculate environmental impacts on terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems and/or to inform the land-use model of areas to be avoided in order to help locate alternative development.

#### Freight Models:

- Consider developing a simple freight model.

#### Policy Analysis Capabilities:

- Can define and evaluate trend forecasts, combined general plans, and preferred RTP scenarios.
- Models can be used to evaluate increased density and mix, urban growth limits, improved neighborhood walkability and bikeability, and one or more transit improvement proposals, as well as demand management, pricing strategies, and housing affordability.
- Can evaluate policies for their effects on lower-income households. This can be done by evaluating traveler welfare measures based on the mode choice log sums for each household income class, or based on travel costs for them.

### ***Category 3 - MPOs that are nonattainment for ozone or CO, with a metropolitan planning area containing an urbanized population over 200,000.***

Can consider all the planning practice examples identified in Category 2 and those listed below.

#### Travel Demand Models:

- Four-step models can be developed with full feedback across travel model steps and some sort of land use modeling.

- Vehicle ownership model can be developed and used. A vehicle ownership model is used to determine the number of motor vehicles available for use by household members. MPOs can consider variables such as household size, income, the number of workers, types of housing units, residential and employment density, and access to transit and non-motorized transport as part of vehicle ownership model.
- Walk, drive, wait, and in-vehicle travel time can be included when calculating the duration of a transit trip.
- A time of day model can be developed and used to allocate daily trips.
- Vehicle occupancy rate can be varied based on the trip purpose and time of day.

#### Regional Economic & Land-Use Models:

- Consider using travel costs or mode choice log sums for simple environmental justice analysis. Examples of such analyses include the effects of transportation and development scenarios on low-income or transit-dependent households, the combined housing/transportation cost burden on these households, and the jobs/housing fit.
- Consider developing models that test joint (or simultaneous)-choice of mode and destination.

#### Freight Models:

- Consider implementing freight or commodity flow models.

#### Policy Analysis Capabilities:

- Travel welfare can be measured using various economic measures (wages, jobs, production, and exports) can be created.

### ***Category 4 - The largest MPOs with rapid growth, large population centers and established transit systems.***

Consider all the planning practice examples identified in Categories 2 and 3 and those listed below.

#### Travel Demand Models:

- MPOs are encouraged to transition to activity-based TDM
- Technology influences the travel behavior by substituting for travel (telework) and leading to more travel by allowing for people to live farther away from their jobs. Consider reflecting the interactions between technology and travel behavior within the TDM.

#### Regional Economic & Land Use Models:

- If resources permit, consider building formal microeconomic land use models to analyze and evaluate the effects of growth scenarios on economic welfare (utility), including land prices, home affordability, jobs-housing fit, the combined housing-transportation cost burden, and economic development (wages, jobs, exports).
- Consider integrating land use and activity-based models into a single modeling system – integrated land use/transportation model that would allow planners to analyze the interactions between land use and the transportation system. (“Jobs-housing fit” is the extent to which the rents and mortgages in the community are affordable to the people who currently work there or will fill anticipated jobs).

#### Freight Models:

- Consider incorporating freight movement into the travel demand process. Consider documenting assumptions about freight growth and mode choice that impact truck VMT.
- Consider using information from the statewide freight model, local trip-based truck demand models, or commodity flows models when available. MPOs are encouraged to coordinated freight data collection programs with statewide efforts.

#### Data:

- Household travel surveys can be activity-based and include a tour table. Global Positioning System (GPS) sampling is encouraged and extra emphasis can be placed on accurate geocoding of households, workplace locations, and stops. Regions are encouraged to carefully design and follow the survey's data collection procedures so that the results are appropriate for the type of model being utilized. Coordination with Caltrans' travel survey efforts is encouraged


#### Policy Analysis Capabilities:

- Integrating land use modeling with transportation demand modeling can simulate the complex interactions of proposed changes in land use, economic, and transportation systems. Equity analysis can include changes in welfare by household income class. Economic development impacts may be comprehensively evaluated with this model set. Time-of-day road tolls can be evaluated.
- Agencies can take transit capacity constraints into consideration to derive operating scenarios that avoid overcrowded buses and trains. The amount of transit service thus derived can advise policy makers on needed transit capital and operating funding levels.



### 3.5 RTP Travel Analysis Groupings – Federal/State Laws

MPOs, regional transportation planning agencies (RTPAs), and congestion management agencies (CMAs) are organized into travel analysis groups based on federal and state laws (see map below). Group A includes Isolated Rural Attainment Areas (A1) and Isolated Rural Nonattainment or Maintenance Areas (A2) RTPAs that fall within the A grouping are not



required to conduct federal air quality conformity analysis as part of their RTP development. Caltrans is required to perform project-level air quality conformity analysis for regionally significant federal funded projects.

Group B includes federally recognized MPOs not located within a metropolitan transportation area with a population over 200,000 and therefore, not designated transportation management areas (TMAs). This group includes two categories based on federal air quality conformity laws, (B1) Attainment Areas and (B2) Nonattainment or Maintenance Areas. Group C includes MPOs located within TMAs. This grouping includes (C1) Attainment Areas and (C2) Nonattainment or Maintenance Areas.

**Group A1: Isolated Rural Attainment Areas -- Federal Requirements (Shalls)**

None

**Group A1: Isolated Rural Attainment Areas -- State Requirements (Shalls)**

**California Government Code**

**§65080(a)** Each transportation planning agency designated under Section 29532 or 29532.1 shall prepare and adopt a regional transportation plan directed at achieving a coordinated and balanced regional transportation system, including, but not limited to, mass transportation, highway, railroad, maritime, bicycle, pedestrian, goods movement, and aviation facilities and services. The plan shall be action-oriented and pragmatic, considering both the short-term and long-term future, and shall present clear, concise policy guidance to local and state officials. The regional transportation plan shall consider factors specified in Section 134 of Title 23 of the United States Code. Each transportation planning agency shall consider and incorporate, as appropriate, the transportation plans of cities, counties, districts, private organizations, and state and federal agencies.

**Group A1: Isolated Rural Attainment Areas -- Federal Recommendations (Shoulds)**

None

**Group A1: Isolated Rural Attainment Areas -- State Recommendations (Shoulds)**

**California Government Code**

**§14522.2(b)** Transportation planning agencies other than those identified in paragraph (1) of subdivision (a) of Section 14522.1, cities, and counties are encouraged, but not required, to utilize travel demand models that are consistent with the guidelines in the development of their regional transportation plans.

**§65080(c)** Each transportation planning agency may also include other factors of local significance as an element of the regional transportation plan, including, but not limited to, issues of mobility for specific sectors of the community, including, but not limited to, senior citizens.

## **Group A2: Isolated Rural Nonattainment or Maintenance Areas -- Federal Requirements (Shalls)**

Regional Transportation Planning Agencies are not required to perform federal air quality conformity analysis as part of their RTP development. Caltrans is the responsible agency for performing the project level air quality analysis requirements and recommendations listed in this grouping.

### **40 CFR §93**

#### **§93.109 Criteria and procedures for determining conformity of transportation plans, programs, and projects: General.**

**(g)** Isolated rural nonattainment and maintenance areas. This paragraph applies to any nonattainment or maintenance area (or portion thereof) which does not have a metropolitan transportation plan or TIP and whose projects are not part of the emissions analysis of any MPO's metropolitan transportation plan or TIP. This paragraph does not apply to "donut" areas which are outside the metropolitan planning boundary and inside the nonattainment/maintenance area boundary.

**(1)** FHWA/FTA projects in all isolated rural nonattainment and maintenance areas must satisfy the requirements of §§93.110, 93.111, 93.112, 93.113(d), 93.116, and 93.117. Until EPA approves the control strategy implementation plan or maintenance plan for a rural CO nonattainment or maintenance area, FHWA/FTA projects must also satisfy the requirements of §93.116(b) ("Localized CO, PM10, and PM2.5 violations (hot spots)").

**(2)** Isolated rural nonattainment and maintenance areas are subject to the budget and/or interim emissions tests as described in paragraph (c) of this section, with the following modifications:

**(i)** When the requirements of §§93.106(d), 93.116, 93.118, and 93.119 apply to isolated rural nonattainment and maintenance areas, references to "transportation plan" or "TIP" should be taken to mean those projects in the statewide transportation plan or statewide TIP which are in the rural nonattainment or maintenance area. When the requirements of §93.106(d) apply to isolated rural nonattainment and maintenance areas, references to "MPO" should be taken to mean the state department of transportation.

**(ii)** In isolated rural nonattainment and maintenance areas that are subject to §93.118, FHWA/FTA projects must be consistent with motor vehicle emissions budget(s) for the years in the timeframe of the attainment demonstration or maintenance plan. For years after the attainment year (if a maintenance plan has not been submitted) or after the last year of the maintenance plan, FHWA/FTA projects must satisfy one of the following requirements:

**(A)** §93.118;

**(B)** §93.119 (including regional emissions analysis for NOX in all ozone nonattainment and maintenance areas, notwithstanding §93.119(f)(2)); or

**(C)** As demonstrated by the air quality dispersion model or other air quality modeling technique used in the attainment demonstration or maintenance plan, the FHWA/FTA project, in combination with all other regionally significant projects expected in the area in the timeframe of the statewide transportation plan, must not cause or contribute to any new violation of any standard in any areas; increase the frequency or severity of any existing violation of any standard in any area; or delay timely attainment of any standard or any required interim emission reductions or other milestones in any area. Control measures assumed in the analysis must be enforceable.

**(iii)** The choice of requirements in paragraph (g)(2)(ii) of this section and the methodology used to meet the requirements of paragraph (g)(2)(ii)(C) of this section must be determined through the interagency consultation process required in §93.105(c)(1)(vi) through which the

relevant recipients of title 23 U.S.C. or Federal Transit Laws funds, the local air quality agency, the State air quality agency, and the State department of transportation should reach consensus about the option and methodology selected. EPA and DOT must be consulted through this process as well. In the event of unresolved disputes, conflicts may be escalated to the Governor consistent with the procedure in §93.105(d), which applies for any State air agency comments on a conformity determination.

**Group A2: Isolated Rural Nonattainment or Maintenance Areas -- State Requirements (Shalls)**

**California Government Code**

**§65080(d)** Except as otherwise provided in this subdivision, each transportation planning agency shall adopt and submit, every four years, an updated regional transportation plan to the California Transportation Commission and the Department of Transportation. A transportation planning agency located in a federally designated air quality attainment area or that does not contain an urbanized area may at its option adopt and submit a regional transportation plan every five years. When applicable, the plan shall be consistent with federal planning and programming requirements and shall conform to the regional transportation plan guidelines adopted by the California Transportation Commission. Prior to the adoption of the regional transportation plan, a public hearing shall be held after the giving of notice of the hearing by publication in the affected county or counties pursuant to Section 6061.

**Group A2: Isolated Rural Nonattainment or Maintenance Areas -- Federal Recommendations (Shoulds)**

None

**Group A2: Isolated Rural Nonattainment or Maintenance Areas -- State Recommendations (Shoulds)**

None

**Group B1: Non-TMA MPOs - Attainment Areas -- Federal Requirements (Shalls)**

**Title 23 CFR §450**

**§450.306 Scope of the metropolitan transportation planning process.**

(c) Consideration of the planning factors in paragraph (b) of this section shall be reflected, as appropriate, in the metropolitan transportation planning process. The degree of consideration and analysis of the factors should be based on the scale and complexity of many issues, including transportation system development, land use, employment, economic development, human and natural environment (including Section 4(f) properties as defined in 23 CFR 774.17), and housing and community development.

**§450.316 Interested parties, participation, and consultation.**

(a) The MPO shall develop and use a documented participation plan that defines a process for providing individuals, affected public agencies, representatives of public transportation employees, public ports, freight shippers, providers of freight transportation services, private providers of transportation (including intercity bus operators, employer-based commuting programs, such as carpool program, vanpool program, transit benefit program, parking cash-out program, shuttle program, or telework program), representatives of users of public transportation, representatives of users of pedestrian walkways and bicycle transportation facilities, representatives of the disabled, and other interested parties with reasonable opportunities to be involved in the metropolitan transportation planning process.

(1) The MPO shall develop the participation plan in consultation with all interested parties and shall, at a minimum, describe explicit procedures, strategies, and desired outcomes for:

(iii) MPOs are required to use visualization techniques as part the public participation plan, RTP, and TIP development that are usable and understandable to the public.

(iv) Making public information (technical information and meeting notices) available in electronically accessible formats and means, such as the World Wide Web;

**§450.324 Development and content of the metropolitan transportation plan.**

(a) The metropolitan transportation planning process shall include the development of a transportation plan addressing no less than a 20-year planning horizon as of the effective date. In formulating the transportation plan, the MPO shall consider factors described in § 450.306 as the factors relate to a minimum 20-year forecast period. In attainment areas, the effective date of the transportation plan shall be its date of adoption by the MPO.

(b) MPOs are required to develop RTPs that address a minimum of 20-year horizon and include both long and short-range strategies/actions that lead to the development of an integrated multimodal transportation system that facilitates the safe and efficient movement of people and goods in addressing current and future transportation demand.

(c) The MPO shall review and update the transportation plan at least every 5 years in attainment areas to confirm the transportation plan's validity and consistency with current and forecasted transportation and land use conditions and trends and to extend the forecast period to at least a 20-year planning horizon. The MPO shall approve the transportation plan (and any revisions) and submit it for information purposes to the Governor. Copies of any updated or revised transportation plans must be provided to the FHWA and the FTA.

(e) The MPO, the State(s), and the public transportation operator(s) shall validate data used in preparing other existing modal plans for providing input to the transportation plan. In updating the transportation plan, the MPO shall base the update on the latest available estimates and assumptions for population, land use, travel, employment, congestion, and economic activity. The MPO shall approve transportation plan contents and supporting analyses produced by a transportation plan update.

(f) The metropolitan transportation plan shall, at a minimum, include:

(1) The current and projected transportation demand of persons and goods in the metropolitan planning area over the period of the transportation plan

(2) Existing and proposed transportation facilities (including major roadways, public transportation facilities, intercity bus facilities, multimodal and intermodal facilities, nonmotorized transportation facilities (e.g., pedestrian walkways and bicycle facilities), and intermodal connectors) that should function as an integrated metropolitan transportation system, giving emphasis to those facilities that serve important national and regional transportation functions over the period of the transportation plan

**Group B1: Non-TMA MPOs – Attainment Areas -- State requirements (Shalls)**

**California Government Code**

**§14522.2 (a)** MPOs are required to disseminate the methodology, results, and key assumptions of whichever travel demand models it uses in a way that would be usable and understandable to the public

**§65080 (b)** The regional transportation plan shall be an internally consistent document and shall include all of the following:

(1) A policy element that describes the transportation issues in the region, identifies and quantifies regional needs, and describes the desired short-range and long-range transportation goals, and pragmatic objective and policy statements. The objective and policy statements shall be consistent with the funding estimates of the financial element. The policy element of

transportation planning agencies with populations that exceed 200,000 persons may quantify a set of indicators including, but not limited to, all of the following:

(A) Measures of mobility and traffic congestion, including, but not limited to, daily vehicle hours of delay per capita and vehicle miles traveled per capita.

(B) Measures of road and bridge maintenance and rehabilitation needs, including, but not limited to, roadway pavement and bridge conditions.

(C) Measures of means of travel, including, but not limited to, percentage share of all trips (work and non-work) made by all of the following:

(i) Single occupant vehicle;

(ii) Multiple occupant vehicle or carpool;

(iii) Public transit including commuter rail and intercity rail;

(iv) Walking;

(v) Bicycling.

(D) Measures of safety and security, including, but not limited to, total injuries and fatalities assigned to each of the modes set forth in subparagraph (C).

(E) Measures of equity and accessibility, including, but not limited to, percentage of the population served by frequent and reliable public transit, with a breakdown by income bracket, and percentage of all jobs accessible by frequent and reliable public transit service, with a breakdown by income bracket.

(F) The requirements of this section may be met utilizing existing sources of information. No additional traffic counts, household surveys, or other sources of data shall be required.

#### **Group B1: NonTMAs MPOs - Attainment Areas -- Federal Recommendations (Shoulds):**

##### **Title 23 CFR §450**

##### **§450.306 Scope of the metropolitan transportation planning process.**

(c) The degree of the consideration and analysis of the planning factors (23 CFR §450.306(b)) should be based on the scale and complexity of the many issues, including transportation system development, land use, employment, economic development, human and natural environment (including Section 4(f) properties as defined in (23 CFR §774.17), and housing and community development).

##### **§450.324 Development and content of the metropolitan transportation plan.**

(c) In addition, the MPO may revise the transportation plan at any time using the procedures in this section without a requirement to extend the horizon year.

#### **Group B1: NonTMAs MPOs - Attainment Areas -- State Recommendations (Shoulds)**

This section includes all of the Isolated Rural Attainment (see Map) state recommendations. No new recommendations are identified in this section.

#### **Group B2: Non-TMA MPOs – Nonattainment or Maintenance Areas -- Federal Requirements (Shalls)**

This section includes all of Group B1 federal requirements and the following requirements.

##### **Federal Clean Air Act of 1990**

**Section 176(c)(1)(B)(iii) of the Clean Air Act** states that "[t]he determination of conformity shall be based on the most recent estimates of emissions, and such estimates shall be determined from the most recent population, employment, travel, and congestion estimates as determined by the MPO or other agency authorized to make such estimates." The Clean Air Act

requires that transportation investments be based on the most recent information that is available, in order to protect public health over the long-term.

### **Title 40 CFR §93**

#### **§93.102 Applicability. (a) Action applicability.**

(1) Except as provided for in paragraph (c) of this section or §93.126, conformity determinations are required for:

(i) The adoption, acceptance, approval or support of transportation plans and transportation plan amendments developed pursuant to 23 CFR part 450 or 49 CFR part 613 by an MPO or DOT;

(ii) The adoption, acceptance, approval or support of TIPs and TIP amendments developed pursuant to 23 CFR part 450 or 49 CFR part 613 by an MPO or DOT; and

(iii) The approval, funding, or implementation of FHWA/FTA projects.

(b) Geographic applicability. The provisions of this subpart shall apply in all nonattainment and maintenance areas for transportation-related criteria pollutants for which the area is designated nonattainment or has a maintenance plan.

#### **§93.104 Frequency of conformity determinations.**

(a) Conformity determinations and conformity redetermination for transportation plans, TIPS, and FHWA/FTA projects must be made according to the requirements of this section and applicable implementation plan.

(b) Frequency of conformity determinations for transportation plans.

(1) Each new transportation plan must be demonstrated to conform before the transportation plan is approved by the MPO or accepted by DOT

(2) All transportation plan amendments must be found to conform before the transportation plan amendments are approved by the MPO or accepted by DOT, unless the amendment merely adds or deletes exempt projects listed in §93.126 or §93.127. The conformity determination must be based on the transportation plan and the amendment taken as a whole.

(3) The MPO and DOT must determine the conformity of the transportation plan (including a new regional emissions analysis) no less frequently than every four years. If more than four years elapse after DOT's conformity determination without the MPO and DOT determining conformity of the transportation plan, a 12-month grace period will be implemented as described in paragraph (f) of this section. At the end of this 12-month grace period, the existing conformity determination will lapse.

(e) Triggers for transportation plan and TIP conformity determinations. Conformity of existing transportation plans and TIPs must be redetermined within two years of the following, or after a 12-month grace period (as described in paragraph (f) of this section) the existing conformity determination will lapse, and no new project-level conformity determinations may be made until conformity of the transportation plan and TIP has been determined by the MPO and DOT:

(1) The effective date of EPA's finding that motor vehicle emissions budgets from an initially submitted control strategy implementation plan or maintenance plan are adequate pursuant to §93.118(e) and can be used for transportation conformity purposes;

(2) The effective date of EPA approval of a control strategy implementation plan revision or maintenance plan which establishes or revises a motor vehicle emissions budget if that budget has not yet been used in a conformity determination prior to approval; and

(3) The effective date of EPA promulgation of an implementation plan which establishes or revises a motor vehicle emissions budget.

**§93.105 Consultation. Sections (a) and (c)**

**(a) General.** The implementation plan revision required under §51.390 of this chapter shall include procedures for interagency consultation (Federal, State, and local), resolution of conflicts, and public consultation as described in paragraphs (a) through (e) of this section. Public consultation procedures will be developed in accordance with the requirements for public involvement in 23 CFR part 450.

**(c) Interagency consultation procedures: Specific processes.** Interagency consultation procedures shall also include the following specific processes:

**(1)** A process involving the MPO, State and local air quality planning agencies, State and local transportation agencies, EPA, and DOT for the following:

**(i)** Evaluating and choosing a model (or models) and associated methods and assumptions to be used in hot-spot analyses and regional emissions analyses;

**(ii)** Determining which minor arterials and other transportation projects should be considered “regionally significant” for the purposes of regional emissions analysis (in addition to those functionally classified as principal arterial or higher or fixed guideway systems or extensions that offer an alternative to regional highway travel), and which projects should be considered to have a significant change in design concept and scope from the transportation plan or TIP;

**(iii)** Evaluating whether projects otherwise exempted from meeting the requirements of this subpart (see §§93.126 and 93.127) should be treated as non-exempt in cases where potential adverse emissions impacts may exist for any reason;

**(iv)** Making a determination, as required by §93.113(c)(1), whether past obstacles to implementation of TCMs which are behind the schedule established in the applicable implementation plan have been identified and are being overcome, and whether State and local agencies with influence over approvals or funding for TCMs are giving maximum priority to approval or funding for TCMs. This process shall also consider whether delays in all the applicable implementation plan to remove TCMs or substitute TCMs or other emission reduction measures;

**(v)** Notification of transportation plan or TIP amendments which merely add or delete exempt projects listed in §93.126 or §93.127; and

**(vi)** Choosing conformity tests and methodologies for isolated rural nonattainment and maintenance areas, as required by §93.109(g)(2)(iii).

**(2)** A process involving the MPO and State and local air quality planning agencies and transportation agencies for the following:

**(i)** Evaluating events which will trigger new conformity determinations in addition to those triggering events established in §93.104; and

**(ii)** Consulting on emissions analysis for transportation activities which cross the borders of MPOs or nonattainment areas or air basins.

**(3)** Where the metropolitan planning area does not include the entire nonattainment or maintenance area, a process involving the MPO and the State department of transportation for cooperative planning and analysis for purposes of determining conformity of all projects outside the metropolitan area and within the nonattainment or maintenance area.

**(4)** A process to ensure that plans for construction of regionally significant projects which are not FHWA/FTA projects (including projects for which alternative locations, design concept and scope, or the no-build option are still being considered), including those by recipients of funds designated under title 23 U.S.C. or the Federal Transit Laws, are disclosed to the MPO on a regular basis, and to ensure that any changes to those plans are immediately disclosed.

**(5)** A process involving the MPO and other recipients of funds designated under title 23 U.S.C. or the Federal Transit Laws for assuming the location and design concept and scope of projects which are disclosed to the MPO as required by paragraph (c)(4) of this section but



whose sponsors have not yet decided these features, in sufficient detail to perform the regional emissions analysis according to the requirements of §93.122.

(6) A process for consulting on the design, schedule, and funding of research and data collection efforts and regional transportation model development by the MPO (e.g., household/travel transportation surveys).

(7) Interagency consultation procedures shall include a process for providing final documents (including applicable implementation plans and implementation plan revisions) and supporting information to each agency after approval or adoption. This process is applicable to all agencies described in paragraph (a)(1) of this section, including Federal agencies (40 CFR 93.105).

#### **§93.106 Content of transportation plans and timeframe of conformity determinations.**

(c) Transportation plans for other areas. Transportation plans for other areas must meet the requirements of paragraph (a) of this section at least to the extent it has been the previous practice of the MPO to prepare plans which meet those requirements. Otherwise, the transportation system envisioned for the future must be sufficiently described within the transportation plans so that a conformity determination can be made according to the criteria and procedures of §§93.109 through 93.11

#### **§93.110 Criteria and procedures: Latest planning assumptions.**

(a) If new data that become available (after the analysis begins) they are required to use it for the conformity determination only if a significant delay in the analysis has occurred (as determined through interagency consultation).

(b) The assumptions are required to be derived from the estimates of current and future population, employment, travel, and congestion most recently developed by the MPO or other agency authorized to make such estimates and approved by the MPO. The conformity determination must also be based on the latest assumptions about current and future background concentrations.

(c) The conformity determination for each transportation plan and TIP must discuss how transit operating policies (including fares and service levels) and assumed transit ridership have changed since the previous conformity determination.

(d) The conformity determination must include reasonable assumptions about transit service and increases in transit fares and road and bridge tolls over time.

(e) The conformity determination must use the latest existing information regarding the effectiveness of the TCMs and other implementation plan measures which have already been implemented.

(f) Key assumptions shall be specified and included in the draft documents and supporting materials used for the interagency and public consultation required by §93.105 (40 CFR 93.110(f)).

#### **§93.111 Criteria and procedures: Latest emissions model.**

(a) The conformity determination must be based on the latest emission estimation model available. This criterion is satisfied if the most current version of the motor vehicle emissions model specified by EPA for use in the preparation or revision of implementation plans in that State or area is used for the conformity analysis. Where EMFAC is the motor vehicle emissions model used in preparing or revising the applicable implementation plan, new versions must be approved by EPA before they are used in the conformity analysis.

#### **§93.122 Procedures for determining regional transportation-related emissions.**

(a) General requirements.

(1) The regional emissions analysis required by §§93.118 and 93.119 for the transportation plan, TIP, or project not from a conforming plan and TIP must include all regionally significant

projects expected in the nonattainment or maintenance area. The analysis shall include FHWA/FTA projects proposed in the transportation plan and TIP and all other regionally significant projects which are disclosed to the MPO as required by §93.105. Projects which are not regionally significant are not required to be explicitly modeled, but vehicle miles traveled (VMT) from such projects must be estimated in accordance with reasonable professional practice. The effects of TCMs and similar projects that are not regionally significant may also be estimated in accordance with reasonable professional practice.

(7) Reasonable methods shall be used to estimate nonattainment or maintenance area VMT on off-network roadways within the urban transportation planning area, and on roadways outside the urban transportation planning area.

### **§93.122 Procedures for determining regional transportation-related emissions.**

(d) In all areas not otherwise subject to paragraph (b) of this section, regional emissions analyses must use those procedures described in paragraph (b) of this section if the use of those procedures has been the previous practice of the MPO. Otherwise, areas not subject to paragraph (b) of this section may estimate regional emissions using any appropriate methods that account for VMT growth by, for example, extrapolating historical VMT or projecting future VMT by considering growth in population and historical growth trends for VMT per person. These methods must also consider future economic activity, transit alternatives, and transportation system policies.

### **Title 23 CFR §450**

#### **§450.324 Development and content of the metropolitan transportation plan.**

(a) In nonattainment and maintenance areas, the effective date of the transportation plan shall be the date of a conformity determination issued by the FHWA and the FTA.

(c) The MPO shall review and update the transportation plan at least every 4 years in air quality nonattainment and maintenance areas to confirm the transportation plan's validity and consistency with current and forecasted transportation and land use conditions and trends and to extend the forecast period to at least a 20-year planning horizon.

(d) In metropolitan areas that are in nonattainment for ozone or carbon monoxide, the MPO shall coordinate the development of the metropolitan transportation plan with the process for developing transportation control measures (TCMs) in a State Implementation Plan (SIP).

#### **Group B2: Non-TMA MPOs – Nonattainment or Maintenance Areas -- State Requirements (Shalls)**

This section includes all of Group A and B1 state requirements. No new requirements are identified in this section.

#### **Group B2: Non-TMA MPOs - Nonattainment or Maintenance Areas -- Federal Recommendations (Shoulds)**

This section includes all of Group A and B1 federal recommendations. No new requirements are identified in this section.

#### **Group B2: Non-TMA MPOs - Nonattainment or Maintenance Areas -- State Recommendations (Shoulds)**

This section includes all of Group A and B1 state recommendations. No new requirements are identified in this section.

### **Group C1: TMA MPOs - Attainment Areas -- Federal Requirements (Shalls)**

This section includes all Group B1 and B2 federal requirements and the following requirements

#### **Title 23 CFR §450**

##### **§450.322 Congestion management process in transportation management areas.**

**a)** The transportation planning process in a TMA shall address congestion management through a process that provides for safe and effective integrated management and operation of the multimodal transportation system, based on a cooperatively developed and implemented the metropolitan-wide strategy, of new and existing transportation facilities eligible for funding under title 23 U.S.C. and title 49 U.S.C. Chapter 53 through the use of travel demand reduction (including intercity bus operators, employer-based commuting programs such as a carpool program, vanpool program, transit benefit program, parking cash-out program, shuttle program, or telework program), job access projects, and operational management strategies.

**(d)** The congestion management process shall be developed, established, and implemented as part of the metropolitan transportation planning process that includes coordination with transportation system management and operations activities. The congestion management process shall include.

**(1)** Methods to monitor and evaluate the performance of the multimodal transportation system, identify the underlying causes of recurring and nonrecurring congestion, identify and evaluate alternative strategies, provide information supporting the implementation of actions, and evaluate the effectiveness of implemented actions;

**(2)** Definition of congestion management objectives and appropriate performance measures to assess the extent of congestion and support the evaluation of the effectiveness of congestion reduction and mobility enhancement strategies for the movement of people and goods;

**(3)** Establishment of a coordinated program for data collection and system performance monitoring to define the extent and duration of congestion, to contribute in determining the causes of congestion, and evaluate the efficiency and effectiveness of implemented actions;

**(4)** Identification and evaluation of the anticipated performance and expected benefits of appropriate congestion management strategies that will contribute to the more effective use and improved safety of existing and future transportation systems based on the established performance measures.

### **Group C1: TMAs MPOs - Attainment Areas -- State Requirements (Shalls)**

Includes all state requirements in Group B. No new requirements are identified in this section.

### **Group C1: TMA MPOs - Attainment Areas -- Federal Recommendations (Shoulds)**

Includes all federal recommendations in Group B and the following requirements.

#### **Title 23 CFR §450**

##### **§450.322 Congestion management process in transportation management areas**

**(d)(3)** To the extent possible, TMA's data collection programs should be coordinated with existing data sources, archived operational/ITS data, and coordinated with operations managers in metropolitan areas.

### **Group C1: TMA MPOs - Attainment Areas -- State Recommendations (Shoulds)**

Includes all state recommendations in Group B. No new requirements are identified in this section.

## **Group C2: TMA MPOs - Nonattainment or Maintenance Areas -- Federal Requirements (Shalls)**

Includes all federal requirements in Group B and C (1) and the following requirement.

### **Title 40 CFR §93**

#### **§93.106 Content of transportation plans and timeframe of conformity determinations.**

(a) Transportation plans adopted after January 1, 1997 in serious, severe, or extreme ozone nonattainment areas and in serious CO nonattainment areas. If the metropolitan planning area contains an urbanized area population greater than 200,000, the transportation plan must specifically describe the transportation system envisioned for certain future years which shall be called horizon years

(1) The agency or organization developing the transportation plan may choose any years to be horizon years, subject to the following restriction:

(i) Horizon years may be no more than 10 years apart;

(ii) The first horizon year may be no more than 10 years from the base year used to validate the transportation demand planning model;

(iii) The attainment year must be a horizon year if it is in the timeframe of the transportation plan and conformity determination;

(iv) The last year of the transportation plan's forecast period must be a horizon year; and

(v) If the timeframe of the conformity determination has been shortened under paragraph (d) of this section, the last year of the timeframe of the conformity determination must be a horizon year.

(2) For these horizon years described in:

(i) The transportation plan shall quantify and document the demographic and employment factors influencing expected transportation demand, including land use forecasts, in accordance with implementation plan provisions and the consultation requirements specified by §93.105;

(ii) The highway and transit system shall be described in terms of the regionally significant additions or modifications to the existing transportation network which the transportation plan envisions to be operational in the horizon years. Additions and modifications to the highway network shall be sufficiently identified to indicate intersections with existing regionally significant facilities, and to determine their effect on route options between transportation analysis zones. Each added or modified highway segment shall also be sufficiently identified in terms of its design concept and design scope to allow modeling of travel times under various traffic volumes, consistent with the modeling methods for area-wide transportation analysis in use by the MPO. Transit facilities, equipment, and services envisioned for the future shall be identified in terms of design concept, design scope, and operating policies that are sufficient for modeling of their transit ridership. Additions and modifications to the transportation network shall be described sufficiently to show that there is a reasonable relationship between expected land use and the envisioned transportation system; and iii) Other future transportation policies, requirements, services, and activities, including intermodal activities, shall be describe;

(iii) Other future transportation policies, requirements, services, and activities, including intermodal activities, shall be described.

#### **§93.122 Procedures for determining regional transportation-related emissions.**

(b) Regional emissions analysis in serious, severe, and extreme ozone nonattainment areas and serious CO nonattainment areas must meet the requirements of paragraphs (b) (1) through (3) of this section if their metropolitan planning area contains an urbanized area population over 200,000.

(1) By January 1, 1997, estimates of regional transportation-related emissions used to support conformity determinations must be made at a minimum using network-based travel models according to procedures and methods that are available and in practice and supported by current and available documentation. These procedures, methods, and practices are available from DOT and will be updated periodically. Agencies must discuss these modeling procedures and practices through the interagency consultation process, as required by §93.105(c)(1)(i). Network-based travel models must at a minimum satisfy the following requirements:

(i) Network-based travel models must be validated against observed counts (peak and off-peak, if possible) for a base year that is not more than 10 years prior to the date of the conformity determination. Model forecasts must be analyzed for reasonableness and compared to historical trends and other factors, and the results must be documented;

(ii) Land use, population, employment, and other network-based travel model assumptions must be documented and based on the best available information;

(iii) Scenarios of land development and use must be consistent with the future transportation system alternatives for which emissions are being estimated. The distribution of employment and residences for different transportation options must be reasonable;

(iv) A capacity-sensitive assignment methodology must be used, and emissions estimates must be based on a methodology which differentiates between peak and off-peak link volumes and speeds and uses speeds based on final assigned volumes;

(v) Zone-to-zone travel impedances used to distribute trips between origin and destination pairs must be in reasonable agreement with the travel times that are estimated from final assigned traffic volumes. Where use of transit currently is anticipated to be a significant factor in satisfying transportation demand, these times should also be used for modeling mode splits; and;

(vi) Network-based travel models must be reasonably sensitive to changes in the time(s), cost(s), and other factors affecting travel choices;

(2) Reasonable methods in accordance with good practice must be used to estimate traffic speeds and delays in a manner that is sensitive to the estimated volume of travel on each roadway segment represented in the network-based travel model;

(3) Highway Performance Monitoring System (HPMS) estimates of vehicle miles traveled (VMT) shall be considered the primary measure of VMT within the portion of the nonattainment or maintenance area and for the functional classes of roadways included in HPMS, for urban areas which are sampled on a separate urban area basis. For areas with network-based travel models, a factor (or factors) may be developed to reconcile and calibrate the network-based travel model estimates of VMT in the base year of its validation to the HPMS estimates for the same period. These factors may then be applied to model estimates of future VMT. In this factoring process, consideration will be given to differences between HPMS and network-based travel models, such as differences in the facility coverage of the HPMS and the modeled network description. Locally developed count-based programs and other departures from these procedures are permitted subject to the interagency consultation procedures of §93.105(c)(1)(i).

#### **Title 23 CFR §450**

##### **§450.322 Congestion management process in transportation management areas.**

(f) In TMAs designated as nonattainment for ozone or carbon monoxide, the congestion management process shall provide an appropriate analysis of reasonable (including multimodal) travel demand reduction and operational management strategies for the corridor in which a project that will result in a significant increase in capacity for SOVs (as described in paragraph (d) of this section) is proposed to be advanced with Federal funds. If the analysis demonstrates that travel demand reduction and operational management strategies cannot fully satisfy the

need for additional capacity in the corridor and additional SOV capacity is warranted, then the congestion management process shall identify all reasonable strategies to manage the SOV facility safely and effectively (or to facilitate its management in the future). Other travel demand reduction and operational management strategies appropriate for the corridor, but not appropriate for incorporation into the SOV facility itself, shall also be identified through the congestion management process. All identified reasonable travel demand reduction and operational management strategies shall be incorporated into the SOV project or committed to by the State and MPO for implementation.

**Group C2: TMA MPOs – Nonattainment or Maintenance Areas -- State Requirements (Shalls)**

Includes all state requirements in Group A and B. No new requirements are identified in this section.

**Group C2: TMA MPOs – Nonattainment or Maintenance Areas -- Federal Recommendations (Shoulds)**

Includes all federal recommendations in Group B and C1. No new recommendations are identified in this section.

**Group C2: TMA MPOs – Nonattainment or Maintenance Areas -- State Recommendations (Shoulds)**

Includes all state recommendations in Group B. No new recommendations are identified in this section.

Page Left Intentionally Blank

# Chapter 4

## RTP Consultation and Coordination



Page Left Intentionally Blank

## **RTP CONSULTATION & COORDINATION**

### **4.1 Consultation & Coordination**

Transportation planning is a collaborative process, led by the MPO and other key stakeholders in the regional transportation system. Transportation planning activities include visioning, forecasting population/employment, identifying major growth corridors, projecting future land use in conjunction with local jurisdictions, assessing needs, developing capital and operating strategies to move people and goods, and developing a financial plan. Consistent with SB 375 and Title 23 CFR Part 450.316, the required planning processes are designed to foster involvement by all interested parties, such as walking and bicycling representatives, public health departments and public health non-governmental organizations, affordable housing advocates, transportation advocates, neighborhood and community groups, environmental advocates, home builder representatives, broad-based business organizations, landowners, commercial property interests and homeowner associations, the Native American community, neighboring MPOs and the general public through a proactive public participation process. Review all sections of this chapter for detailed public participation requirements.

Coordination is the cooperative development of plans, programs and schedules among agencies and entities with legal standing in order to achieve general consistency. Consultation means that one or more parties confer with other identified parties in accordance with the established process and, prior to taking action(s), considers the views of the other parties and periodically informs them about action(s) taken. It is very important for the development of the RTP to be conducted both in coordination and consultation with interested parties.

In addition to having an extensive public participation process, each MPO should coordinate its regional transportation planning activities with all transportation providers, facility operators such as airports, appropriate federal, state, local agencies, Native American Tribal Governments, environmental resource agencies, air districts, pedestrian and bicycle representatives and adjoining MPOs. The RTP shall (Title 23 CFR Part 450.324(g)(1) and (2)) reflect consultation with resource and permit agencies to ensure early coordination with environmental resource protection and management plans, for additional information regarding consultation with resource agencies see Section 4.10.

RTPs are required to be developed in coordination with local and regional air quality planning authorities and shall reflect specific consultation activities with air quality agencies on the development of the RTP (Title 40 CFR Part 93.105 (b)). MPOs participate in air quality planning by providing travel activity data for emissions inventories. They also implement Transportation Control Measures to reduce transportation related emissions. This participation helps lay the groundwork for future SIP conformity determinations. All MPOs in nonattainment and maintenance areas shall coordinate the development of their RTPs with their respective Air Quality Management District(s), the California Air Resources Board, Caltrans, local transportation agencies, EPA, and U.S. DOT in order to ensure conformity with the SIP. The federal Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990 requires SIP development to be coordinated with the transportation planning process (Title 42 Section 7504(b)). Detailed requirements may also be found in Title 40 CFR Parts 51 and 93 (Transportation Conformity rules).

Development of the Public Participation Plan and the RTP shall include consultation and coordination with all interested parties and shall, at a minimum, describe explicit procedures, strategies and desired outcomes (Title 23 CFR Part 450.316).

In summary, the consultation process shall:

1. Provide adequate public notice and the opportunity to comment on proposed RTPs and public participation plans;
2. Employ visualization techniques to describe the RTP;
3. Make the RTP electronically accessible, such as placing it on the Internet;
4. Hold public hearings at convenient and accessible locations and times;
5. Demonstrate explicit consideration and response to public input on the RTP (documentation);
6. Seek out and consider the needs of those traditionally underserved by existing transportation systems, such as low income and minority households;
7. Provide additional opportunities to comment on the RTP and the FTIP, if the final version differs due to additional comments;
8. Coordinate with the state transportation planning and public involvement processes; and,
9. Periodically review intended RTP outcomes, products and/or services.

#### **Requirements (Shalls)**

**Federal:** Transportation Conformity Regulations of Title 40 CFR Part 93.105; Title 23 CFR Part 450.316 requires MPOs to develop a process and mechanism in which all parties may provide comments/input on the MPOs public participation plan and in the development of the RTP.

**State:** Government Code Section 65080(b)(2)(E)

**Planning Practice Examples:** Available in Appendix L

## **4.2 Title VI & Environmental Justice Considerations in the RTP**

Evaluation of the entire range of a region's needs is a key element in the process of developing an RTP, and like consideration of public comment is required by both federal and state law. Providing more transportation and mobility choices such as increased transit, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities, as well as appropriate housing choices near job centers increases opportunities for all segments of the population at all income levels. Each region is required by federal regulation and state laws to plan for and implement transportation system improvements that will provide a fair share of benefits to all residents, regardless of race, ethnicity or income level. As discussed in Section 4.4, the public participation plan must provide for "Seeking out and considering the needs of those traditionally underserved by existing transportation systems, such as low-income and minority households as well as people with limited English proficiency, who may face challenges accessing employment and other services." This section discusses separate legal requirements that protect low-income and minority individuals: Title VI of the federal Civil Rights Act of 1964, Section 11135 of the California Government Code, Presidential Executive Order 12898 on Environmental Justice (EJ), and the U.S. DOT EJ Order 5610.2(A). As discussed below, these laws and orders require MPOs to conduct analyses to determine (under Title VI) whether transportation and land use changes identified in the RTP result in disparate impacts to minority communities and populations and (with respect to EJ) to identify and address, as appropriate, disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of programs, policies, and activities on low-income populations and minority populations resulting from the transportation and land use changes in the RTP.

## **Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964**

Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 prohibits discrimination by recipients of federal funds on the basis of race, color or national origin. A similar prohibition applies to recipients of state funds under California Gov. Code section 11135, which prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color or national origin, as well as ethnic group identification, religion, age, sex, sexual orientation, genetic information, or disability. When an MPO receives federal funding for only a limited purpose, such as a specific service or project, it is still subject to Title VI in all of its “policies, programs or activities,” whether or not they are directly supported with the federal funds.

The general prohibition of Title VI is far-reaching. While U.S. DOT’s Title VI regulations (49 CFR § 21.5) enumerates specific prohibitions, they also state that “the enumeration of specific forms of prohibited discrimination in [the regulations] does not limit the generality of the prohibition.” Among the numerous specific forms of discrimination the regulations call out are prohibitions on subjecting a person to segregation in any matter related to receipt of any benefit under the program; denying a person the opportunity to participate as a member of a planning, advisory, or similar body which is an integral part of the program; or utilizing any criteria or methods of administration that have the effect of subjecting persons to discrimination. Other discriminatory actions are specifically prohibited. Title VI and its implementing regulations (49 CFR § 21.5) state that the recipient of federal funds may not directly or through contractual or other arrangements, on the grounds of race, color, or national origin:

1. Deny a person any service, financial aid, or other benefit provided under the program;
2. Provide any service, financial aid, or other benefit to a person which is different, or is provided in a different manner, from that provided to others under the program;
3. Subject a person to segregation or separate treatment in any matter related to his receipt of any service, financial aid, or other benefit under the program;
4. Restrict a person in any way in the enjoyment of any advantage or privilege enjoyed by others receiving any service, financial aid, or other benefit under the program;
5. Treat a person differently from others in determining whether he satisfies any admission, enrollment, quota, eligibility, membership, or other requirement or condition which persons must meet in order to be provided any service, financial aid, or other benefit provided under the program;
6. Deny a person an opportunity to participate in the program through the provision of services or otherwise or afford him an opportunity to do so which is different from that afforded others under the program; or
7. Deny a person the opportunity to participate as a member of a planning, advisory, or similar body which is an integral part of the program.

## **Title VI Analysis**

In addition to prohibiting discrimination, the Title VI regulation imposes affirmative obligations on recipients. Among other things, recipients are prohibited from denying a person an opportunity to participate in the program through the provision of services or otherwise afford him an opportunity to do so which is different from that afforded others under the program. The Title VI regulation also requires them to “take affirmative action to assure that no person is excluded from participation in or denied the benefits of the program or activity on the grounds of race, color, or national origin,” and both as part of the Title VI report described below and more

generally, to “have available for the Secretary racial and ethnic data showing the extent to which members of minority groups are beneficiaries of programs receiving Federal financial assistance.”

As described in FTA Circular 4702.1B, “*Title VI Requirements and Guidelines for FTA Recipients*,” part of the Title VI Program for MPOs includes an analysis of impacts that identifies any disparate impacts on basis of race, color, or national origin. Specifically, FTA Circular 4702.1B requires MPOs to submit a Title VI Program report certifying compliance every three years. (MPOs that have the responsibility typically held by transit operators, such as development of new transit services or setting of transit fares must also conduct equity studies if proposing significant service or fare changes.) The Circular requires that MPOs include the following information in their Title VI Program reports:

1. All general requirements set out in section 4 of Chapter III of the Circular;
2. A demographic profile of the metropolitan area that includes identification of the locations of minority populations in the aggregate;
3. A description of the procedures by which the mobility needs of minority populations are identified and considered within the planning process;
4. Demographic maps that overlay the percent minority and non-minority populations as identified by Census or ACS data, at Census tract or block group level, and charts that analyze the impacts of the distribution of State and Federal funds in the aggregate for public transportation purposes, including Federal funds managed by the MPO as a designated recipient;
5. An analysis of impacts identified in paragraph (4) that identifies any disparate impacts on the basis of race, color, or national origin, and, if so, determines whether there is a substantial legitimate justification for the policy that resulted in the disparate impacts, and if there are alternatives that could be employed that would have a less discriminatory impact.

This information is submitted to the State as the primary recipient of funding and also to FTA separately from the RTP. This Title VI analysis is applicable to the MPO activities and planning process as a whole. Federal law requires each MPO periodically to “certify . . . that the metropolitan transportation planning process is being carried out in accordance with . . . Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.” 23 C.F.R. § 450.334 (a) (3). A valid Title VI Analysis is an essential part of a valid Title VI certification.

The Circular includes the following related definitions:

1. Discrimination refers to any action or inaction, whether intentional or unintentional, in any program or activity of a Federal aid recipient, sub-recipient, or contractor that results in disparate treatment, disparate impact, or perpetuating the effects of prior discrimination based on race, color, or national origin.
2. Disparate impact refers to a facially neutral policy or practice that disproportionately affects members of a group identified by race, color, or national origin, where the recipient’s policy or practice lacks a substantial legitimate justification and where there exists one or more alternatives that would serve the same legitimate objectives but with less disproportionate effect on the basis of race, color, or national origin.
3. Disproportionate burden refers to a neutral policy or practice that disproportionately affects low-income populations more than non-low-income populations. A finding of

disproportionate burden requires the recipient to evaluate alternatives and mitigate burdens where practicable.

4. Disparate treatment refers to actions that result in circumstances where similarly situated persons are intentionally treated differently (i.e., less favorably) than others because of their race, color, or national origin....
5. Minority population means any readily identifiable group of minority persons who live in geographic proximity and, if circumstances warrant, geographically dispersed/transient populations (such as migrant workers or Native Americans) who will be similarly affected by a proposed DOT program, policy, or activity.

## Environmental Justice

Presidential Executive Order 12898 requires that “each federal agency shall conduct its programs, policies, and activities that substantially affect human health or the environment, in a manner that ensures such programs, policies, and activities do not have the effect of excluding persons (including populations) from participation in, denying persons (including populations) the benefits of, or subjecting persons (including populations) to discrimination under, such programs, policies, and activities, because of their race, color, or national origin.” It also requires federal executive agencies and the entities to which they extend financial support or project approval to “identify and address, as appropriate, disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of its programs, policies, and activities on minority populations.”

The U.S. DOT Order 5610.2(a) on EJ defines “adverse effects” as “the totality of significant individual or cumulative human *health or environmental effects*.” That phrase is defined broadly as extending to “interrelated social and economic effects, which may include, but are not limited to: bodily impairment, infirmity, illness or death; air, noise, and water pollution and soil contamination; destruction or disruption of man-made or natural resources; destruction or diminution of aesthetic values; destruction or disruption of community cohesion or a community’s economic vitality; destruction or disruption of the availability of public and private facilities and services; vibration; adverse employment effects; displacement of persons, businesses, farms, or nonprofit organizations; increased traffic congestion, isolation, exclusion or separation of minority or low-income individuals within a given community or from the broader community.” That phrase also includes “the denial of, reduction in, or *significant delay in the receipt of, benefits* of DOT programs, policies, or activities.”

Environmental Justice at FHWA means “*identifying and addressing disproportionately high and adverse effects of the agency’s programs, policies, and activities on minority and low-income populations to achieve an equitable distribution of benefits and burdens. This includes the full and fair participation by all potentially affected communities in the transportation decision-making process*”.

The FTA EJ Circular 4703.1 describes an EJ analysis to determine whether the activity will result in a “[d]isproportionately high and adverse effect on human health and environment.” The DOT order prohibits, if further mitigation measures or alternatives that would reduce the disproportionately high and adverse effects are feasible, any “[d]isproportionately high and adverse effect on minority and low-income populations,” defined as “an adverse effect that: (1) is *predominately borne by* a minority population and/or a low-income population, or (2) will be suffered by the minority population and/or low-income population and is *appreciably more severe or greater in magnitude* than the adverse effect that will be suffered by the non-minority population and/or non-low-income population.”

DOT EJ Order 5610.2(a) and FTA EJ Circular 4703.1 provide direction related to the responsibilities of MPOs on environmental justice as recipients of federal funds. There are three federally established guiding EJ principles, summarized in FTA Circular 4703.1, to consider throughout transportation planning, public outreach and participation efforts conducted in development of the RTP:

- “To avoid, minimize, or mitigate disproportionately *high and adverse human health and environmental effects, including social and economic effects*, on minority populations and low-income populations.
- To ensure the *full and fair participation* by all potentially affected communities in the transportation decision-making process.
- To prevent the *denial of, reduction in, or significant delay in the receipt of benefits* by minority and low-income populations.”

While Title VI and EJ are closely related, FTA Circular 4703.1, “*Environmental Justice Policy Guidance for FTA Recipients*,” provides an understanding of the overlap and distinction between the two. Title VI prohibits discrimination by recipients of federal assistance on the basis of race, color, and national origin. By contrast, the Executive Order on EJ extends its protections not only to “minority populations” but also to “low-income populations.”

DOT EJ Order 5610.2(a) defines “Minority Population” to mean “any readily identifiable groups of minority persons who live in geographic proximity, and if circumstances warrant, geographically dispersed/transient persons (such as migrant workers or Native Americans) who will be similarly affected by a proposed DOT program, policy or activity.” The U.S. DOT EJ Order similarly defines “Low-Income Population” as “any readily identifiable groups of low-income persons who live in geographic proximity, and if circumstances warrant, geographically dispersed/transient person (such as migrant workers or Native Americans) who will be similarly affected by a proposed DOT program, policy or activity.” FTA’s EJ Circular 4703.1 and FTA’s 2012 Title VI Circular 4702.1B include similar definitions.

## **Incorporating Environmental Justice Principles into Decision Making Processes**

Specific to low-income and minority populations, MPOs are required to conduct an EJ analysis. The requirement of an EJ analysis grows out of the requirement in the federal EJ Executive Order to “*identify and address, as appropriate, disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of its programs, policies, and activities on minority populations.*” As described in FTA Circular 4703.1, an EJ analysis starts with knowing basic socioeconomic information about the people who live and/or work in the region. This information will provide a basis for developing a public engagement plan that will encourage the full and fair participation by all members of the affected communities. The public engagement plan will then guide the rest of the analysis as consideration of whether the proposed programs, policies and activities will result in disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects on EJ populations.

Chapter 2 of FTA Circular 4703.1 on EJ describes a four-step process for conducting an EJ analysis: “Step 1: Know your community by analyzing demographic data. Step 2: Develop Public Engagement Plan that responds to the community. Step 3: Consider proposed project and likely adverse effects and benefits. Step 4: Select alternative, incorporate mitigation as

needed.” MPOs may adjust the above four step framework to fit the particular activity they are analyzing. Each step is discussed in more detail in the Circular: Step 1 is discussed in chapter II; Step 2 in chapter III; and Steps 3 and 4 in Chapters IV and V. MPOs are advised to consult this Circular for details and specific requirements and recommendations. The Circular also contains recommendations for State DOTs, MPOs, and transit providers on “(1) how to fully engage EJ populations in the transportation decision-making process; (2) how to determine whether EJ populations would be subjected to disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of a public transportation project, policy or activity; and (3) how to avoid, minimize or mitigate these effects.”

## **Title VI Analysis & EJ Analysis**

There may be some overlap between EJ and Title VI analyses; however, engaging in EJ analysis during the federal transportation planning process will not necessarily satisfy Title VI requirements. Conversely, a Title VI analysis would not necessarily satisfy EJ requirements, since Title VI does not include low-income populations. Moreover, Title VI applies to all federally-funded projects and activities, including those that will provide new benefits or services, not solely those activities that may have adverse human health or environmental effects on communities, which the U.S. DOT Order on EJ defines very broadly.

### **Requirements (Shalls)**

**Federal:** Title 23 CFR Part 450.316(a); Title 42 U.S.C. Chapter 21 Section 2000(d) (Title VI of the federal Civil Rights Act of 1964); Title 49 CFR Part 21 (Title VI Regulations); portions of FTA Circular 4702.1B – Title VI Requirements and Guidelines for FTA Recipients; Presidential Executive Order 12898 on Environmental Justice (1994); portions of U.S. DOT Order 5610.2(a) (2012) and FHWA Order 6640.23A (2012).

**State:** Government Code Section 11135

### **Recommendations (Shoulds)**

**Federal:** FTA Circular 4703.1 – EJ Policy Guidance for FTA Recipients; portions of FTA Circular 4702.1B-Title VI Requirements and Guidance for FTA Recipients; portions of U.S. DOT EJ Order 5610.2(a), and FHWA Order 6640.23A (2012).

**Planning Practice Examples:** Available in Appendix L

## **4.3 Social Equity Factors**

Social equity factors relevant to RTP development include, but are not limited to, housing and transportation affordability, access to transportation, displacement and gentrification, and the jobs/housing fit.

Title 23 CFR Part 450.316(a)(1)(vii) requires that an MPO’s public participation plan describe explicit procedures, strategies and desired outcomes for seeking out and considering the needs of those traditionally underserved by existing transportation systems, such as low-income communities and communities of color, who may face challenges accessing employment and other services.



MPOs can encourage the involvement of low-income communities and communities of color by proactively seeking the input of these households and by making public meetings as accessible as possible. Public engagement strategies may include:

- Provide all materials related to the update with adequate time for public review and input.
- Hold meetings at convenient and accessible locations and outside of traditional working hours (e.g. evenings and weekends);
- Locate meetings in low-income communities and communities of color;
- Locate meetings at sites accessible via affordable transit;
- Translate meeting materials for non-English speakers;
- Consider the needs to low-income and individuals with limited English proficiency when translating outreach materials and ensuring that documents are easy to understand (i.e. evaluate the reading level of the materials and quality of translations);
- Technology and the Internet can reach many people, but efforts should be made to reach individuals with limited/no internet access;
- Provide interpretation at meetings for non-English speakers; and,
- Ensure meetings are attended by MPO decision makers in addition to MPO staff.

In addition to the practices listed above, MPOs are also encouraged, to the extent practicable, to develop partnerships with local, regional and state-wide organizations that can assist in achieving RTP participation goals.

**Planning Practice Examples:** Available in Appendix L

#### **4.4 Participation Plan**

Involving the public in planning and project development poses a major challenge as well as an opportunity. Many people are skeptical about whether they can truly influence the outcome of a transportation project. Others feel that transportation plans are too abstract and long-term to warrant attention. At the same time, especially for MPOs as a result of SB 375, there has been and continues to be, increased interest in regional transportation planning by individuals and groups not previously involved.

The RTP is one of the key processes an MPO undertakes. It is a primary avenue for public participation in the long-range transportation planning process. Title 23 CFR Part 450.316(a) states the following concerning participation and consultation:

*“The MPO shall develop and use a documented participation plan that defines a process for providing individuals, affected public agencies, representatives of public transportation employees, public ports, freight shippers, providers of freight transportation services, private providers of transportation, representatives of users of public transportation, representatives of users of pedestrian walkways and bicycle transportation facilities, representatives of the disabled, and other interested parties with reasonable opportunities to be involved in the metropolitan transportation planning process.”*

Title 23 CFR Part 450.316(a)(1) also requires that public participation plans be developed by MPOs in consultation with all interested parties and describe explicit procedures, strategies, and desired outcomes for:

- (i) Providing adequate public notice of public participation activities and time for public review and comment at key decision points, including but not limited to a reasonable opportunity to comment on the proposed metropolitan transportation plan and the TIP;
- (ii) Providing timely notice and reasonable access to information about transportation issues and processes;
- (v) Holding any public meetings at convenient and accessible locations and times;
- (vii) Seeking out and considering the needs of those traditionally underserved by existing transportation systems, such as low-income and minority households, who may face challenges accessing employment and other services.

The purpose of the MPO's participation plan is to establish the process by which the public can participate in the development of regional transportation plans and programs. The public participation plan should be designed to assist MPO staff in implementing an effective public participation process through a variety of strategies. It provides MPO staff with a menu of techniques or activities from which they can tailor their specific program's input process. MPOs should also refer to the CTP Public Participation Plan document, or the CTP/FSTIP Public Participation Plan, which can provide the most effective methods for engaging with the public. This document can be accessed through the following link: [http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tpp/offices/osp/ppp\\_files/CTPE\\_PPP\\_Final\\_052913\\_dq\\_29.pdf#zoom=75](http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tpp/offices/osp/ppp_files/CTPE_PPP_Final_052913_dq_29.pdf#zoom=75). Which public participation methods the MPO uses will require a careful analysis of what is desired to be accomplished as well as the scope of the particular transportation project(s). Plenty of flexibility is available to MPOs in developing specific public involvement programs. Every given situation or region in California is different, and each approach to a specific public involvement challenge will be unique.

When significant written and oral comments are received on the draft RTP and as a result of the participation process or the interagency consultation process required under the EPA transportation conformity regulations (Title 40 CFR Part 93), a summary, analysis, and report of the proposed comments shall be made as part of the final RTP.

It is important to note that the public participation plan should be prepared prior to the development of the RTP. The public participation plan should have public input during its preparation and have a 45-day comment period before the MPOs board adopts it. This enhanced public participation plan is a federal requirement. MPOs that currently have a public participation plan per federal requirements do not need to adopt another plan to meet new SB 375 requirements for additional public participation. The public participation requirements for development of the Sustainable Communities Strategy, pursuant to the requirements of SB 375, can be incorporated into the existing plan.

Title 23 CFR Part 450.316(a)(1)(iii) requires the participation plan to use visualization techniques to describe the RTP and FTIP. Visualization techniques range from a simple line drawing or hand written chart to technologically complex web cast public meetings, GIS modeling and computer generated maps. The specific type of visualization technique is determined by the MPO.

The public participation plan, the draft and adopted RTP shall be posted on the MPO website to the maximum extent practicable and for the life of the RTP. It is also recommended that MPOs place hard copies of the draft and adopted copies of RTPs in local libraries and other locations where the public would have access to these documents.

Public involvement programs for regional transportation plans in California are required to follow state and federal requirements. If the minimum state and federal requirements are inadequate for the region, the MPO may develop a more specialized public involvement program if that promises to be more effective.

In developing RTPs, the MPO should consult with agencies and officials responsible for other planning activities within their region that are affected by transportation or at least coordinate the planning process to incorporate input. These areas include, but are not limited to, the listed examples:

1. State and local growth;
2. Public health;
3. Housing;
4. Economic development;
5. Tourism;
6. Natural disaster risk reduction;
7. Environmental protection;
8. Airport operations; and,
9. Goods Movement.

When the MPO region includes California Indian Tribal Lands (reservations, Rancherias, and allotments) the MPO shall appropriately involve the federally recognized Native American Tribal Government(s) in the development of the RTP. The MPO should also seek input even from tribes that are not federally recognized or from other “interested parties” that may have a background and/or history of Native American culture within the region. In addition, AB 52 (Chapter 532, Statutes of 2014) established “Tribal Cultural Resources as a new, separate, and distinct resource to be analyzed in the CEQA process. A project that causes an adverse change to a TCR is one that may have a significant effect on the environment, so the MPO should avoid or mitigate impacts to Tribal Cultural Resources when feasible. The MPO must also begin consultation with a California Native American Tribe that is traditionally and culturally affiliated with the MPO region prior to the release of a Negative Declaration, a Mitigated Negative Declaration, or an Environmental Impact Report if the tribe requested, in writing, to be informed by the lead agency of proposed projects in that geographic area and if other procedural requirements are met. See Section 4.9 Native American Tribal Government Consultation and Coordination for further discussion.

Similarly, when the MPO region includes federal public lands, the MPO shall appropriately involve the federal land management agencies in the development of RTP.

The MPO shall also, to the extent practicable, develop a documented process that outlines roles, responsibilities, and key decision points for consulting with other governments and agencies.

MPOs are also encouraged to involve the media, including ethnic media as appropriate, as a tool to promote public participation in the RTP development, review and commenting process.

For MPOs, SB 375 increased the minimum level of public participation required in the regional transportation planning process including collaboration between partners in the region during the development of a SCS (see Sections 4.7 and 4.8).

Public participation and consultation for the development of the RTP remains an essential element of the overall RTP process. Mapping and visualization tools should be used, to the extent practicable, to create visual representations of proposed scenarios, the SCS and the APS, if applicable. Use of these tools will help facilitate more effective and meaningful public involvement in development and refinement of the SCS and APS, if applicable. A Public Participation Plan includes public outreach, public awareness, and public input beginning with the planning stage.

## **Periodic Evaluation of the Public Participation Plan**

A periodic review of the public participation plan is important to evaluate the effectiveness of the procedures and strategies employed during the full and open participation process. This periodic review can help to ensure that the public participation plan, once adopted, is being implemented effectively and is achieving its goals of engaging low-income and minority residents in expressing and prioritizing their needs and their views on how the RTP can best meet those needs.

### **Requirements (Shalls)**

**Federal:** Title 23 CFR Part 450.316 requires that the MPO shall develop and use a documented participation plan that defines a process for providing reasonable opportunities for all parties to comment and be involved in the metropolitan transportation planning process.

**State:** Government Code Section 65080; Public Resources Code Section 5097.94, and Sections 21073 through 21084.3.

**Planning Practice Examples:** Available in Appendix L

## **4.5 Private Sector Involvement**

Private sector involvement relates to how the goods movement industry and other business or commercial interests are represented in the development of the RTP. Trucks, freight trains, taxis, limousines all use the transportation network and are an integral part of the regional transportation system. Other examples of private sector involvement in the development of the RTP include Transportation Management Associations, private transit operators, developers, and Chambers of Commerce. Their absence in the regional transportation planning process adversely impacts the efficiency of the transportation network.

In urbanized areas of California, the number of trucks on the highway system has substantially increased. This has had a direct impact on traffic congestion within these areas. An increased level of truck activity has also had an impact in rural areas of the state, although primarily on the principal routes in rural counties. For these reasons, an RTP that does not include the “Private Sector” in the planning process is not a viable plan. The impact of the private sector on the transportation system is significant and must be included and documented in the RTP process.

Unfortunately, in many plans, the private sector is not identified as a planning partner. Where addressed, goods movement is discussed in the abstract with minimal long-range assumptions identified or assessed.

MPOs should take necessary actions to ensure major trucking firms, large employers and business organizations are formally invited to participate in the preparation of the RTP. The

MPO should strive to include any major long-range plans of these organizations that may have an impact on the regional transportation system. The purpose is to provide private sector transportation providers a process of communication and involvement into the region's transportation planning process. The specific outreach techniques developed and ultimately used is dependent on the size and composition of the region. These efforts to solicit input into the long-range regional transportation planning process should be documented in the RTP.

#### **Requirements (Shalls)**

**Federal:** Federal regulations require private sector involvement as a component of the regional transportation planning process. Title 23 U.S.C. Part 134 (g)(4), Title 23 U.S.C. Section 135(e) and Title 23 CFR Part 450.316 (a) require the transportation planning process include input from the goods movement industry and other transportation organizations.

#### **Recommendations (Shoulds)**

**State:** California Government Code Section 14000(d) recommends that a comprehensive multimodal transportation planning process should be established which involves all levels of government and the private sector in a cooperative process to develop coordinated transportation plans.

**Planning Practice Examples:** Available in Appendix L

### **4.6 Consultation with Interested Parties**

The U.S. DOT defines consultation as when: *“one or more parties confer with other identified parties in accordance with an established process and, prior to taking action(s), considers the views of the other parties and periodically informs them about action(s) taken.”* Some areas of consultation could include transportation, land use, employment, economic development, housing, community development and environmental issues.

The U.S. DOT definition of “interested parties” to be engaged in statewide and metropolitan transportation planning has been expanded. Title 23 CFR Part 450.324(j) provides the list of interested parties that shall be provided with a reasonable opportunity to comment on the RTP using the Public Participation Plan developed under 450.316(a). The MPO shall provide the following interested parties with reasonable opportunity to comment on the proposed RTP:

1. Individuals;
2. Affected public agencies;
3. Representatives of public transportation employees;
4. Public ports;
5. Freight shippers;
6. Private providers of transportation;
7. Representatives of users of public transportation;
8. Representatives of users of pedestrian walkways and bicycle transportation facilities;
9. Representatives of people with disabilities;
10. Providers of freight transportation services; and,
11. Other interested parties.

Consistent with SB 375, the MPO shall adopt a Public Participation Plan in advance of developing an SCS and/or APS to also include consultation with congestion management

agencies, transportation agencies, and transportation commissions. Reference Section 4.4 for Public Participation requirements and Section 4.5 for Private Sector Involvement. The remaining sections of this chapter provide more detailed requirements for RTP/SCS input, consultation and coordination.

### **Requirements (Shalls)**

**Federal:** Consulting with interested parties on plans, programs and projects shall include individuals or organizations that are mentioned in Title 23 CFR Part 450.316(a). Title 23 CFR Part 450.316(d) requires MPOs to consult with federal land use management agencies as appropriate during the development of RTP. Title 23 CFR part 450.324(g) states that MPOs shall consult as appropriate with state and local agencies responsible for land use management, natural resources, environmental protection, conservation and historic preservation during the development of their RTP. Title 23 CFR Part 450.324(j) provides the list of interested parties that shall be provided with a reasonable opportunity to comment on the RTP using the Public Participation Plan developed under 450.316(a).

**State:** Government Code Section 65080

**Planning Practice Examples:** Available in Appendix L

## **4.7 Input & Consultation on SCS Development**

This section applies only to federally-designated MPOs that are required to prepare a SCS, and APS, if applicable.

Existing federal regulations require MPOs to ensure the general public, resource agencies and Native American Tribal Governments are consulted during the development of the RTP. As a result of SB 375, this input and consultation requirement has been expanded.

### **SCS Public Participation Plan**

Consistent with SB 375, the MPO shall adopt a Public Participation Plan in advance of developing an SCS and/or APS to include:

- Outreach efforts encouraging the active participation of a broad range of stakeholders in the planning process, consistent with the MPO's adopted Federal Public Participation Plan. This includes, but is not limited to, affordable housing advocates, transportation advocates, neighborhood and community groups, environmental advocates, home builder representatives, broad-based business organizations, landowners, commercial property interests, and homeowner associations.
- Consultation with congestion management agencies, transportation agencies, and transportation commissions.
- Regional public workshops with information and tools providing a clear understanding of policy choices and issues. At least one workshop in each county. At least three workshops for counties with a population greater than 500,000. To the extent practicable, each workshop shall include urban simulation computer modeling to create visual representations of the SCS and APS.
- Preparation and circulation of a draft SCS (and APS, if one is prepared) not less than 55 days before adoption of a final RTP.

- For multiple-county MPOs at least three public hearings shall be held on the draft SCS in the RTP (and APS, if any). For a single county MPO, at least two public hearings shall be held. To the maximum extent feasible, the hearings shall be in different parts of the region to maximize the opportunity for participation by members of the public throughout the region.
- A process enabling the public to provide a single request to receive notices, information and updates.

Pursuant to Government Code Section 65080 (b)(2)(A)(ii), the MPO shall hold at least one public workshop within the region, after receiving the Regional Targets Advisory Committee (RTAC) recommendation report regarding methods and factors for setting regional GHG targets (which was released on September 29, 2009).

This public participation plan is not required to be reviewed or approved by any state agency, but it is recommended that a summary discussion of the RTP/SCS public participation process be included in the RTP. However, the MPO should maintain a record of its public participation efforts relative to the SCS and APS if applicable, and therefore, it is recommended these additional requirements should be included in the federally required public participation plan.

### **Consultation with Local Elected Officials**

During the development of the SCS (and APS if applicable), the MPO must conduct at least two informational meetings in each county for members of the board of supervisors and city councils. Only one informational meeting is needed in each county if it is attended by representatives of the county board of supervisors and city councils that represent a majority of the cities representing a majority of the population in the incorporated areas of that county. The purpose of this meeting (or meetings) shall be to discuss the SCS (and APS if applicable), including the key land use and planning assumptions, with the members of the board of supervisors and city council members in that county and to solicit and consider their input and recommendations. Notices of these meetings are to be sent to the clerk of the board of supervisors and city councils.

Continuing with a collaborative transportation planning process, MPOs work and consult with local elected officials as key stakeholders in the regional transportation system. While local elected officials serve on regional agency boards, expanded consultation is required pursuant to Government Code Section 65080(b)(2)(E) and (F) to provide outreach to all local elected officials and their member jurisdictions affected by the SCS (and APS if applicable). This is particularly significant in those regions where not all cities and counties have a permanent seat on the MPO board. Early consultation with all member agencies may avoid future conflicts with implementation of the RTP including the SCS (and APS, if applicable).

Pursuant to Government Code Section 65080(b)(2)(G), in preparing an SCS, the MPO shall consider spheres of influence that have been adopted by Local Agency Formation Commissions (LAFCOs) within the region. MPOs should also consult with LAFCOs regarding special districts within the region that provide property-related services such as water or wastewater services, and should consult with these regional special districts, as appropriate, during development of an SCS (and APS if applicable).

## **Consultation with School Districts**

Additionally, MPOs should consider consultation with school districts within their region during development of the RTP. School-related trips constitute a significant portion of all vehicle trips. For that reason, MPOs are encouraged to share data on growth projections and consult with school districts in the development of the SCS (and APS if applicable), especially with respect to land uses and the regional transportation system. Where possible, an SCS should incorporate current and future school needs into the RTP. Some school districts use School Facilities Master Plans (SFMP) as a way to compile comprehensive data on the district's long-term facilities including the general location of planned new schools and the expansion, revitalization and reuse of existing schools. A SFMP may also contain Board of Education adopted policies related to joint use and the district's sustainability efforts which can dovetail with community and regional efforts (e.g. infill, reuse, busing, pedestrian/bike safe routes to schools, etc.).

For additional information on the consultation process please refer to Section 4.1, 4.9, and 4.10.

## **4.8 Interagency Coordination on SCS Development**

As the MPO works on RTP development and approval, interagency coordination with both federal and State agencies provides necessary information for the RTP, and notification to all interested parties. Advanced and continuous coordination with all appropriate agencies is highly recommended. MPO development of the RTP should include interagency coordination with, but not limited to, the following entities:

1. Federal agencies including: Federal Highways Administration (FHWA), Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), and Federal Transit Administration (FTA)
2. California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD)
3. California Air Resources Board (ARB)
4. California Department of Transportation (Caltrans)
5. Appropriate Resources Agencies (see list in Section 4.10)
6. Adjacent MPOs with which the MPO shares a significant amount of interregional travel.

ARB must exchange technical information with Caltrans, MPOs, local air districts, and local governments in developing the regional GHG reduction targets for the MPOs. MPOs are strongly encouraged to participate in the target update process by providing ARB with region-specific target recommendations supported by modeling, technical data and analysis.

The California Transportation Commission (CTC) also encourages State agencies to work with the MPOs to provide the best data and information available as they develop their GHG emissions modeling methodology together with ARB.

MPOs are also encouraged to work with HCD to incorporate the appropriate RHNA within their RTPs.

A Sequencing Flowchart showing the RTP development and approval process for MPOs as they work with these entities is located in Section 2.8 of the RTP Guidelines.



#### **4.9 Native American Tribal Government Consultation & Coordination**

During the development of the RTP, Tribal Government **consultation** can be described as the meaningful and timely process of seeking, discussing, and considering carefully the views of leaders of federally recognized Tribal Governments and, where feasible, seeking agreement on important matters. The MPO can do this by sharing information and conducting meetings with leaders of the federally recognized Tribal Governments during the preparation of the RTP prior to taking action(s) on the plan and by making sure to consider input from the tribe as decisions are made. Consultation should be conducted in a way that is mutually respectful of each party's sovereignty. Tribal Government **coordination** is the comparison of the MPOs transportation plans, programs, projects and schedules with similar documents prepared by the tribe. The MPO needs to ensure consistency with tribal plans and the RTP.

Currently there are 109 federally recognized tribes in California. The federally recognized Tribal Governments hold inherent power of limited sovereignty and are charged with the same responsibility as other governmental authorities. In addition, California is home to the largest Native American population in the country, including non-federally recognized tribes, and urban Indian communities.

When the MPO region includes California Indian Tribal Lands (reservations, Rancherias, and allotments) the MPO shall appropriately involve the federally recognized Native American Tribal Government(s) in the development of the RTP. The MPO should also seek input even from tribes that are not federally recognized or from other "interested parties" that may have a background and/or history of Native American culture within the region. In addition, AB 52 mandates that agencies must consult with tribes regarding impacts to Tribal Cultural Resources as an impact under CEQA.

The MPO should include a discussion of consultation, coordination and communication with federally recognized Tribal Governments when the tribes are located within the boundary of an MPO/RTPA. The MPO should establish a government-to-government relationship with each tribe in the region. This refers to the protocol for communicating between the MPOs and the Tribal Governments as sovereign nations. This consultation process should be documented in the RTP. The initial point of contact for Tribal Governments should be the Chairperson for the tribe.

The MPO should develop protocol and communication methods for outreach and consultation with the Tribal Governments. However these protocol and communication methods should be re-evaluated if the agencies are un-successful in obtaining a response during the development of the RTP.

It is important to ensure that efforts in establishing channels of communication are documented in the RTP. For further information and assistance in the consultation process, contact the Caltrans Native American Liaison Branch (NALB) at: <http://dot.ca.gov/hq/tpp/offices/ocp/nalb>. The NALB webpage also provides contact information for the Caltrans Districts' Native American Liaisons.

As mentioned above, California is home to many non-federally recognized tribes as well as Native Americans living in urban areas. MPOs should involve the Native American communities in the public participation processes. Establishing and maintaining government-to-government

relations with federally recognized Tribal Governments through consultation is separate from, and precedes the public participation process.

### **Requirements (Shalls)**

**Federal:** Title 23 CFR part 450.316(c) requires MPOs to involve the federally recognized Native American Tribal Government in the development of the RTP and FTIP. Title 23 CFR part 450.316 (a)(1), the participation plan shall be developed by the MPO in consultation with all interested parties and shall, at a minimum, describe explicit procedures, strategies and desired outcomes. The requirement of including interested parties in the development of the participation plan and the RTP would include federally recognized or non-federally recognized tribes.

**State:** Public Resources Code Section 5097.94, and Sections 21073 through 21084.3. AB 52 added Tribal Cultural Resources as an impact under CEQA and required consultation to mitigate those impacts with the California Native American tribes as defined in California Public Resources Code Section 21073. Because RTPs are subject to CEQA and a program EIR is prepared to analyze the impacts of implementing an RTP, AB 52 means that MPOs must consult with tribes with regards to Tribal Cultural Resources as part of the CEQA process.

**Planning Practice Examples:** Available in Appendix L

## **4.10 Consultation with Resource Agencies**

Current federal regulations require MPOs to consult with resource agencies, State and local agencies responsible for land use management, environmental protection, conservation, and historic preservation concerning the development of the RTP. As part of SCS development, MPOs must gather and consider the best available scientific information on resource areas and farmlands within the region which may be impacted by the RTP. State and federal resource agencies may be able to assist MPOs by providing data, maps, or other information.

The consultation efforts shall involve:

1. Comparing transportation plans with State conservation plans, maps and other data, if available; and,
2. Comparing transportation plans with inventories of natural and historic resources, if available.

Federal requirements seek to receive input/comments from resource agencies early in the planning process. The reason for proactive consultation and engagement is to prevent project delays at a later time. In other words, coordinating and consulting with resources agencies early in the planning process, may lead to better coordination, minimal litigation, possible project cost savings and an upfront understanding of resource agency issues.

Some examples of resource agencies that could be included in a more seamless multi-agency process, but are not limited to California Environmental Protection Agency (CalEPA), California Coastal Commission, and U.S. Fish and Wildlife, U.S. Army Corp of Engineers, California Department of Fish and Wildlife and California Department of Parks and Recreation.

The FHWA Eco-Logical and Integrated Ecological Framework and the state Regional Advance Mitigation Planning model provides a process by which early consultation with resource agencies and conservation non-profit organizations to develop regional greenprints or conservation plans that identify areas of conservation value can satisfy federal requirements for early consultation and result in benefits for both transportation agencies and environmental protection. Programmatic mitigation plans, Natural Communities Conservation Plans and Habitat Conservation Plans can provide early consultation and identification of natural resources that need to be avoided or minimized in order to reduce risk and streamline project delivery. For additional information related to coordination of regional mitigation activities with other planning processes, see Chapter 5.

An MPO shall coordinate and consult with resource agencies on data or information sharing, if available. The following is a preliminary list of resource agencies that should be consulted in the development of the RTP:

1. Federal Highway Administration;
2. Federal Transit Administration;
3. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency;
4. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers;
5. NOAA Fisheries Services;
6. U.S. National Park Service;
7. U.S. National Marine and Fishery Service;
8. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service;
9. California Coastal Commission;
10. California Ocean Protection Council;
11. California Energy Commission;
12. California Office of Planning and Research;
13. California Environmental Protection Agency;
14. California Natural Resources Agency;
15. California Water Resources Control Board;
16. California Regional Water Quality Control Board;
17. California Department of Fish and Wildlife;
18. California Department of Resources, Recycling, and Recovery;
19. California Air Resources Board;
20. California Department of Parks and Recreation;
21. California Department of Conservation;
22. California State Mining and Geology Board;
23. Any additional California environmental, energy, resource and permit agencies;
24. Bay Conservation and Development Commission (Bay Area);
25. Regional Air Quality Management Districts, and;
26. California Office of Historic Preservation.

It may be challenging to obtain timely responses and comments to the RTP, its programs and projects, when the commenting period is announced to the general public and stakeholders. It is understandable that these efforts will depend on the specific region. MPOs in the Sacramento Valley and Southern California have chosen a targeted approach and send letters to specific stakeholders requesting comment/s on plans, programs and projects. When responses are not received, these MPOs follow-up on the request by asking for a reason from the resource agency as to why a response was not received.

Interagency Consultation for Transportation Conformity – The transportation conformity rule requires that State and local agencies establish formal procedures to ensure interagency coordination on critical transportation conformity issues. Nonattainment and maintenance areas have adopted consultation procedures to meet these requirements. These procedures are federally enforceable and must be followed for each conformity determination.

Additional guidance regarding federally required consultation with resource agencies during the RTP development process is available in Section 5.2 Federal Environmental Requirements.

### **Requirements (Shalls)**

**Federal:** Title 23 CFR part 450.324(g)(1) & (g)(2) requires that the MPO shall consult, as appropriate, with State and local agencies responsible for land use management, natural resources, environmental protection, conservation, and historic preservation concerning the development of the transportation plan. The consultation shall involve, as appropriate: (1) Comparison of transportation plans with State conservation plans or maps, if available; or (2) Comparison of transportation plans to inventories of natural or historic resources, if available. In addition, the discussion of mitigation activities required by 23 CFR 450.324(f)(10) (and described more fully in Section 5.2) shall be developed in consultation with Federal, State, and Tribal land management, and regulatory agencies. 23 CFR 93.105 for interagency consultation for transportation conformity.

**State:** California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), consultation with agencies, governments or individuals that could potentially be impacted by transportation projects in the RTP. Government Code Section 65080(b)(2)(B)(v) requires that MPOs develop a SCS (which is part of the RTP) that shall gather and consider the best practically available scientific information regarding “resource areas” and “farmland” as defined in subdivisions (a) and (b) of Government Code Section 65080.01.

**Planning Practice Examples:** Available in Appendix L

## **4.11 Coordinated Public Transit/Human Services Transportation Plans**

The aim of the Coordinated Public Transit/Human Services Transportation Plan is to improve transportation services for persons with disabilities, older adults and individuals with lower incomes by ensuring that communities coordinate the available transit resources. Coordination enhances transportation access, minimizes duplication of services and facilitates the most appropriate cost-effective transportation system possible with available resources.

Federal transit law requires that projects selected for funding under the following FTA programs be derived from a coordinated plan: Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities Program (Title 49 U.S.C. Section 5310). Information on this program can be found at:

<http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/MassTrans>

MPOs are not required to be the lead agency in the development of the coordinated plan. Federal guidance states that the coordinated plan may be developed separately or as a part of the metropolitan transportation planning process. In any case, MPOs should ensure that the

plan is coordinated and consistent with their regions' metropolitan transportation planning process.

The coordinated plan must be developed through a process that includes representatives of public, private, and non-profit transportation and human services providers and participation by members of the public. The public participation requirements may be shared with those for the development of the RTP.

As with all FTA programs, transit projects selected for funding must be consistent with the RTP and FTIP. Further, the annual list of obligated projects is a planning requirement that will necessitate active involvement by the MPO in those programs.

**Recommendations (Shoulds)**

**Federal:** Title 23 CFR Part 450.306(h) states the regional planning process should be coordinated and consistent with the preparation of the coordinated public transit-human services transportation plan as required by Title 49 U.S.C. Section 5310.

# Chapter 5

## RTP Environmental Considerations

Page Left Intentionally Blank

## **RTP ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS**

### **5.0 Introduction**

This section will briefly discuss the context for environmental requirements, options for RTP environmental document preparation, federal requirements and recommendations outlined in the Statewide and Nonmetropolitan Transportation Planning *and* Metropolitan Transportation Planning Final Rule (FHWA/FTA Planning Final Rule), key resource areas for avoidance and mitigation and finally, a description of air quality and transportation conformity will be provided.

The federal government has shown its commitment to the environment through the passage of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) in 1969, which requires federal agencies to consider the environmental impacts of their actions. In a similar vein, California passed the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) in 1970, which was designed to ensure that public agencies consider the environmental impacts of their decisions.

In California, the environmental review associated with the RTP and the subsequent project delivery process is two-fold. MPOs are responsible for the planning contained in the RTP that precedes project delivery. Typically a local government, consultant or Caltrans is responsible for the actual construction of the project i.e. project delivery. CEQA applies to the planning document (RTP) while both NEPA and CEQA may apply to the individual projects that implement the RTP during the project delivery process. Likewise, all RTP CEQA Analysis and subsequent transportation project CEQA analysis assess all environmental issue areas identified in the CEQA Guidelines Environmental Checklist Form, Appendix G.

A change to transportation analysis in environmental review under CEQA occurred with the Governor's approval of SB 743 which requires an update in the metrics of transportation impact used in CEQA from Level of Service and vehicle delay to one that promotes the reduction of GHGs, the development of multimodal transportation networks, and a diversity of land uses for transit priority areas. Except any of the events specified in Public Resources Code Section 21166, a residential, employment center, or mixed-use development project, including a subdivision or any zoning change is exempted from SB 743 requirements if the project is (a) within a transit priority area; (b) to implement and consistent with a specific plan for which an EIR has been certified; (c) consistent with the general use designation, density, building intensity, and applicable policies specified for the project area in an ARB-accepted SCS/APS (Public Resources Code Sections 21155.4 and 21099; Government Code Section 65080). Per ARB Vision Model results, reductions in VMT growth and widespread transportation electrification are needed to achieve sufficient GHG emissions reduction for climate stabilization, as reflected in executive orders on 2030 and 2050 GHG targets. The regulatory language (CEQA Guidelines changes) to implement the law are pending, though VMT has been identified by the Governor's Office as a potential metric to determine significant impacts. A future update of the RTP Guidelines will capture any "shoulds" or "shall" resulting from the formal rulemaking process. Lead agencies should refer to current CEQA statutes, regulations, and case law when performing CEQA analysis for their RTPs/SCSs.

Given that protection of the environment is an important public policy goal and it is an important aspect of public acceptance during project delivery, best regional planning practices would seek to plan and implement transportation projects that would avoid or minimize environmental impacts.



## **5.1 Environmental Documentation**

The RTP planning document as well as the projects listed in it are considered to be projects for the purposes of CEQA. Subsequent RTP amendments or updates are discretionary actions that can also trigger CEQA compliance. As defined in CEQA statute section 21065, a project means “an activity which may cause either a direct physical change in the environment, or a reasonably foreseeable indirect physical change in the environment, and which is any of the following: (a) An activity directly undertaken by any public agency or (b) An activity undertaken by a person which is supported, in whole or in part, through contracts, grants, subsidies, loans, or other forms of assistance from one or more public agencies”.

To initiate CEQA compliance, the MPO as the lead agency determines if the proposed action is a project and whether the project is statutorily or categorically exempt. If the project is not exempt from CEQA, an Initial Study or equivalent environmental assessment is completed. Based on the outcome of the Initial Study the appropriate type of environmental document is then prepared. The Initial Study can indicate the use of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR), a Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) or a Negative Declaration (ND). Additionally, there are several types of EIRs such as a Master EIR, a Project EIR or a Program EIR. Information regarding the CEQA process and guidelines for implementation can be found at:

[www.opr.ca.gov](http://www.opr.ca.gov)

<http://opr.ca.gov/index.php?a=ceqa/index.html>

<http://resources.ca.gov/ceqa/>

<http://www.califaep.org/policy>

<http://aq.ca.gov/globalwarming/ceqa.php>

California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA) White Paper on CEQA and Green House Gases:

<http://www.capcoa.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/03/CAPCOA-White-Paper.pdf>

### **Program EIR**

Many MPOs prepare a Program Environmental Impact Report (PIER) to analyze the environmental impacts of implementing their RTP. The purpose of the PEIR is to enable the MPO to examine the overall effects of the RTP i.e. broad policy alternatives, program wide mitigation, growth inducing impacts and cumulative impacts can be considered at a time when the agency has greater flexibility to avoid unnecessary adverse environmental effects. The PEIR is a device that was originally developed by federal agencies under NEPA. The County of Inyo v. Yorty court case established its use under CEQA.

Additionally, environmental documents subsequently prepared for the individual projects contained in the RTP can be tiered off of the PEIR thus saving time and reducing duplicative analysis. Tiering refers to environmental review of sequential actions, where general matters and environmental effects are examined in a broad EIR for a decision such as adoption of a policy, plan, program, or ordinance, and subsequent narrower or site-specific EIRs are prepared that incorporate by reference the prior EIR and concentrate on environmental effects that can be mitigated or that were not analyzed in the prior EIR. In such instances, the later narrow EIR “tiers” off the prior broad EIR. If a project-specific EIR tiers off from a broader prior EIR such as the PEIR prepared for a RTP, it could help eliminate repetitive discussions of the same environmental issues; facilitate project-level impact analysis by focusing on issues specific to

the later project; reduce the burdens from duplicative reconsiderations of a program, plan or policy with a certified EIR; and, reduce CEQA delay and paperwork at project level. (See Appendix J Glossary for a definition of 'tiering')

## **Changes to the RTP/FTIP**

When the MPO modifies its RTP/FTIP, it must determine whether the proposed changes have the potential to impact the environment and trigger CEQA review. As a lead agency under CEQA, it is the responsibility of each MPO to analyze the potential environmental affects that proposed changes of their RTP may have on the environment. This should be done by providing substantial evidence that proposed changes to the RTP would be "minor" or "technical" in nature, if there would be "new" or "more severe" significant environmental impacts, if "circumstances" of the project or "new environmental information" is discovered, or if "substantial" or "major changes" to the RTP are proposed. An abbreviated or focused type of CEQA document will usually suffice. The most common alternatives to an EIR, MND or ND are an Addendum, a Supplement, or a Subsequent environmental document.

## **Addendum**

An Addendum may be prepared when minor technical changes or additions are made to the RTP. The Addendum makes the prior EIR, MND or ND adequate when the proposed changes to the RTP do not create any new or substantially more severe significant environmental impacts. An addendum does not require public circulation.

## **Supplement**

A Supplement to the EIR need contain only the information necessary to make the previous EIR adequate for the project as revised. The supplement only needs to meet the circulation and public review requirements of a *draft* EIR.

## **Subsequent**

A Subsequent EIR, MND or ND is used when there are substantial or major changes in the project, in the circumstances of the project or when new environmental information is discovered. A subsequent EIR, MND or ND is intended to be a complete environmental document and it requires the same full level of circulation and public review as the previous EIR, MND or ND.

## **NEPAs Applicability to the RTP**

NEPA does not apply to the RTP. In the *Atlanta Coalition on the Transportation Crisis, Inc. v. Atlanta Regional Commission*, 559 F.2d 1333 (5<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1979) court case, federal judges found that "Congress did not intend NEPA to apply to state, local or private actions..." The courts recognized the development of the RTP and TIP as a matter of state and local sovereignty.

However, NEPA review does apply to the individual projects identified in the RTP during the project delivery process when the individual projects are federally funded and/or a federal approval is required (e.g. a permit for wetlands impacts). When NEPA review is required, implementing agencies should reference the Federal Council on Environmental Quality's (CEQ) memorandum published on August 1, 2016 entitled, *Final Guidance for Federal Departments 2017 RTP Guidelines for MPOs*

and Agencies on Consideration of Greenhouse Gas Emissions and the Effects of Climate Change in NEPA reviews. Section 6.28 provides further guidance for GHG reduction and Section 6.30 provides guidance for addressing adaption of the regional transportation system to climate change. The full CEQ guidance is available at:

[https://ceq.doe.gov/current\\_developments/ceq\\_guidance\\_nepa-ghg-climate\\_final\\_guidance.html](https://ceq.doe.gov/current_developments/ceq_guidance_nepa-ghg-climate_final_guidance.html).

#### **Requirements (Shall)**

**State:** Public Resources Code 21000 et seq, Environmental Protection, and CEQA guidelines section 15000 et seq.

## **5.2 FHWA/FTA Planning Final Rule – Federal Environmental Requirements**

Federal requirements are intended to enhance the consideration of environmental issues in the transportation planning process. Pursuant to Title 23 CFR Part 450.324, the RTP must provide a discussion of potential environmental mitigation activities and areas, including those mitigation activities that might maintain or restore the environment that is affected by the plan. This mitigation discussion must happen in consultation with Federal, State and Tribal land management and wildlife regulatory agencies. Additionally, federal regulations contain a planning process mandate that requires the MPO to compare the RTP with available state conservation plans or maps and inventories of natural or historic resources. This comparison is facilitated by the requirement to “consult as appropriate with state and local agencies responsible for land use management, natural resources, environmental protection, conservation and historic preservation”. For additional information related to consultation with resource agencies on regional mitigation activities, see Section 4.10.

#### **Requirements (Shall)**

##### **Federal:**

##### **Title 23 CFR Part 450.324(f)(10):**

Requires that the RTP shall include a discussion of types of potential environmental mitigation activities and potential areas to carry out these activities, including activities that may have the greatest potential to restore and maintain the environmental functions affected by the metropolitan transportation plan. The discussion shall be developed in consultation with Federal, State, and Tribal land management, wildlife, and regulatory agencies.

##### **Title 23 CFR Part 450.324(g)(1) and (2):**

Requires that the MPO shall consult, as appropriate, with State and local agencies responsible for land use management, natural resources, environmental protection, conservation, and historic preservation concerning the development of the transportation plan. The consultation shall involve, as appropriate: (1) Comparison of transportation plans with State conservation plans or maps, if available; or (2) Comparison of transportation plans to inventories of natural or historic resources, if available.

##### **Title 23 CFR Part 450.306(b)(5):**

Requires that the metropolitan transportation planning process shall be continuous, cooperative, and comprehensive, and provide for consideration and implementation of projects, strategies, and services that will address the following factors: Protect and enhance the environment, promote energy conservation, improve the quality of life, and promote consistency between transportation improvements and State and local planned growth and economic development

patterns. See Section 5.4 for key resource areas for avoidance and mitigation as well as planning practice examples in Appendix L.

**Planning Practice Examples:** Available in Appendix L

### **5.3 FHWA/FTA Planning Final Rule – Federal Environmental Recommendations**

#### **Appendix A - Linking the Transportation Planning and NEPA processes**

Appendix A of Title 23 CFR Part 450 encourages environmental information developed during the transportation planning process to be applied to the project delivery process. The goal is to make planning decisions more sustainable and to maximize the effectiveness of mitigation strategies. Appendix A is optional. It provides details on how the information and analysis from the RTP can be incorporated into and relied upon in the NEPA documents prepared for the individual projects that will implement the RTP in the future. Appendix A presents environmental review as a continuum of sequential study, refinement, and expansion of information. The actual text of Appendix A to Title 23 CFR Part 450 is contained in Appendix D of this document. More guidance is available in Appendix E, which addresses the legal aspects of integrating planning and project delivery. Implementation of the strategies contained in Appendix A of Title 23 CFR Part 450 is a state of the art practice.

#### **Recommendations (Shoulds)**

**Federal:** Title 23 CFR Part 450.318 and Appendix A to Part 450 “Linking Planning and NEPA” describes the steps for streamlining the project delivery process by providing environmental information in the RTP.

#### **Programmatic Mitigation**

Recently updated federal regulations governing the development of metropolitan transportation plans include an updated section on programmatic mitigation. In particular, Title 23 CFR Sections 450.214 (State) and 450.320 (MPO), on the development of programmatic mitigation plans, indicate that “a State/MPO may utilize the optional framework to develop programmatic mitigation plans as part of the statewide transportation planning process to address the potential environmental impacts of future transportation projects.” The FHWA supports an ecological approach to planning infrastructure and transportation projects and provides guidance on establishing a Regional Ecological Framework (REF). *Eco-logical* is a nine-step, voluntary framework that identifies an ecosystem approach to developing infrastructure projects. It outlines a framework for partners to integrate their planning processes, share data, and prioritize areas of ecological significance in order to harmonize economic, environmental, and social needs and objectives. Regionally significant resources like fish passage, terrestrial and aquatic habitat connectivity, migration corridors, and coastal trails can be incorporated into the regional transportation planning process. In addition, regional and local planning stakeholders can coordinate on mitigation strategies and conservation priorities as part of the regional transportation planning process. If the region elects to include the preparation of a REF or programmatic mitigation plan as part of the Regional Transportation Plan update, the region can notify other stakeholders to allow for a more collaborative partnering and planning effort. This environmental review toolkit is available at:

<https://www.environment.fhwa.dot.gov/ecological/ImplementingEcoLogicalApproach/>.

## **5.4 Key Resource Areas for Avoidance and Mitigation**

Taking these environmental resources and laws into account during the transportation planning process can expedite the delivery of the projects that are contained in the RTP. The transportation planning process and the NEPA environmental analysis required during project delivery can work in tandem with the results of the transportation planning process informing the NEPA process. The RTP can identify plan-level environmental constraints and consider potential impacts that could allow projects in the plan to be modified to avoid or minimize impacts. Additional information regarding environmental planning considerations can be found in Section 2.7 and Appendix L. For a more in-depth discussion of potential environmental impact and resource areas, please see Volume 1 of the Standard Environmental Reference at:

<http://www.dot.ca.gov/ser/vol1/vol1.htm>

During project delivery SAFETEA-LU Section 6002 (23 U.S.C. Section 139, Efficient Environmental Reviews for Project Decision-making) set forth a new environmental review process. MAP-21/FAST Act made revisions to 23 U.S.C. 139 although the revisions are minor. The first step under Efficient Environmental Reviews for Project Decision-making is to initiate the environmental review process by notifying FHWA's Secretary of the type of work, termini, length, general location of the project, and a listing of anticipated federal permits. One means of initiating the process is to include the required information in the discussion of each EIS-level project that is contained in the RTP. The resource areas of concern are enumerated below.

### **Wetlands**

Wetlands and other waters are protected under a number of laws and regulations, including the federal Clean Water Act, federal Executive Order for the Protection of Wetlands (E.O. 11990), and state Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act and parts of the state Fish and Wildlife Code. Section 404 of the Clean Water Act establishes a permit program that prohibits any discharge of dredged or fill material into wetlands or other "waters of the United States" if a practicable alternative exists that is less damaging to the aquatic environment or if the nation's waters would be significantly degraded. The Section 404 permit program is run by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE) with oversight by the U.S. EPA.

The Executive Order for the Protection of Wetlands (EO 11990) states that a federal agency, such as the FHWA, cannot undertake or provide assistance for new construction located in wetlands unless the head of the agency finds that there is no practicable alternative to the construction and the proposed project includes all practicable measures to minimize harm. Strategic retreat or relocation shall be one alternative to be considered.

At the state level, primarily the Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) and the Regional Water Quality Control Boards (RWQCB) regulate wetlands and waters. (In certain circumstances, the California Coastal Commission or Bay Conservation and Development Commission may also be involved.) Impacts on wetlands, lakes, streams or rivers may require a Lake or Streambed Alteration agreement with CDFW. The RWQCB issues water quality certifications in compliance with Section 401 of the Clean Water Act.

## **Parks, Refuges, Historic Sites**

Section 4(f) of the DOT Act (Title 49 U.S.C. Section 303) states that FHWA and FTA may not approve the use of land from a significant publicly-owned park, recreation area, wildlife and waterfowl refuge, or any significant historic site unless a determination is made that there is no other feasible and prudent alternative to the use of that land. Section 4(f) evaluations require the development of an avoidance alternative, however, if no feasible choices exist, extensive planning must be done to minimize harm to the property resulting from such use.

<http://www.parks.ca.gov/>

## **Cultural Resources**

Cultural Resources are protected under a number of laws and regulations, including the National Historic Preservation Act (Section 106) and CEQA and the California Public Resources Code (PRC) 5024 et seq. Under Section 106 of the NHPA, federal agencies are mandated to take into account the effect of federal undertakings on historic properties affected by federally funded or federally approved undertakings. If avoidance is not an option, then minimization of impacts and mitigation of the effects are required. Under CEQA, a project which may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource would require mitigation of the project effects by the project's lead CEQA agency.

## **California Coastal Trail (CCT)**

The CCT is a state-mandated trail system pursuant to the passage of SB 908 in 2001. AB 1396 in 2007 added Section 65080.1 to the Government Code, which mandates that provision for the CCT be provided in each RTP for those MPOs located along the coast. More information and guidance relative to the CCT can be found in Section 6.11 and at:

<http://www.scc.ca.gov/>

[www.coastal.ca.gov](http://www.coastal.ca.gov)

[http://www.scc.ca.gov/webmaster/pdfs/CCT\\_Siting\\_Design.pdf](http://www.scc.ca.gov/webmaster/pdfs/CCT_Siting_Design.pdf)

## **Floodplains**

Executive Order 11988 (Floodplain Management) directs all federal agencies to refrain from conducting, supporting, or allowing actions in floodplains unless it is the only practicable alternative.

## **Threatened and Endangered Species**

The primary federal law protecting threatened and endangered species is the federal Endangered Species Act (ESA) (Title 16 U.S.C. Section 1531 et seq.). This act provides for the conservation of endangered and threatened species and the ecosystems upon which they depend. Under Section 7 of this act, federal agencies, such as the FHWA, are required to consult with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and the National Marine Fisheries

Service (NOAA Fisheries) to ensure that they are not taking actions likely to jeopardize the continued existence of listed species or destroy or adversely modify critical habitat.

California has enacted a similar law at the state level, the California Endangered Species Act (CESA) (Fish and Game Code, 2050, et seq.). CESA emphasizes early consultation to avoid potential impacts to rare, endangered, and threatened species and to develop appropriate planning to offset project caused losses of listed species populations and their essential habitats.

<http://www.dfg.ca.gov/>

<http://bios.dfg.ca.gov/>

## **Cumulative Impacts**

As defined in CEQA, cumulative impacts refer to “two or more individual impacts that, when considered together, are considerable or that compound or increase other environmental impacts”. Because the RTP addresses long-range future transportation improvements, cumulative impacts are inherent and need to be fully discussed within the environmental document. Guidance on preparing cumulative impact analysis is available at:

[http://www.dot.ca.gov/ser/cumulative\\_guidance/approach.htm](http://www.dot.ca.gov/ser/cumulative_guidance/approach.htm).

## **Habitat Connectivity**

Section 1797.5 of the California Fish and Game Code expresses the State’s policy to promote the voluntary protection of wildlife corridors and habitat strongholds in order to enhance the resiliency of wildlife and their habitats to climate change, protect biodiversity, and allow for the migration and movement of species by providing connectivity between habitat lands. In order to further these goals, it is the policy of the State to encourage voluntary steps to protect the functioning of wildlife corridors through various means, such as the acquisition or protection of wildlife corridors as open space through conservation easements; the installation of wildlife-friendly or directional fencing; siting of mitigation and conservation banks in areas that provide habitat connectivity for affected fish and wildlife resources; and the provision of roadway undercrossings, overpasses, oversized culverts, or bridges to allow for fish passage and the movement of wildlife between habitat areas. Transportation facilities should be designed, engineered, planned, and programmed with habitat connectivity in mind in keeping with these State goals in order to maintain healthy ecological function and climate change resiliency in and between habitat areas.

AB 2087 (Chapter 455, Statutes of 2016) established a conservation planning tool called a Regional Conservation Investment Strategy to promote the conservation of species, habitats and other natural resources and enable advance mitigation for public infrastructure projects, including transportation. An RCIS provides a non-regulatory assessment and analysis of conservation needs in a region including habitat connectivity and climate resilience. Transportation agencies can use an approved RCIS to secure mitigation credit for conservation investments consistent with the RCIS.

Below are tools that can help speed along habitat corridor projects in a cost-effective way during the initial phases of project planning and design:



California Water Action Plan: 2016 Update:

[http://resources.ca.gov/docs/california\\_water\\_action\\_plan/Final\\_California\\_Water\\_Action\\_Plan.pdf](http://resources.ca.gov/docs/california_water_action_plan/Final_California_Water_Action_Plan.pdf)

California Essential Habitat Connectivity Project:

<https://www.wildlife.ca.gov/conservation/planning/connectivity/CEHC>

Western Governors Association's Crucial Habitat Assessment Tool:

<http://www.wafwachat.org/map>

California State Wildlife Action Plan: <https://www.wildlife.ca.gov/SWAP/Final>

## **Growth-Related Indirect Impacts**

Growth-related indirect impacts are those impacts associated with a project or plan that would encourage or facilitate development or would change the location, rate, or type, or amount of growth. RTPs typically contain proposed actions that will be built along a new alignment and/or provide new access and those are the types of projects that will typically require a growth-related impact analysis. Where such impacts are identified, appropriate and reasonable steps to avoid or minimize indirect impacts can be considered early in the process, and incorporated into the RTP and its associated environmental document. Additional guidance on growth-related indirect impacts is available at:

[www.dot.ca.gov/ser/Growth-related\\_IndirectImpactAnalysis/gri\\_guidance.htm](http://www.dot.ca.gov/ser/Growth-related_IndirectImpactAnalysis/gri_guidance.htm)

## **Air Quality Impacts**

The Clean Air Act as amended in 1990 is the primary federal law that governs air quality. This law mandates the U.S. EPA to establish national air quality standards. The U.S. EPA must review the standards every five years and revise them as necessary to protect public health and welfare. RTPs for MPOs in nonattainment/maintenance areas are required to show compliance with the federal Clean Air Act through the transportation conformity process.

There is a California Clean Air Act in the Health and Safety Code that is generally similar in concept to the Federal Clean Air Act. Under the California Clean Air Act, the California Air Resources Board sets and updates State air quality standards. The California Clean Air Act requires attainment as expeditiously as practicable, but does not require RTPs to demonstrate conformity like the federal Clean Air Act.

Reducing emissions is critical to achieving improved health outcomes and meeting air quality standards. The regional planning process provides an excellent forum to promote measures to improve health and reduce emissions. When practicable, RTPs may discuss the public health impact associated with the operations of on-road passenger and freight vehicles, and seek to promote the implementation of the lowest emission technologies available to provide the needed utility for a proposed transportation network.

## **Requirements (Shalls)**

**Federal:** Title 23 CFR Part 450.306(b)(5) requires that the metropolitan planning process addresses protection and enhancement of the environment, among other planning factors



**State:** Government Code Section 65080(b)(2)(B)(v) requires that MPOs develop a sustainable communities strategy (which is part of the RTP) that shall gather and consider the best practically available scientific information regarding resource areas and farmland in the region as defined in subdivisions (a) and (b) of Government Code Section 65080.01.

**Recommendations (Shoulds)**

**Federal:** Title 23 CFR 450.318 and Appendix A to Part 450 “Linking Planning and NEPA” describe the steps for streamlining the project delivery process by providing environmental information in the RTP.

**Planning Practice Examples:** Available in Appendix L

## **5.5 Project Intent Statements/Plan Level Purpose & Need Statements**

The 2003 RTP Guidelines Supplement referred to “**Project Intent Statements**” which were defined as **Plan Level Statements of Purpose and Need**. A Plan Level Statement of Purpose and Need is a short statement, which serves as a justification for a project or a group of projects. These brief plan level justifications would be contained in the RTP. An example of a Plan Level Statement of Purpose and Need would be the problem of reducing congestion on a specific route. The Plan Level Statements of Purpose and Need briefly identify the transportation needs or problems and describe the intended outcome of the project(s) that would meet these needs or solve the identified problems.

A more detailed, project specific **Project level Purpose and Need Statement** is written during the project delivery process and is contained in the project initiation document (Project Study Report) and the subsequent environmental document.

MPOs may wish to prepare Plan Level Statements of Purpose and Need during the development of the RTP for the following reasons:

1. To provide justification for the lead agency’s projects in the RTIP
2. To justify expenditure of transportation funds to the public and the CTC
3. During project selection, to provide the rationale for selecting specific projects over other projects
4. To provide the foundation for Project Level Purpose and Need information in the environmental documents.
5. To provide consistent project justification from planning through project Implementation.

**Recommendations (Shoulds)**

**State:** The 2003 RTP Guidelines Supplement states that the RTP should include a project justification that identifies the specific need for the project and describes how these needs or problems will be addressed.

**Planning Practice Examples:** Available in Appendix L

## **5.6 Air Quality & Transportation Conformity**


### **Federal and State Clean Air Act**

The Clean Air Act as amended in 1990 is the primary federal law that governs air quality. This law mandates the U.S. EPA to establish the standards for the concentrations of pollutants that can be in the air. The U.S. EPA must review the standards every five years and revise them as necessary to protect public health and welfare. These standards are called National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS). Standards have been established for six criteria pollutants that have been linked to health concerns; the criteria pollutants are: carbon monoxide (CO), nitrogen dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>), ozone (O<sub>3</sub>), particulate matter (PM), lead (Pb), and sulfur dioxide (SO<sub>2</sub>). The State Implementation Plan (SIP) is the statewide plan for achieving the goals of the Clean Air Act and describes how the NAAQS will be met. The SIP has both statewide and regional components. The California Air Resources Board is responsible for submitting the SIP to the U.S. EPA, and for developing and implementing statewide control measures such as those related to on-road mobile sources (vehicle emission controls). Local air pollution control and air quality management districts (APCD or AQMD) are responsible for regional control measures, which may also include measures that affect mobile sources (e.g., fleet rules, indirect source review requirements).

There is a California Clean Air Act in the Health and Safety Code that is generally similar in concept to the Federal Clean Air Act. Under the California Clean Air Act, the California Air Resources Board sets and updates State air quality standards. The State air quality standards are usually more stringent than the Federal, but the State air quality planning structure does not include the fixed attainment deadlines and conformity process found in the Federal program.

APCD or AQMD perform regional air quality planning in consultation with the MPO, including development of on-road mobile source emission budgets that are part of the SIP required by the Federal Clean Air Act. APCDs and AQMDs are the main implementation agencies for stationary source emission control programs.

The U.S. EPA designates an area as “attainment” if the area meets the NAAQS mandated by the Clean Air Act. If the area does not meet the NAAQS, it is designated as a nonattainment area. The area must then submit an attainment plan showing how the area will meet the NAAQS. Once a nonattainment area attains a NAAQS, the area may develop a maintenance SIP and submit a re-designation request, the U.S. EPA can re-designate the area as a “maintenance” area. The shaded areas on the map below illustrate the areas of the State that have not attained, or have attained with a maintenance SIP, the NAAQS. All of California except Lake County fails to attain one or more of the State ambient air quality standards.



## **SIP Transportation Conformity Requirement**

Transportation conformity is required by section 176(c) of the 1990 Federal Clean Air Act. Transportation conformity to a SIP means that on-road transportation activities will not produce new air quality violations, worsen existing violations, or delay timely attainment of the NAAQS. In nonattainment and maintenance areas, federal regulations require that RTPs, FTIPs and Federally funded or approved highway and transit activities demonstrate transportation conformity. Under the 1990 Federal Clean Air Act Amendments, the U.S. DOT cannot fund, authorize, or approve Federal actions to support programs or projects that are not first found to conform to the SIP (Clean Air Act Section 176 (c), codified in 42 U.S.C. 7506(c)). The U.S. EPA has issued extensive regulations covering how conformity is determined for transportation planning, programming, and projects in 40 CFR 93 Subpart A. Under the EPA regulations, the RTP's regional transportation conformity analysis must include all regionally significant transportation (road and transit) activities regardless of funding source.

### **RTP Conformity**

Transportation conformity is intended to ensure that Federal funding and approval are given to those transportation activities that support the purpose and goals of the SIP. Conformity ensures that these transportation activities do not degrade air quality and that they support attainment of the NAAQS. The MPO and the U.S. DOT (FHWA/FTA) have a responsibility to ensure that the RTP conforms to the SIP.

Transportation conformity requirements apply to all U.S. EPA designated nonattainment and maintenance areas. When areas are designated as nonattainment for the first time, or for a new NAAQS, a conformity determination must be made within one year of the effective date of the designation. RTP and FTIP amendments, Federal project approvals and Federal funding are all contingent upon the conformity determination that shows that the total emissions projected in the RTP and FTIP are within the motor vehicle emission limits or 'budgets' established in the SIP. Before budgets are established in the SIP, "interim" emission tests are also available. The conformity regulations also contain specific requirements for fiscal constraint and assumptions to be used in the emissions analysis.

No new transportation conformity requirements were created by MAP-21/FAST Act. However, previous requirements were modified to shorten or lengthen the time period for conformity determinations and re-determinations, to add or substitute transportation control measures (TCMs) in an approved SIP, and to adjust the frequency of conformity determinations. The Clean Air Act section 176(c) (42 U.S.C. 7506(c)) was amended, and U.S. EPA regulations at 40 CFR 93 Subpart A have been amended to conform to the Clean Air Act changes, as noted below.

RTPs are subject to regional conformity, while RTP projects not exempt from conformity are subject to project level conformity. Project cost, scope, and schedule must be consistent with the RTP. MPOs are encouraged to work closely with project sponsors to ensure no project delivery delays result from development of project level conformity determinations.

For more detailed information about transportation conformity please see the following key websites:

<http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/env/air/index.htm>

<http://www.epa.gov/otaq/stateresources/transconf/index.htm>

**Requirements (Shalls):**

**Federal:** RTPs prepared by MPOs in areas subject to transportation conformity requirements shall meet the requirements of Title 42 U.S.C. Section 7506(c) and Title 40 CFR Part 93 Subpart A regarding transportation conformity. All of the specific conformity requirements are listed in CFR Section 93.100-129 and apply to all nonattainment and maintenance areas.

Title 40 CFR Part 93.104(b)(3) and (c)(3) sets the required frequency of transportation conformity determinations for RTPs and FTIPs at four years; Title 42 U.S.C. Section 7506(c)(2)(E) and Title 40 CFR Part 93.104(e) provide two years to determine conformity after new SIP motor vehicle emissions budgets are either found adequate, approved or promulgated; Title 42 U.S.C. Section 7506(c)(9) adds a one-year grace period before the consequences of a conformity lapse apply; Title 42 U.S.C. Section 7506(c)(4)(e) and Title 40 CFR Part 93.105 streamline requirements for conformity SIPs; and, Title 42 U.S.C. Section 7506(c)(8), Title 40 CFR Part 93.113, and EPA's policy January 2009 guidance (EPA420-B-09-002) identify procedures for areas to use in substituting or adding transportation control measures (TCMs) to approved SIPs.

**Transportation Control Measures**

The RTP shall discuss ways in which activities in the plan will conform to the SIP, including TCM implementation. To achieve consistency between the RTP and the SIP, all TCMs identified in the SIP and approved by U.S. EPA must be identified in the RTP by MPOs in areas subject to conformity requirements (Title 40 CFR Part 93.113).

The conformity analysis prepared for the RTP shall describe both completed TCMs and TCMs that are underway. TCMs that are included in the SIP must be implemented in a timely fashion. Implementation of the TCMs must be coordinated with the SIP implementation schedule. When there is a delay in TCM implementation, the conformity analysis document must describe the measure and the steps that the MPO is taking to address the delay. TCM projects must receive priority for funding.

**Interagency Consultation**

There is a formal interagency consultation requirement in areas subject to conformity requirements; see Title 40 CFR Parts 93.105 and 93.112. Consultation for key decisions related to the conformity analysis (and to many individual projects in areas subject to conformity because of particulate matter NAAQS nonattainment or maintenance) must include FHWA, FTA, U.S. EPA, ARB, Caltrans, the MPO, and local transit providers. The air pollution control/air quality management districts(s) shall also be included. Identifying the consultation partners and defining the form of local consultation procedures is the core of the "Conformity SIP" required by Title 40 CFR Part 51.390.

**State:** None. There is no conformity process in the California Clean Air Act. However, air quality is normally addressed as part of the CEQA environmental documentation for the RTP.

**Recommendations (Shoulds)**

**Federal:** Title 42 U.S.C. Section 7506(c)(7)(A) and Title 40 CFR Part 93.106 provide an option for reducing the time period addressed by conformity determinations. Normally, a regional

conformity analysis must cover at least 20 years, but under certain circumstances the time period covered may be reduced to not less than 10 years.

**Planning Practice Examples:** Available in Appendix L

## **5.7 Analysis of GHGs & Achievement of SB 375 GHG Targets**

Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21083.05 and Sections 15064 and 15064.4 of the California Code of Regulations, the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines require analysis of the potential direct, indirect, and cumulative greenhouse (GHG) emissions impacts and mitigation of any significant impacts. California Government Code Section 65080 requires that an MPO demonstrate that its SCS would, if implemented, achieve the GHG reduction targets set by ARB. These targets are established for each MPO region, for the years 2020 and 2035. MPOs are required to submit their final SCSs and quantification of the GHG emissions reductions to ARB for review and concurrence with the MPO's determination. If the SCS would not achieve the targets, then the MPO must prepare and adopt an Alternative Planning Strategy, describing the obstacles to achievement of the targets and alternative measures that would need to be taken to achieve the targets. Integration of climate change policies in the RTP coupled with analysis of climate impacts, and mitigation of significant impacts identified in the environmental document, supports the statewide effort to reduce GHG emissions and combat the effects of climate change. Additional information regarding state goals and policies relating to climate change is available in Section 2.2.

Page Left Intentionally Blank

# Chapter 6

## RTP Contents



Page Left Intentionally Blank

# **RTP CONTENTS**

## **6.1 Summary of RTP Components**

The development of the RTP is based on state and federal statutory and regulatory requirements in addition to CTC policy direction. As per Government Code 65080, each MPO shall prepare and adopt an RTP directed at achieving a coordinated and balanced regional transportation system including, but not limited to, mass transportation, highway, railroad, maritime, bicycle, pedestrian, goods movement and aviation. In addition, the RTP shall be action oriented and pragmatic, considering both short-term (0-10 years) and long-term (10-20 years) periods. The RTP shall be an internally consistent document and shall include all of the following:

### **The Policy Element**

The purpose of the Policy Element is to identify legislative, planning, financial and institutional issues and requirements, as well as any areas of regional consensus. Consider referring to the CTP policy framework which provides goals and policies that can help with development of policies and strategies at the most regional level. The Policy Element presents guidance to decision-makers of the implications, impacts, opportunities, and foreclosed options that will result from implementation of the RTP. Moreover, the Policy Element is a resource for providing input and promoting consistency of action among state, regional and local agencies including; transit agencies, congestion management agencies, employment development departments, the California Highway Patrol, private and public groups, tribal governments, etc. California statutes state that each RTP shall (Government Code Section 65080 (b)) include a Policy Element that:

1. Describes the transportation issues in the region;
2. Identifies and quantifies regional needs expressed within both short and long-range planning horizons (Government Code Section 65080 (b)(1)); and,
3. Maintains internal consistency with the Financial Element and fund estimates.

State law requires that the objectives shall (Government Code Section 65080 (b)(1)) be linked to short-range and long-range transportation implementation goals or horizons. Each objective should be consistent with the needs identified in the RTP as a means of strengthening the linkage between statewide system planning and ultimate project implementation. The RTP shall consider factors specified in Section 134 of Title 23 of the United States Code.

The Policy Element should clearly convey the region's transportation policies and supportive strategies and related land use forecast assumptions. These land-use assumptions take into account the latest planning documents and associated policies of the local jurisdictions. As part of this Element, the discussion should: (1) relay how these policies were developed, (2) identify any significant changes in the policies from the previous plans and (3) provide the reason for any changes in policies from previous plans. The Policy Element should clearly describe the SCS strategies, including land use, transportation, and other measure intended to reduce per capita GHG emissions from passenger vehicles. It should also explain how the financial commitments are consistent with and support the land use pattern and personal mobility objectives of the RTP.

Although not required by law, MPOs should identify a set of indicators that will be used to assess the performance of the RTP. In addition, the RTP should identify the criteria that the MPO or RTPA/County Transportation Commission used to select the transportation projects on the constrained and unconstrained project lists. More information for performance measurement is available in Chapter 7.

### **The Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS)**

The second component of the RTP (for MPOs only) is a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS), as required by Government Code Section 65080(b)(2)(B). The SCS is statutorily required to:

1. Identify the general location of uses, residential densities, and building intensities within the region.
2. Identify areas within the region sufficient to house all the population of the region, including all economic segments of the population over the course of the planning period of the regional transportation plan taking into account net migration into the region, population growth, household formation and employment growth.
3. Identify areas within the region sufficient to house an eight-year projection of the regional housing need for the region pursuant to Government Code Section 65584.
4. Identify a transportation network to service the transportation needs of the region.
5. Gather and consider the best practically available scientific information regarding resource areas and farmland in the region as defined in subdivisions (a) and (b) of Government Code Section 65080.01.
6. Consider the state housing goals specified in Sections 65580 and 65581.
7. Utilize the most recent planning assumptions, considering local general plans and other factors (see Section 6.25 for additional guidance).
8. Set forth a forecasted development pattern for the region, which, when integrated with the transportation network, and other transportation measures and policies, will reduce the GHG emissions from automobiles and light trucks to achieve, if there is a feasible way to do so, the GHG emission reduction targets approved by the ARB.
9. Provide consistency between the development pattern and allocation of housing units within the region (Government Code 65584.04(i)(1))
10. Allow the regional transportation plan to comply with Section 176 of the federal Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. Section 7506)

### **The Action Element**

The third major component as required in Government Code Section 65080 states that RTPs shall have an Action Element. The Action Element of the RTP must describe the programs and actions necessary to implement the RTP, including the SCS, and assigns implementation responsibilities. The action element may describe the transportation projects proposed to be completed during the RTP plan horizon, and must consider congestion management activities within the region. All transportation modes (highways, local streets and roads, mass transportation, rail, maritime, bicycle, pedestrian and aviation facilities and services) are addressed. The action element is critical to providing clear direction about the roles and responsibilities of the MPO and other agencies to follow through on the RTP's policies and projects. It consists of short and long-term activities that address regional transportation issues and needs. In addition, the Action Element should also identify investment strategies, alternatives and project priorities beyond what is already programmed.

The Action Element is divided into two sections. The first section includes a discussion of the preparatory activities such as identification of existing needs, assumptions, and forecasting and potential alternative actions. The second section addresses the data and conclusions.

## **The Financial Element**

The Financial Element is also statutorily required. The Financial Element is fundamental to the development and implementation of the RTP. It identifies the current and anticipated revenue sources and financing techniques available to fund the planned transportation investments described in the Action Element. The intent of the Financial Element is to define realistic financing constraints and opportunities. Finally, with this financing information, alternatives are developed and used by State and local decision-makers to determine which projects should be planned for funding.

There are six major components that constitute the Financial Element:

1. Summary of costs to operate and maintain the current transportation system;
2. Estimate of costs and revenues to implement the projects identified in the Action Plan;
3. Inventory of existing and potential transportation funding sources;
4. List of candidate projects if funding becomes available;
5. Potential funding shortfalls; and,
6. Identification of alternative policy directions that affect the funding of projects.

Government Code Section 65080 (b)(4)(C) states that the MPO or county transportation agency, whichever entity is appropriate, shall consider financial incentives for cities and counties that have resource areas or farmland, as defined in Government Code Section 65080.01, for the purposes of, for example, transportation investments for the preservation and safety of the city street or county road system and farm to market and interconnectivity transportation needs. The MPO or county transportation agency, whichever entity is appropriate, shall also consider financial assistance for counties to address countywide service responsibilities in counties that contribute towards the GHG emission reduction targets by implementing policies for growth to occur within their cities.

It is very important that RTPs reflect the transportation needs of the specific region. There are State statutory content requirements for the SCS, Policy, Action and Financial Elements of the RTP; however, there is flexibility in choosing a format for the presentation of this information. Most MPOs/RTPAs use the categories of Policy, Action and Financial to organize their RTP.

## **Consistency between the SCS & the RTP Policy, Financial & Action Elements**

The RTP shall be an “internally consistent” document. This means that the contents of the Policy, Action, Financial Elements, and Sustainable Communities Strategy shall be consistent with one another. As a result, transportation investments and the forecasted development pattern in the SCS should be complementary and not contradictory. For information regarding transportation projects exempt from the internal consistency provisions of SB 375 pursuant to Government Code Section 65080(b)(2)(L) please refer to Section 6.16 of these Guidelines.

For more detailed information regarding the contents of an SCS please refer to Section 6.25 of the RTP Guidelines.

## Other RTP Contents

The RTP should also include the following:

1. Executive Summary – An Executive Summary of the RTP as an introductory chapter. The Executive Summary should provide a regional perspective, and identify the challenges and transportation objectives to be achieved.
2. Reference to regional environmental issues and air quality documentation needs.
3. Discussion of types of potential environmental mitigation activities that might maintain or restore the environment that is affected by the RTP (refer to Section 5.2 for Federal Environmental Requirements)

### Requirements (Shalls)

**Federal:** Title 23 CFR Part 450.324

**State:** California Government Code Section 65080

## 6.2 Financial Overview

Federal statute and regulations and California State statute requires RTPs to contain an estimate of funds available for the 20-year planning horizon. This discussion of financial information is fundamental to the development and implementation of the RTP. The financial portions of the RTP identify the current and anticipated revenue sources and financing techniques available to fund the planned transportation investments described in other portions of the RTP. The intent is to define realistic financing constraints and opportunities. All projects, except illustrative projects i.e. unconstrained projects, must be fully funded in order to be included in the RTP. With this financing information, alternatives are developed and used by the MPO, local agencies and State decision-makers in funding transportation projects. During programming and project implementation the total cost of the project is refined and broken out by cost per phase.

Federal law requires each transportation plan and each transportation improvement program prepared by the MPO to include a financial plan that demonstrates how the adopted Plan and TIP can be implemented. The Financial Plan should also indicate resources from public and private sources that are reasonably expected to be made available to carry out the transportation plan and FTIP, identify innovative financing techniques to finance projects, programs and strategies, and recommend any additional financing strategies for needed projects and programs. The Federal statutory requirements are codified in Title 23 U.S.C. Section 134(i)(2)(C) and 134(j)(2)(B). Federal regulations pertaining to financial planning and constraint for statewide and metropolitan transportation plans and programs are codified in Title 23 CFR Part 450.

There are six major components that should be addressed in the financial portion of the RTP:

1. Projected Available Funds – The MPO, public transit operators and the State shall cooperatively develop estimates of funds that will reasonably be available to support RTP implementation. All anticipated public and private financial resources available over the next 20 years, including estimated highway, local streets and roads, bicycle and pedestrian and transit funds, shall be identified. The financial plan shall include

recommendations for additional financing strategies. New funding sources and strategies shall also be identified. All revenue estimates for the financial plan must use an inflation rate that reflects the “year of expenditure dollars” developed cooperatively by the MPO, State and transit operators.

2. Projected Costs – The MPO shall take into account all projects and strategies proposed for funding with Federal, State, local and private fund sources in developing the financial plan. Estimate of costs to implement the projects identified in the four year FTIP and the RTP must be included. Both the revenue and construction cost estimates must use inflation rates to reflect “year of expenditure dollars” based on reasonable financial principles and information developed cooperatively by the MPO State and public transportation operators.
3. Projected Operation and Maintenance Costs – The financial plan shall contain system level estimates of costs and revenue sources that are reasonably expected to be available to adequately operate and maintain Federal-aid highways and public transportation. Planning practice examples in developing the RTP financial plan would also include revenue sources for the operation and maintenance of local streets and roads as well as bicycle and pedestrian facilities. A summary of costs to operate and maintain the current transportation system should be included. This should be identified by mode and include the cumulative cost of deferred maintenance on the existing infrastructure. Financial plans that support the RTP process must assess capital investment and other measures necessary to ensure the preservation of:
  - A) The existing transportation system, including requirements for operational improvements;
  - B) Resurfacing, restoration, and rehabilitation of existing and future major roadways, as well as operations, maintenance, modernization, and rehabilitation of existing and future transit facilities.
4. Constrained RTP - Financially constrained list of candidate projects with the available funding (short and long-term). MPOs are encouraged to provide the timing or year of construction for major investments, as practicable.
5. Un-Constrained (Illustrative) List of Projects - Un-constrained (Illustrative) list of candidate projects if additional funding becomes available (short and long-term). The financial plan may include additional projects that would be included in the adopted transportation plan if additional resources were to become available.
6. Potential Funding Shortfall. The short and long-term needs for system operation, preservation, and maintenance can be enormous. Simply maintaining the existing system can demand a huge investment, while system expansion demands investments of a similar scale. At times, the combination of these competing demands can cause temporary shortfalls to an MPOs budget. To the extent there appear to be shortfalls, the MPO must identify a strategy to address these gaps in funding prior to the adoption of a new RTP - or the amendment of an existing RTP. The strategy should include an action plan that describes the steps to be taken that will make funding available within the time frame shown in the financial plan and needed to implement the projects in the long-range transportation plan. There should be, among other things, a range of options to address projected shortfalls. The strategy may rely upon the MPO or transit operators’

past record of obtaining funding. If it relies on new funding sources, the MPO must demonstrate that these funds are reasonably expected to be available.

**Requirements (Shalls)**

**Federal:** Title 23 CFR Part 450.324(f)(11)

**State:** California Government Code Section 65080(b)

**Planning Practice Examples:** Available in Appendix L

### **6.3 Fiscal Constraint**

Fiscal constraint is the demonstration of sufficient funding (Federal, State, local and private) to operate and maintain transportation facilities and services and to implement planned and programmed transportation system improvements. Fiscal constraint can also be thought of as the description of fully funded projects in the RTP based on the projected available revenues during the 20 plus year planning horizon.

Title 23 CFR Part 450.104 provides the following definition of fiscal constraint or fiscally constrained: “(it) means that the metropolitan transportation plan, TIP, and STIP includes sufficient financial information for demonstrating that projects in the metropolitan transportation plan, TIP and STIP can be implemented using committed, available or reasonably available revenue sources, with reasonable assurance that the federally supported transportation system is being adequately operated and maintained. For the TIP and the STIP, financial constraint/fiscal constraint applies to each programming year. Additionally, projects in air quality nonattainment and maintenance areas can be included in the first two years of the TIP or STIP only if funds are ‘available’ or ‘committed’.”

To support air quality planning under the 1990 Clean Air Act Amendments, a special requirement has been placed on air quality nonattainment and maintenance areas, as designated by the U.S. EPA. Specifically, projects in air quality nonattainment and maintenance areas can be included in the first two years of the FTIP only if funds are "available or committed" (Title 23 CFR Part 450.324(e)). Available funds include those derived from an existing source of funds dedicated to or historically used for transportation purposes. For Federal funds, authorized and/or appropriated funds and the extrapolation of formula and discretionary funds at historic rates of increase are considered “available.” Committed funds include funds that have been bound or obligated for transportation purposes. For State funds that are not dedicated to or historically used for transportation purposes, only those funds over which the Governor has control may be considered as “committed.” For local and private sources not dedicated to or historically used for transportation purposes, a commitment in writing/letter of intent by the responsible official or body having control of the funds constitutes a “commitment.” Additionally, EPA's transportation conformity regulations specify that an air quality conformity determination can only be made on a fiscally constrained RTP and FTIP (Title 40 CFR Part 93.108). New funding for RTP projects from a proposed gas tax increase, a proposed regional sales tax, or a major funding increase still under consideration would not qualify as "available or committed" until it has been enacted by legislation or referendum i.e. the period of time between the sunset date of the current regional sales tax and before the next legislative or referendum action to restore or increase funding. Therefore, nonattainment and maintenance areas may rely on existing revenue, newly approved tax revenue, or other newly approved revenue sources for the first two years of the FTIP.

**Requirements (Shalls)**

**Federal:** Title 23 CFR Part 450.324(f)(11)

**State:** California Government Code Section 65080(b)

**Planning Practice Examples:** Available in Appendix L

**6.4 Listing of Constrained & Un-constrained Projects**

In addition to the current list of financially constrained projects identified in the RTP, each Plan should contain a list of needed unconstrained projects (Illustrative projects). Illustrative projects are additional transportation projects that may (but is not required to) be included in the RTP if reasonable additional resources were to become available. This unconstrained list will identify projects that are recommended by the MPO without a funding source identified. The list should be included separately from the financially constrained project list. It is also preferred that projects on the unconstrained list be identified by transportation corridor within the region.

The following is accomplished by including a list of regionally desired un-funded (Illustrative) transportation projects in the RTP:

1. Identifies projects that could be funded, should additional funding become available.
2. Allows for a more accurate determination of overall transportation needs.

**Requirements (Shalls)**

**Federal:** Title 23 CFR Part 450.324(f)(11) Requires a fiscally constrained list of projects.

**Recommendations (Shoulds)**

**Federal:** Title 23 CFR part 450.324(f)(11)(vii) For illustrative purposes, the list of projects may include additional projects if an additional source of funds is located.

**Planning Practice Examples:** Available in Appendix L

**6.5 Revenue Identification & Forecasting**

Revenue forecasts for RTPs can take into account new funding sources that are "reasonably expected to be available." New funding sources are revenues that do not currently exist or that may require additional steps before the MPO or transit agency can commit such funding to transportation projects. As codified in federal regulations, strategies for ensuring the availability of these planned new revenue sources must be clearly identified. Future revenues may be projected based on historical trends, including consideration of past legislative or executive actions. The level of uncertainty in projections based on historical trends is generally greatest for revenues in the "outer years" (10 years or more) of an RTP.

According to Title 23 CFR Part 450.324(f)(11)(iv), the MPO shall take into account all projects and strategies proposed for funding under Title 23 U.S.C.; Title 49 U.S.C. Chapter 53; other Federal funds; State transportation funds; local funding sources and private sources of funds for transportation projects. Beginning December 11, 2007, funding estimates contained in the RTP must use an inflation rate to reflect "year of expenditure dollars".



Title 23 CFR Part 450.324(f)(11)(viii) states: “In cases that the FHWA and the FTA find a metropolitan transportation plan to be fiscally constrained and a revenue source is subsequently removed or substantially reduced (i.e. by legislative or administrative actions), the FHWA and FTA will not withdraw the original determination of fiscal constraint; however, in such cases, the FHWA and FTA will not act on an updated or amended metropolitan transportation plan that does not reflect the changed revenue situation.” The same policy applies if project costs or operations/maintenance cost estimates change after an RTP or FTIP is adopted. Such a change in cost estimates does not invalidate the adopted transportation plan or program. However, the revised costs must be provided in new or amended RTPs and FTIPs. In such cases, FHWA will expect the MPO to identify alternative sources of revenue as soon as possible. In such cases the FHWA/FTA will not act on new or amended RTPs or FTIPs unless they reflect the changed revenue and project cost situation. If FHWA and FTA find an RTP or FTIP to be fiscally constrained and the planned/programmed projects are included based on outdated or invalid cost estimates, then FHWA/FTA will not make funding or environmental approval actions for the listed project(s) unless the RTP and FTIP are updated or amended to reflect the latest project cost estimate.

The estimated revenue by existing revenue source (local, State, Federal and private) available for transportation projects shall be determined and any shortfalls identified. Proposed new revenues and/or revenue sources to cover shortfalls shall be identified, including strategies for ensuring their availability for proposed investments. Existing and proposed revenues shall cover all forecasted capital, operating, and maintenance costs. All cost and revenue projections shall be based on the data reflecting the existing situation and historical trends. For nonattainment and maintenance areas, the financial plan element shall address the specific financial strategies required to ensure the implementation of projects and programs (TCMs) to reach air quality compliance

#### **Requirements (Shalls)**

**Federal:** Title 23 CFR Part 450.324(f)(11)

**State:** California Government Code Section 65080(b)

**Planning Practice Examples:** Available in Appendix L

## **6.6 Estimating Future Transportation Costs**

Federal regulations require that (Title 23 CFR Part 450.324(f)(11)(iv)) costs of future transportation projects must use “year of expenditure dollars” rather than “constant dollars” in cost and revenue estimates to better reflect the time-based value of money. MPOs must ensure project costs identified in both the RTP and FTIP are in year of expenditure dollars. This is particularly crucial for large-scale projects with construction/implementation dates stretching into the future. For those MPOs located in air quality nonattainment and maintenance areas the financial plan developed by the MPO shall address the specific financial strategies and funding sources required to ensure the implementation of TCMs whether or not the TCMs are identified in the SIP pursuant to Title 23 CFR Part 450.324(f)(11)(vi).

Reporting the costs in year of expenditure dollars will provide the proper context to express a more realistic estimate of future construction costs. After cost estimates are prepared for the RTP and FTIP, the costs should be expressed in year of expenditure dollars. This can be done

by assigning an inflation rate per year to the proposed midpoint of construction. Make certain that the selected year of expenditure reflects a realistic scenario, taking into account project planning and development durations, as well as construction. Inflation rates may be different for specific cost elements (e.g. construction vs. right-of-way). The RTP should clearly specify how inflation is considered in the estimate and clearly State that the estimate is expressed in year of expenditure dollars. Consider multiple sources for determining the inflation rate, including nationwide and local references. Include consideration of any locality-specific cost factors that may reflect a growth rate significantly in excess of the inflation rate, such as land acquisition costs in highly active markets. The inflation rate(s) should be based on sound, reasonable financial principles and information, developed cooperatively by the MPO and transit agencies. To ensure consistency, similar financial forecasting approaches ideally should be used for both the RTP and FTIP. In addition, the financial forecast approaches, assumptions, and results should be clear and well documented.

Revenues and related cost estimates for operations and maintenance should be based on a reasonable, documented process. Some accepted practices include:

**Trend analysis** - A functional analysis based on expenditures over a given duration, in which costs or revenues are increased by inflation, as well as a growth percentage based on historic levels. This analysis could be linear or exponential. When using this approach, however, it is important to be aware of new facilities or improvements to existing facilities. Transit operations and maintenance costs will vary with the average age of the bus or rail car fleet.

**Cost per unit of service** – Examples include: lane-mile costs; centerline mile costs; traffic signal cost; transit peak vehicles by vehicle type; revenue hours; and vehicle-miles by vehicle type.

Regardless of the methodology employed, the assumptions should be adequately documented by the MPO and transit agency. Estimating current and reasonably available new revenues and required operations and maintenance costs over a 20-year planning horizon is not an exact science. To provide discipline and rigor, MPOs and transit operators should attempt to be as realistic as possible, as well as ensure that all costs assumptions are publicly documented.

#### **Requirements (Shalls)**

**Federal:** Title 23 CFR Part 450.324(f)(11)

**State:** California Government Code Section 65080(b)

#### **Recommendations (Shoulds)**

**Federal:** Title 23 CFR Part 450.324(f)(11)(v) authorizes the option to use aggregate cost ranges or bands in the outer years of the RTP.

**Planning Practice Examples:** Available in Appendix L

## **6.7 Asset Management**

The transportation system in California continues to experience substantial wear and tear from increased vehicle miles traveled, growing population, and greater congestion to aging infrastructure and escalating operating costs. These challenging circumstances put greater demands than ever on the transportation system. The goal of asset management is to

minimize the life-cycle costs for managing and maintaining transportation assets, including roads, transit, bridges, tunnels, runways, rails, and roadside features.

As the state becomes more multimodal, consideration of policies from the CTP regarding the importance of evaluating the multimodal life cycle cost can help preserve and maintain transportation facilities. These policies can also assist in developing a strategic approach to assess and prioritize transit assets helping to select projects most in need of funding.

The American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) define asset management as:

*“A strategic and systematic process of operating, maintaining, upgrading, and expanding physical assets effectively through their life cycle. It focuses on business and engineering practices for resource allocation and utilization, with the objective of better decision making based upon quality information and well defined objectives.”*

Through the use of asset management systems, engineering and economic analysis, and other tools, MPOs and transit operators can more comprehensively view the big picture and evaluate collected data before making decisions as to how specific resources should be deployed. Asset management principles and techniques should be applied throughout the planning process, from initial goal setting and long-range planning to development of the TIP and then through operations, preservation, and maintenance.

MPOs should ensure the transportation system is managed to meet both current and future condition and performance demands and that expenditures are optimal. Asset management principles and techniques are valuable tools that can be applied by an MPO and result in more effective decision making. The MPO role in a successful asset management program includes defining performance measures for assets through public involvement, serving as a repository for asset data, and promoting standard data collection technology applications, and making investment decisions based on measured performance relative to established goals. MPOs can also educate the public and decision makers and work cooperatively with stakeholders across transportation modes.

Title 23 CFR Part 450.306(e) states the following concerning asset management:

*“In carrying out the metropolitan transportation planning process, MPOs, States, and public transportation operators may apply asset management principles and techniques in establishing planning goals, defining TIP priorities, and assessing transportation investment decisions, including transportation system safety, operations, preservation, and maintenance, as well as strategies and policies to support homeland security and to safeguard the personal security of all motorized and non-motorized users.”*

MPOs should consider including asset management principles in the development of their RTPs. The following are the benefits of applying transportation asset management during the planning process:

1. Maximize transportation system performance.
2. Improve customer satisfaction.
3. Minimize life-cycle costs.
4. Mitigate system vulnerabilities.

5. Match service provided to public expectations.
6. Make more informed, cost-effective program decisions and
7. Better use of existing transportation assets.

Additional information is available from the FHWA at:

<http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/infrastructure/asstmgmt/tpamb.cfm>

### **Requirements (Shalls)**

**Federal:** MAP-21/FAST Act establish limitations on federal funding flexibility if the aggregate bridge condition in California does not meet certain minimum conditions for National Highway System (NHS) bridges. Caltrans or the appropriate entity shall monitor the current structurally deficient bridge deck area and make the necessary investment decisions that result in less than 10% of the agencies' NHS bridge deck area being structurally deficient.

### **Recommendations (Shoulds)**

**Federal:** Title 23 CFR Part 450.306(e) - MPOs, States, and public transportation operators may apply asset management principles and techniques in establishing planning goals, defining TIP priorities, and assessing transportation investment decisions.

**State:** None

**Planning Practice Examples:** Available in Appendix L

## **Modal Discussion**

The RTP is the key document prepared by the MPO that reflects future plans of the transportation system for the region. This future vision includes all modes of transportation and is one of the key functions of the RTP.

Both federal regulations and state statute require RTPs to address each transportation mode individually. Title 23 CFR Part 450.324(b) states: *"the transportation plan shall include strategies/actions that lead to the development of an integrated multimodal transportation system to facilitate the safe and efficient movement of people and goods in addressing current and future transportation demand."*

It is also important for MPOs to integrate modal considerations to enable the development of a complete and connected multimodal transportation system. As modes often overlap (e.g. transit vehicles and private vehicles use the same modes, and people and goods use multiple modes), consider how all transportation modes interact with one another, and how improvements in one mode can benefit the entire transportation system.

SB 375 requires MPOs to meet GHG per capita reduction targets, if feasible. It allows discretion in scenario development. Transportation infrastructure investment, among many other factors, affect travel patterns, mode choice, and VMT. In general, the RTP Guidelines recognize that some studies suggest that investments in roadway capacity tend to cause increases in VMT and GHGs; however, there are exceptions depending on project location and the current transportation network.

These studies are summarized in materials available on the following Caltrans and ARB websites:

National Center for Sustainable Transportation Research Brief:

[http://www.dot.ca.gov/newtech/researchreports/reports/2015/10-12-2015-NCST\\_Brief\\_InducedTravel\\_CS6\\_v3.pdf](http://www.dot.ca.gov/newtech/researchreports/reports/2015/10-12-2015-NCST_Brief_InducedTravel_CS6_v3.pdf)

Air Resources Board Brief:

[http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/sb375/policies/hwycapacity/highway\\_capacity\\_brief.pdf](http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/sb375/policies/hwycapacity/highway_capacity_brief.pdf)

Air Resources Board Technical Background Document:

[http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/sb375/policies/hwycapacity/highway\\_capacity\\_bkqd.pdf](http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/sb375/policies/hwycapacity/highway_capacity_bkqd.pdf)

Title 23 CFR Part 450.324(f)(2) requires that RTPs address both existing and proposed transportation facilities such as major roadways, transit lines (both rail and primary bus routes), multimodal and intermodal connector facilities, pedestrian walkways and bicycle facilities.

California Government Code Section 65080(a) states that transportation planning agencies shall prepare and adopt an RTP directed at achieving a coordinated and balanced regional transportation system that includes mass transportation, highway, railroad, maritime, bicycle, pedestrian, goods movement, and aviation facilities.

## **6.8 Highways**

The section of the RTP discussing highways should consider the following:

1. An overview of the primary highway and arterial road system within the region;
2. National and State highway system, and regionally significant streets and roads;
3. Any corridor preservation processes for possible future transportation projects (i.e. right of way, historic highways, abandoned highways or rails);
4. Maintenance of State highways;
5. Data collection and other infrastructure requirement for ITS;
6. Unmet highway needs;
7. Consider CTP policy suggesting strategic investing to optimize performance;
8. Consider CTP policy suggesting the application of sustainable preventative maintenance and rehabilitation strategies;
9. Consider investing in HOV-related emerging technologies and by promoting the use of zero-emission vehicles on the highway network to reduce GHG emissions;
10. Consider investing strategically to advance widespread transportation electrification; and,
11. Consider emissions from highways, and their impact on adjacent communities.

### **Requirements (Shalls)**

**Federal:** Title 23 CFR Part 450.324(b) requires short and long-range strategies for an integrated multimodal transportation system.

**State:** Government Code Section 65080(a) requires that the RTP shall be directed at achieving a coordinated and balanced regional transportation system.

## **6.9 Local Streets & Roads**

Local streets and roads are critical to provide an interconnected, multi-modal transportation system where every trip begins and ends. Investment in local streets and roads is an investment in public safety, economic growth, goods movement and farm to market needs. According to 2013 California Public Road Data compiled by Caltrans Division of Research, Innovation & System Information, counties and cities maintain 81 percent of the maintained miles within the State of California and carry 45 percent of the total annual miles of vehicle travel. The condition of local streets and roads continue to deteriorate due to the funding shortfalls and will be further challenged by the escalating repair costs in future years. Adequately investing in the local system is critical to protect the public's current investment. The local system will become ever more important in supporting the goals of climate change and building sustainable communities, as local streets and roads serve as the right-of-way for transit, bicycle and pedestrian travel.

The section of the RTP discussing local streets and roads should consider the following:

1. The preservation needs for the local road system, including but not limited to pavement and essential components to support travel by bicycle, bus, pedestrian, or automobile (including the unmet need for maintaining and preserving the existing local streets and road, public transit, bicycling and pedestrian transportation system);
2. Bi-annual Data collection and periodic collaborative efforts to update system-wide local streets and road preservation needs (including deferred maintenance);
3. Encouraging all agencies to utilize Pavement Management Software (PMS) in their data collection efforts;
4. The benefits of achieving Best Management Practices (BMPs) for the local streets and roads and maintaining them at that level;
5. The issue of declining local streets and roads maintenance revenues in connection with rising maintenance costs and achieving SB 375 goals;
6. System preservation assessments such as bridges, safety, traffic signals, transit stop, signage, lane and crosswalk striping, sidewalks, curb ramps, lighting, drainage, landscaping, and other elements within the road right-of-way to support a functioning and integrated multi-modal system; and,
7. The benefits of active transportation and how the RTP supports active transportation planning.

### **References**

1. 2013 California Public Road Data – Statistical Information derived from the Highway Performance Monitoring System. Prepared by Caltrans Division of Research, Innovation & System Information. Available online at:

<http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tsip/hpms/datalibrary.php>

### **Requirements (Shalls)**

**Federal:** Title 23 CFR Part 450.324(b) requires short and long-range strategies for an integrated multimodal transportation system.

**State:** Government Code Section 65080(a) requires that the RTP shall be directed at achieving a coordinated and balanced regional transportation system.

## **6.10 Transit**

Transit plays a key role in the regional effort to reduce traffic congestion, VMT and vehicle emissions particularly in urbanized areas. The increased use of transit is a key element to meeting legislative requirements such as AB 32 and SB 375 that aim to reduce GHG emissions that contribute to global warming. Transit systems also play an important role in the mobility for those who are unable to drive, including youth and the elderly, as well as low-income individuals, and people with disabilities. Given these reasons, it is crucial for MPOs to engage in a continual and comprehensive dialogue with the transit operators within their region. The CTP highlights the positive impacts of public transportation and suggests the integration of multimodal transportation and land use development which can help establish areas within regions that can be possible locations for Transit Oriented Developments (TODs).

The section of the RTP addressing mass transportation issues (including regional transit services and urban rail systems) should address:

1. Identification of passenger transit modes within the region (bus, light and heavy rail, etc.);
2. Integration with transit, highway, street and road projects (including identification of priorities);
3. Implementation plans, operational strategies and schedule for future service (including construction and procurement);
4. Operational integration between transit fleets, and other modes (passenger rail, aviation, taxis, etc.);
5. First/last mile transit connectivity considerations;
6. Summation of the short and long range transit plans along with the capital finance plans for the 20-year period of the RTP;
7. Short and long-range transit plans and capital finance plans for the 20-year RTP period;
8. Inventory of bus fleets by fuel type (diesel, natural gas, and other alternative fuels);
9. Unmet transit needs;
10. Urban and commuter rail project priorities;
11. ITS elements to increase efficiency, safety and level of service;
12. Integration with local land use plans that could increase ridership; and,
13. A measure of transit capacity utilization for peak and off-peak service to evaluate service effectiveness.

In addition, MAP-21/FAST Act added a new requirement for RTPs to also include transportation and transit enhancement activities, including consideration of the role that intercity buses may play in reducing congestion, pollution, and energy consumption in a cost-effective manner and strategies and investments that preserve and enhance intercity bus systems, including systems that are privately owned and operated, including transportation alternatives, as defined in 23 U.S.C. 101(a), and associated transit improvements, as described in 49 U.S.C. 5302(1), as appropriate. The timeline for implementation of this MAP-21/FAST Act planning requirement is outlined in 23 CFR Part 450.340. Prior to May 27, 2018, an MPO may adopt an RTP that has been developed using the SAFETEA-LU requirements or the provisions of the Statewide and Nonmetropolitan Transportation Planning *and* Metropolitan Transportation Planning Final Rule (23 CFR Part 450 and 771 and 49 CFR Part 613). On or after May 27, 2018, an MPO may not adopt an RTP that has not been developed according to the provisions of MAP-21/FAST Act as specified in the Planning Final Rule. MPOs are encouraged to communicate with Caltrans and FHWA/FTA to discuss schedules for RTP adoption.

### **Requirements (Shalls)**

**Federal:** Title 23 CFR Part 450.324(b) requires short and long-range strategies for an integrated multimodal transportation system. 23 CFR 450.325(f)(8) is an added requirement for the RTP pursuant to MAP-21/FAST Act to include consideration of the role that intercity buses play in reducing congestion, pollution, and energy consumption.

**State:** Government Code Section 65080(a) the RTP shall be directed at achieving a coordinated and balanced regional transportation system.

**Planning Practice Examples:** Available in Appendix L

## **6.11 Bicycle & Pedestrian – Including AB 1396 California Coastal Trail**

The use of bicycles and walking as a means of transportation has increased dramatically in California over the last 20 years. Both modes of transportation promote a healthy lifestyle and reduce environmental impacts. Higher levels of physical activity are associated with well-connected transportation networks that are coordinated with land use development. The CTP acknowledges that viable and equitable multimodal choices are created through Complete Streets and high quality transit access in communities. The CTP can be a helpful resource for MPOs to refer to during their RTP development. Additional information regarding the Complete Streets planning process which emphasizes bicycle and pedestrian access and circulation is available in Section 2.7. The RTP section discussing bicycle and pedestrian issues should identify the following:

1. A well-connected transportation network within the region that includes routes with all types of bicycle and pedestrian facilities on local streets which provide trips to destinations;
2. Policies, plans and programs used to promote the usage of bikes and walking;
3. Transit and rail interface with bicyclists and pedestrians;
4. Unmet bicycle and pedestrian needs; and,
5. Existing and potential California Coastal Trail (CCT) network segments and linkages, as well as gaps and related coastal access trail needs.

### **AB 1396 – California Coastal Trail**

Enacted in 2007, AB 1396 added Section 65080.1 to the Government Code which requires transportation planning agencies whose jurisdictions include a portion of the California Coastal Trail (or property designated for the coastal trail) to coordinate with specified agencies regarding development of the coastal trail. The law also requires that RTPs include provisions for the coastal trail. As RTPs are updated, the CCT provisions from each respective certified Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan's policies, programs and maps should be integrated into the RTP update.

Provisions for the CCT should include identification of existing and potential trail network segments and linkages as well as gaps and related coastal access trail needs. Coastal access trail needs could include identification of accommodations for non-motorized modes, critical linkages to parking, bicycle racks, bathrooms and other support facilities, and connections to CCT trailheads. Any necessary trail alignment near motorized traffic should provide for



adequate separation. Prioritization of projects within RTPs could include consideration of connecting the CCT across identified critical gaps in the coastal trail system.

Additional information and maps regarding the California Coastal Trail is available from the State Coastal Conservancy and the California Coastal Commission at:

[www.yourcoast.org](http://www.yourcoast.org)

<http://scc.ca.gov/2010/01/07/the-california-coastal-trail/>

<http://coastal.ca.gov/access/ctrail-access.html>.

<http://www.coastal.ca.gov/access/accndx.html>

<http://www.coastal.ca.gov/access/coastal-trail-map.pdf>

### **Requirements (Shalls)**

**Federal:** Title 23 CFR Part 450.324(f)(12) requires MPOs to include a discussion of pedestrian walkways and bicycle transportation facilities in accordance with Title 23 U.S.C. Section 217(g)

**State:** Government Code Section 65080(a) requires that the RTP shall be directed at achieving a coordinated and balanced regional transportation system.

Government Code Section 65080.1 requires that transportation planning agencies whose boundaries include a portion of the California Coastal Trail or property designated for the trail, coordinate with appropriate agencies including the State Coastal Conservancy, the California Coastal Commission and Caltrans regarding development of the California Coastal Trail, and include provisions for the California Coastal Trail in their Regional Transportation Plan.

**Planning Practice Examples:** Available in Appendix L

## **6.12 Goods Movement (Maritime/Rail/Trucking/Aviation)**

Developing, operating and maintaining a robust goods movement transportation system is vital to California's economy. For many reasons, including its proximity to Asian markets and Mexican near-shoring markets, its strong agricultural economy, and its large population, high volumes of goods are moved within and through California. With the diversity of products being moved, and the complexity of origins and destinations, the transportation system that supports goods movement within California must be multimodal. The system spans the entire state, and the needs for urban and rural goods movement infrastructure can differ between, and within, regions. However, throughout the state, goods movement has both positive and negative impacts. Through the regional planning process, MPOs can create strategies for improving the regional goods movement transportation system so positive impacts (e.g. job creation, access to goods and product diversity, improvements to truck speed and reliability, freight bottleneck relief) are maximized and negative impacts (e.g. land use conflicts, air pollution, roadway congestion and delays, disproportionately high and adverse impact on low income or disadvantaged communities) are minimized.

MPO must plan for the goods movement infrastructure in the same way they plan the transportation infrastructure for the movement of people to support projected population growth and economic development. Goods movement planning is in the public interest because of the potential benefits to the regional economy, environment, public health, and community well-

being. Improvements to the goods movement transportation system can result in co-benefits to the overall system when California's economic, equity, and environmental goals are simultaneously considered. For example, as a rail improvement project could ideally take trucks off the highway, congestion could be reduced and potentially reduce GHG emissions. The CTP recognizes the importance of enhancing freight mobility, reliability, efficiency, and global competitiveness, which is why MPOs should consider deploying, as appropriate and feasible, cost-effective technologies that can help expedite goods movement and reduce congestion at our ports, including ports of entry. A seamless, efficient, low-emitting, and well-maintained multi-modal transportation system is paramount to the state's economic strength and its residents' quality of life. Planning this system involves a broad base of stakeholders, including affected community representatives, local organizations, agencies in charge of seaports and airports, trucking associations, Class I and short line railroads, freight carriers and shippers, local air districts, electric and gas utilities, and multiple State agencies (e.g., ARB, California Energy Commission, Caltrans, California Public Utilities Commission).

The RTP section discussing goods movement should include the following:

1. A discussion of the role of goods movement within the region (the types and the magnitudes of goods moved through the region and their economic importance);
2. An inventory of all major highway and roadway routes consistent with the National Highway Freight Network, including critical urban freight corridors;
3. An inventory of seaport facilities, air cargo facilities, freight rail lines, and major warehouses and freight transfer facilities within the region;
4. An analysis of the efficiency of the overall freight transportation system capacity, including existing land side freight transportation infrastructure (e.g. bottlenecks, gaps, etc.) and identification of expansion or improvement needs at seaport and airport facilities that handle cargo and issues regarding land side access to these facilities;
5. Specific projections, by mode, of future freight demand;
6. Identification of freight-related highway and roadway improvement needs;
7. Identification of expansion or improvement needs for freight rail lines within the region;
8. Identification of intermodal connection issues between different modes (e.g. freight, rail and seaport facilities), as applicable;
9. Identification of U.S.A./Mexico border crossing issues, if applicable;
10. Discussion of ITS and advanced technology opportunities for goods movement, with the aim of maximizing operational efficiencies and minimizing emissions;
11. Identification of opportunities or innovations that improve freight efficiency and support the State's freight system efficiency target as established in the California Sustainable Freight Action Plan; and,
12. Identification of opportunities or innovations that reduce GHG emissions and criteria air pollutant emissions associated with freight.

## **California Sustainable Freight Action Plan**

In July 2015, Governor Brown issued Executive Order B-32-15 which prioritizes California's transition to a more efficient and less polluting freight transportation system. This transition of California's freight transportation system is essential to supporting the State's economic competitiveness in the coming decades while reducing GHG emissions and air quality impacts. The Executive Order directed State agencies to develop an integrated action plan by July 2016 that established clear targets to improve freight efficiency, transition to zero-emission technologies, and increase the competitiveness of California's freight system. It is suggested

that regional transportation agencies consult the California Sustainable Freight Action Plan when developing the freight-related strategies in their respective RTPs.

## **California Freight Mobility Plan**

The state's California Freight Mobility Plan (CFMP) is a policy and action agenda document that supports the improvement of California's goods movement infrastructure while preserving the environment. MPOs are encouraged to review the CFMP for guidance, and ensure consistency while addressing goods movement within their RTPs. The RTPs and the CFMP will ideally function in a feedback loop, as the goods movement strategies and projects identified in RTPs will be incorporated into the next update of the CFMP.

### **Requirements (Shalls)**

**Federal:** Title 23 CFR Part 450.324(b) requires short and long-range strategies for an integrated multimodal transportation system to facilitate the safe and efficient movement of people and goods. Title 23 CFR Part 450.324(f)(1) states that the RTP shall include the projected transportation demand of persons and goods in the metropolitan planning area over the period of the plan, and Title 23 CFR Part 450.324(f)(3) states that the RTP shall include operational and management strategies to improve the performance of existing transportation facilities to relieve vehicular congestion and maximize the safety and mobility of people and goods. Title 23 CFR Part 450.324(j) and Title 23 Part 450.316(a) require that the MPO shall provide freight shippers and providers of freight transportation services, among other stakeholders, a reasonable opportunity to comment on the RTP using the adopted Public Participation Plan. Title 23 U.S.C. Section 134 reflects similar requirements in federal statutes.

**State:** Government Code Section 65080(a) requires that the RTP shall be directed at achieving a coordinated and balanced regional transportation system.

### **Recommendations (Shoulds)**

**Federal:** The FAST Act continues the Metropolitan Planning program. The Program establishes a cooperative, continuous, and comprehensive framework for making transportation management decisions in metropolitan areas. Program oversight is a joint FHWA/FTA responsibility, FAST Act § 1201; 23 U.S.C. 134. The FAST Act continues to encourage MPOs to consult with officials responsible for other types of planning activities, including freight.

The FAST Act directs the Department of Transportation to establish a National Multimodal Freight Network to:

- Assist States in strategically directing resources toward improved system performance for the efficient movement of freight on the Network;
- Inform freight transportation planning;
- Assist in the prioritization of Federal investment; and
- Assess and support Federal investments to achieve the goals of the National Multimodal Freight Policy established in 49 U.S.C. 70101 and of the National Highway Freight Program described in 23 U.S.C. 167.

The FAST Act established a National Highway Freight Network (NHFN). The NHFN includes the following subsystems of roadways:

- **Primary Highway Freight System (PHFS):** This is a network of highways identified as the most critical highway portions of the U.S. freight transportation system determined by measurable and objective national data. The network consist of 41,518 centerline miles,

including 37,436 centerline miles of Interstate and 4,082 centerline miles of non-Interstate roads.

- **Other Interstate portions not on the PHFS:** These highways consist of the remaining portion of Interstate roads not included in the PHFS. These routes provide important continuity and access to freight transportation facilities. These portions amount to an estimated 9,511 centerline miles of Interstate, nationwide, and will fluctuate with additions and deletions to the Interstate Highway System.
- **Identification and Designation of Critical Urban Freight Corridors (CUFCs):** These are public roads in urbanized areas which provide access and connection to the PHFS and the Interstate with other ports, public transportation facilities, or other intermodal transportation facilities.

**Planning Practice Examples:** Available in Appendix L

### **6.13 Regional Aviation System**

Aviation contributes to California's triple bottom line (people, prosperity, and planet) at all levels from local to global. Aviation gives the State's multimodal transportation system access, range, and speed. California's aviation system consists of 246 public-use airports made up of both commercial and general aviation airports, 68 special-use airports, 8 sea plane bases, 356 hospital and/or corporate, police, fire, or private heliports, 22 military/NASA bases, and 1 joint-use facility. (Division of Aeronautics Aviation in California: Fact Sheet (May 2016))

Aviation improves mobility options, generates tax revenue, saves lives through emergency response, medical, and firefighting services, produces over \$170 billion in air cargo revenues annually, and generates over \$14 billion to the State's tourism industry. The Division of Aeronautics Economic study, *Aviation in California: Benefits to Our Economy and Way of Life* (2003), reports that aviation creates almost 9 percent to the State's jobs (1.7 million jobs), and generates revenues totaling (\$110.7 billion). The report is available on line at:

<http://dot.ca.gov/hq/planning/aeronaut/publication.htm><http://dot.ca.gov/hq/planning/aeronaut/publication.htm>

The 2014 Caltrans Airport Forecasting Study, *The Role of California Airports in Smart Growth and Economic Vitality* created tools for communities and regions to use for developing their local airports to their full economic potential. Airports can be used to help locate new business opportunities for a region, and improve quality of life by providing a unique access opportunity. The study includes planning practice examples, available at:

<http://www.dot.ca.gov/aeronaut/index.htm>

To preserve the economic and access benefits aviation contributes to California, airports must be protected through comprehensive planning practices at all levels of government. A large part of protecting airports comes from policies that protect airports from encroachment from incompatible land uses. Every county in California having an airport that is "operated for the benefit of the general public" (PUC Section 21670(b)) must have an airport land use commission (ALUC) whose function is accomplish proper airport land use compatibility planning. The PUC recognizes six types of ALUC. Counties are free to select the type of ALCU that works best for their needs. The PUC further specifies the types of powers and duties reserved for ALCU (PUC Section 21674). ALUCs do not have jurisdiction over airports, but their airport land use

compatibility plans (ALUCP) are developed from an airport's layout plan or master plan. And, general plans shall be consistent with ALUCPs, (PUC Sections 21674(c) and 21675).

Federal laws (Title 23 CFR Part 450.324(g) and Title 23 CFR Part 450.316(a) (1)) requires MPOs to consult with stakeholders responsible for land use management, as appropriate. Although not specifically named in statute, airports and ALUCs meet this criteria, and should be included in the consultation process during the RTP development. See Chapter 4 for guidance on the consultation process. State law (California Government Code Section 65080(a) and California Government Code Section 65081.1(b)) requires a coordinated and balanced regional transportation system. State law further requires RTPAs that have a primary air carrier airport (i.e. an airport with over 10,000 annual enplanements) within their jurisdiction shall have an Airport Ground Access Improvement Program (AGAIP). Annual passenger enplanement and air cargo reports are available from either the Caltrans Division of Aeronautics or from the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Airports Office: Passenger Boarding (Enplanement) and All-Cargo Data for U.S. Airports. See the Division of Aeronautics web site for annual reports of both enplanement and cargo data at:

<http://dot.ca.gov/hq/planning/aeronaut/documents/statistics/paxstats.htm>

### **Requirements (Shalls)**

**Federal:** Title 23 CFR 450.324, Development, and Content of the Metropolitan Transportation Plan. Subsection (b) requires short and long-range strategies for an integrated multimodal transportation system. Title 23 CFR Part 450.324(g) states that MPOs shall consult as appropriate with stakeholders and local agencies responsible for land use management, natural resources, environmental protection, conservation, and historic preservation during the development of the RTPs. Title 23 CFR Part 450.316(a) (1) also requires that public participation plans be developed by MPOs in consultation with all interested parties and describe explicit procedures, strategies, and desired outcomes.

**State:** California Government Code Section 65080(a) states that "Each transportation planning agency...shall prepare and adopt a regional transportation plan directed at achieving a coordinated and balanced regional transportation system, including...aviation facilities and services." Government Code Section 65081.1(b) requires consideration of highway, rail, and mass transportation and states that, "The program shall address the development and extension of mass transit systems, including passenger rail service, major arterial, and highway widening and extension projects, and any other ground access improvement projects the planning agency deems appropriate."

### **Recommendations (Shoulds)**

**State:** MPOs should consider the needs of public-use airports, special-use heliports and military airfields when planning transportation and infrastructure projects (i.e. by consulting with the sponsors) to further sustainable and compatible land use and circulation patterns.

**Planning Practice Examples:** Available in Appendix L

### **Military Airfields and Installations**

California's military installations are vital to America's national security, and the State is home to some of the Department of Defense's (DOD) most important military installations globally. All five of the services (Army, Navy, Air Force, Marines, and Coast Guard) have a major presence in the State. They are major contributors to the State's triple bottom line (people, prosperity,

place), and users of the transportation system. In 2009 California's DOD installations employed over 354,769 civilian and military personnel, with a payroll of over \$56 billion. Military expenditures and contracts awarded to California companies totaled almost \$99 billion. Source: DOD in California brochure. Military installations are subject to strict environmental regulation, and vulnerable to climate change impacts, and sea level rise. Each installation has plans that address environmental and sustainability needs for their installation and practices in place that protect the environment and ensure the Service's ability to execute their mission.

Military transportation needs can be broken down into three broad categories, troop transport, military cargo, and installation employees commuter needs. These needs include surge capabilities as needed. Military facilities are spread throughout California, in all sizes of communities from rural locations to heavily urbanized areas. They share the same transportation needs as their neighboring communities. Although not specifically named in planning statute and codes, the requirement to consult with all users of the transportation system apply to the military as well, see Chapter 4 RTP Consultation and Coordination for detailed discussion of users and the consultation process. In addition to transportation needs, military installations also need protection from encroachment of incompatible land uses that could hamper the facilities ability to meet its mission needs. Military installations with airfields are required by DOD to prepare Air Installation Compatible Use Zone Plan (AICUZ) that address their compatibility needs. ALUC are required to develop an ALUCP for the airfield that is consistent with the AICUZ. The federal government, Transportation Research Board, and some states (Texas, Colorado, North Carolina, New Jersey, and Virginia) offer guidance and planning practice examples regarding how to address land use compatibility issues for military installations. General plans must be consistent with the AICUZ and ALUCP for the military airfields in their jurisdiction. California's Office of Planning and Research (OPR) publishes a guide for how to incorporate land use compatibility planning for military installations in the State. [https://www.opr.ca.gov/docs/Military\\_GPG\\_Supplement.pdf](https://www.opr.ca.gov/docs/Military_GPG_Supplement.pdf).

### **Requirements (Shalls)**

**Federal:** Consulting with interested parties on plans, programs, and projects shall include individuals or organization that are mentioned in Title 23 CFR Part 450.316(a). Title 23 CFR Part 450.316(d) requires MPOs to consult with federal land use management agencies as appropriate during the development of RTP. Title 23 CFR part 450.324(g) states that MPOs shall consult as appropriate with stakeholders and local agencies responsible for land use management, natural resources, environmental protection, conservation, and historic preservation during the development of the RTPs. Title 23 CFR Part 450.316(a) (1) also requires that public participation plans be developed by MPOs in consultation with all interested parties and describe explicit procedures, strategies, and desired outcomes.

### **Recommendations (Shoulds)**

**State:** MPOs should consider the needs of public-use airports, and heliports and military airfields when planning transportation and infrastructure projects (i.e. by consulting with the sponsors) to further encourage sustainable and compatible land use and circulation patterns.

**Planning Practice Examples:** Available in Appendix L

## Programming/Operations

### 6.14 Transportation System Management & Operations

The RTP shall address management and operations strategies aimed at improving the performance of the existing regional transportation system in order to reduce transportation congestion issues and maximize the safety and mobility of people and goods. Examples of operational and management include: (a) Traffic incident management, (b) Travel information services, (c) Roadway weather information, (d) Freeway management, (e) Traffic signal coordination, and (f) Bicycle and transit trip planning.

Although operational and management strategies may be implemented on a regional, area-wide, or project-specific basis, those strategies included in an RTP should typically be those that have importance on a regional level.

RTPs shall include existing and proposed transportation facilities (including major roadways, transit, multimodal and intermodal facilities, pedestrian walkways and bicycle facilities and connectors) that should function as an integrated regional transportation system with emphasis on those facilities that serve important national and regional needs.

If applicable, the locally preferred alternative selected from an Alternative Analysis under the FTA's Capital Investment Grant Program (Section 5309) needs to be adopted as part of the RTP as a condition for funding under Title 49 U.S.C. Section 5309.

#### **Requirements (Shalls)**

**Federal:** Title 23 U.S.C. Section 134 and Title 23 CFR Part 450.324(f)(5) requires strategies for improving the regional transportation system and reducing congestion.

**Planning Practice Examples:** Available in Appendix L

### 6.15 Coordination with Programming Documents

The Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP) is a four-year prioritized listing of federally funded and non-federally funded regionally significant transportation projects that is developed and formally adopted by an MPO as part of the metropolitan transportation planning process. MPOs work cooperatively with public transportation agencies as well as other local, state, and federal agencies to propose projects for inclusion in the FTIP. Each project or project phase in the FTIP must be consistent with the approved RTP. The FTIP must be updated at least every four years. MPOs may also refer to the FTIP as the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP). Specific requirements for the development and content of the FTIP are contained in Title 23 CFR Part 450.326.

As with the RTP, some MPOs refer to their four-year FTIP by other terms. Below is a table outlining the various terms used by federal, state and the MPOs to refer to the same documents:

<b>Federal Term Used</b>	<b>State Term Used</b>	<b>Terms Used by MPOs</b>
TIP	FTIP	TIP, MTIP, FTIP, RTIP
STIP	FSTIP	FSTIP

Projects included in the FTIP may include projects from two other State programming documents: (1) the State Highways Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP), and (2), the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). The purpose of the SHOPP program is to maintain safety, operational integrity and rehabilitation of the State Highway System. The STIP is a five-year capital improvement program of transportation projects on and off the State Highway System funded with revenues from the State Highway Account and other sources. Caltrans manages the SHOPP program, while the CTC manages the STIP. The STIP is a five-year document and is updated every other year. The SHOPP is a ten-year document and is adopted by the CTC in August of each odd numbered year. These two programs are major components of the FTIP.

The Federal Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (FSTIP) is a compilation of the FTIPs prepared by the 18 MPOs. It also includes projects in rural areas of the state not represented by an MPO (Caltrans programs projects in the FSTIP for the rural areas). The FSTIP is prepared by Caltrans and submitted to the FHWA and FTA for approval. The FSTIP covers a four-year period and must be updated at least every four years. States have the option to update more frequently, if desired. Federally funded projects or non-federally funded regionally significant projects cannot be added to the FTIP or FSTIP unless they are included in the RTP. Specific requirements for the development and content of the FSTIP are contained in Title 23 CFR Part 450.218.

The diagram in Appendix B illustrates the federal/state programming process.

#### **Requirements (Shalls)**

**Federal:** Title 23 CFR Part 450.326(a) requires MPOs to prepare a transportation improvement program (TIP). Title 23 CFR Part 450.218(k) states that each project or project phase included in the STIP shall be consistent with the long range statewide transportation plan developed under Title 23 CFR Part 450.216 and, in metropolitan planning areas, consistent with the approved metropolitan transportation plan developed under Title 23 CFR Part 450.324.

### **6.16 Transportation Projects Exempted from Senate Bill 375**

Government Code Section 65080 (b)(2)(L) provides that projects programmed for funding on or before December 31, 2011, are not required to be subject to the provisions required in Government Code Section 65080 (b)(2), a Sustainable Communities Strategy and Alternative Planning Strategy, if they are:

- Contained in the 2007 or 2009 Federal Statewide Transportation Improvement Program, or
- Funded pursuant to the Highway Safety, Traffic Reduction, Air Quality, and Port Security Bond Act of 2006, Chapter 12.49 (commencing with Section 8879.20) of Division 1 of Title 2, or
- Were specifically listed in a ballot measure prior to December 31, 2008, approving a sales tax increase for transportation projects.

Nothing in Government Code Section 65080 (b)(2)(L) shall require a transportation sales tax authority to change the funding allocations approved by the voters for categories of transportation projects in a sales tax measure adopted prior to December 31, 2010. For



purposes of this subparagraph of the Government Code, a transportation sales tax authority is a district, as defined in Section 7252 of the Revenue and Taxation Code that is authorized to impose a sales tax for transportation purposes.

Programmed for funding refers to the inclusion of funding in the 2007 or 2009 FSTIP; the approval of funding by the State Legislature or appropriate administrative agency; or the approval of funding by voters in a sales tax expenditure plan.

For the purposes of Government Code Section 65080 (b)(2)(H), prior to adopting a SCS, the MPO shall quantify the reduction in GHG emissions projected to be achieved by the SCS and set forth the difference, if any, between the amount of that reduction and the target for the region established by the ARB. As a result, an MPO shall include exempted projects in their SCS for purposes of modeling the impacts of the RTP on regional GHG emissions.

Pursuant to Government Code Section 65080(b), the RTP is required to be an internally consistent document. This means the contents of the Policy, Action, Financial elements, and the Sustainable Communities Strategy must be consistent with one another and with the Goals, Policies, and Objectives of the RTP as adopted by the MPO.

Projects meeting the criteria in this section, however, are exempt from these internal consistency requirements. In other words, these projects may be included in the RTP even if they are inconsistent with the SCS or other policies to reduce regional GHG emissions.

However, exempted projects must meet all federal consistency requirements. In particular, pursuant to 23 CFR. 450.306 (b)(5), the RTP “planning process shall . . . promote consistency between transportation improvements and State and local planned growth and economic development”; and pursuant to 23 CFR 450.306 (f), “An MPO shall carry out the metropolitan transportation planning process in coordination with the statewide transportation planning process required by 23 U.S.C. 135 and 49 U.S.C. 5304,” and pursuant to 23 CFR 450.104, “*Coordination* means the cooperative development of plans, programs, and schedules among agencies and entities with legal standing and adjustment of such plans, programs, and schedules to achieve general consistency, as appropriate.”

A project’s status as exempt does not preclude an MPO from evaluating it for inclusion in the RTP and ultimately excluding it from the RTP at its discretion based on financial constraint, policy, or other considerations.

#### **Requirements (Shalls)**

**Federal:** None

**State:** California Government Code Section 65080 (b)(2)(H) and (L)

### **6.17 Regionally Significant Projects**

Title 40 CFR Part 93.101 defines regionally significant projects as follows:

*“Regionally significant project means a transportation project (other than an exempt project) that is on a facility which serves regional transportation needs (such as access to and from the area outside of the region, major activity centers in the region, major planned developments such as new retail malls, sports complexes, etc., or*

*transportation terminals as well as most terminals themselves) and would normally be included in the modeling of a metropolitan area's transportation network, including at a minimum all principal arterial highways and all fixed guide way transit facilities that offer an alternative to regional highway travel."*

All regionally significant projects must be included in an RTP air quality conformity determination by the MPO and FHWA regardless of its funding source. These regionally significant projects should be specifically identified and noted in the project-listing portion of RTP.

### **Requirements (Shalls)**

**Federal:** Title 23 CFR Part 450.326(f) requires all regionally significant projects be included in the TIP regardless if the projects are to be funded with federal funds or not.

## **6.18 Regional ITS Architecture**

Intelligent transportation systems (ITS) encompass a broad range of wireless and wire line communications-based information and electronics technologies. When integrated into the transportation system's infrastructure, and in vehicles themselves, these technologies relieve congestion and improve safety. ITS is one way to increase the efficiency, safety and security of a transportation system. ITS involves the use of advanced computer, electronic and communications technologies and emphasizes *enhancing travel on existing infrastructure* (highways, streets, bridges, trains). Some examples of ITS technologies include advanced traffic signals, roadway and weather monitoring stations, bus and maintenance vehicle location systems, electronic roadside information signs and automated vehicle control systems.

The National ITS Program was established by ISTEA in 1991. Further federal regulations focused on extending ITS to regional planning efforts and training transportation professionals to deal with the range of issues associated with the adoption of advanced transportation technology. The development of the regional ITS architecture is not meant to compete with the formal transportation planning process. In fact, key ITS projects and initiatives are targeted early in the planning process. When updating RTPs, MPOs should be sure to comply with current federal regulations. Title 23 CFR Part 450.306(g) states, "*The metropolitan transportation planning process shall, to the maximum extent practicable, be consistent with the development of applicable regional intelligent transportation systems (ITS) architectures, as defined in Title 23 CFR Part 940.*"

Title 23 CFR Part 940 establishes the protocol for developing a regional architecture plan that, in turn, conforms to national ITS architecture standards. The ITS regulations defines the responsibilities for creating and maintaining Regional ITS Architecture (RA) frameworks. Architecture maintenance is the process of updating a regional architecture with references to new projects and activities, new stakeholders; additions, retirement or replacement of equipment; and, changes to standards and protocols. Maintenance is an ITS program responsibility under Title 23 CFR Part 940.

The intent of the federal ITS requirement is to encourage reciprocal consistency. Title 23 CFR Part 940.5, Intelligent transportation system architecture and standards, calls for the "development of the regional ITS architecture (to) be consistent with the (Metropolitan) transportation planning process...". It is important to coordinate the general RTP planning efforts with plans for specific projects that entail the use of ITS technology. These 'nested'

plans should be developed in an open forum and they should be consistent. The resultant plans would reflect consideration of both documents during the planning process.

The National ITS Architecture and other related resources can be found at the U.S. DOT Architecture website:

<http://www.its.dot.gov/arch/arch.htm>

### **Requirements (Shalls)**

**Federal:** Title 23 CFR Part 450.306(g) states that the RTP shall (to the extent practicable) be consistent with the development of applicable regional ITS architectures as defined in Title 23 CFR Part 940.

## **6.19 Future of Transportation & New Technology**

While maintaining the current transportation network is often a priority for MPOs, MPOs need to be planning ahead for a future in which technology will transform the way that people move and live. MPOs are ideally positioned to anticipate and be responsive to the needs of future generations. This section provides a summary of federal and State legislation to prepare for new technologies and innovations for the future of transportation.

### **Connected Vehicle Program**

There are several activities related to the national Connected Vehicle Program that will certainly impact regional and local transportation agencies, in addition to Caltrans. Since 90% of the roadways in California are owned and operated by local agencies, including the 58 counties and more than 500 incorporated cities, it is critically important for them to be aware of and to plan for the implementation of connected vehicles.

MPOs should be aware of the pending rule being considered by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) to mandate that equipment for vehicle-to-vehicle (V2V) communications, using a technology called “Dedicated Short-Range Communications” (DSRC), be installed in the light-duty passenger car fleet to enable applications that improve vehicle safety. As the government regulator for auto industry safety, NHTSA is expected to adopt this rule, as it did for other safety systems such as seat belts, airbags, and anti-lock brakes. A future update of the RTP Guidelines will capture any “shoulds” or “shalls” resulting from the rulemaking process.

MPOs should also be aware of the pending guidance from the FHWA to transportation infrastructure owner/operators (Caltrans; counties; and cities) on what equipment they should consider installing in their infrastructure to support both V2V and vehicle-to-infrastructure (V2I) communications, again using DSRC. The best example of this equipment is the DSRC radios. These radios provide the communication capability that is essential for V2I applications. Roadside processors may also be necessary in some cases where the applications demands heavier computing requirements.

Unlike connected vehicles, the development of which is being led by the federal government, in partnership with state DOT’s, regional transportation agencies, and the auto industry, automated vehicles are being developed by the technology industry, including companies such

as Google, Tesla, and Delphi. So far, their philosophy has been to avoid dependence on the infrastructure. However it is difficult to achieve vehicle automation and connected vehicle (CV) applications without appropriate support from the infrastructure. The infrastructure needs to be upgraded with DSRC radios and roadside processors. The roadside processors are not an absolute requirement but may be required in some cases.

Title 23 U.S.C. Section 518 requires the U.S. DOT Secretary establishing guidance for recommended implementation path for V2V and V2I communication system deployment. Title 23 U.S.C. Section 519 ensures that funds are available for the development of Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) Infrastructure, equipment and systems.

**Planning Practice Examples:** Available in Appendix L

## **Transportation Electrification**

Pursuant to PUC 740.12(a)(2), it is the policy of the state and the intent of the legislature to encourage transportation electrification as a means to achieve ambient air quality standards and the state's climate goals. Agencies designing and implementing regulation, guidelines, plans, and funding programs to reduce GHG emissions shall take the findings described in paragraph (1) of PUC Section 740.12 into account.

MPOs are encouraged to support widespread transportation electrification and partner with state agencies to advance California toward the standards and goals outlined in Public Utilities Code Section 740.12(a)(1). These include:

- Reducing emissions of GHGs to 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030 and to 80 percent below 1990 levels by 2050.
- Achieving the goals of the Charge Ahead California Initiative (Chapter 8.5 (commencing with Section 44258) of Part 5 of Division 26 of the Health and Safety Code).
- Meeting air quality standards, reducing petroleum use, improving public health, and achieving GHG emission reduction goals.
- Attracting investments and high quality jobs.

See Appendix L for examples of how MPOs are planning for transportation electrification.

**Planning Practice Examples:** Available in Appendix L

## **6.20 Transportation Safety**

While Caltrans supports consideration of security as separate from safety as a planning area, it also recognizes that security and emergency responses efforts are often inextricably linked. Clearly both are linked to ensuring system security and availability of emergency response services in the event of a natural or human-caused disaster. Due to unexpected large-scale security incidents or natural disasters, the potential for the necessity of a wide scale evacuation exists in almost every area of California. MPOs can use the CTP as a resource for *recommendations for public safety and security improvements, such as supporting the implementation of Positive Train Control (PTC) into existing intercity rail cars.*

Under a prior federal surface transportation reauthorization known as TEA-21, safety and security were lumped together in one federal planning factor. SAFETEA-LU changed this in

order to signal the importance of these two items. Safety and security were again updated with MAP-21/FAST Act and are separate federal planning factors. According to Title 23 CFR Part 450.306(b), these two planning factors are:

1. Increase the safety of the transportation system for all motorized and non-motorized users; and,
2. Increase the security of the transportation system for motorized and non-motorized users.

The public expects, and demands, that the transportation system be safe and efficient for all users. Addressing the improvement of transportation safety can help alleviate a myriad of health, financial, and quality-of-life issues for travelers. Fatalities and injuries from motor vehicles crashes are a major public health problem. Historically, transportation safety has not been included as part of the transportation planning process. A clear need has developed for safety to be considered as part of planning process instead of as a reactionary consideration as it has been. To be adequately addressed, safety must be a key goal within the process. Improving the safety of the transportation network requires an active, conscious approach to monitoring the transportation system for safety problems and anticipating problems before they occur.

## **Strategic Highway Safety Plan**

Federal law requires MPOs to draw a strong link between the Strategic Highway Safety Planning process described in Title 23 U.S.C. Section 148 and the regional planning process. Federal regulations also require MPOs to summarize the priorities, goals, countermeasures or projects of the Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP) in their RTPs. SHSPs were first required under SAFETEA-LU, which established the Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) as a core federal program. The FAST Act continues the HSIP as a core Federal-aid program and the requirement for States to develop, implement, evaluate and update an SHSP that identifies and analyzes highway safety problems and opportunities on all public roads no less than every five years. Each State must have a Strategic SHSP in place to receive its full share of federal transportation funds.

Each MPO should review the California SHSP during the preparation of the portion of the RTP addressing safety. The SHSP:

1. Highlights challenges to roadway user safety on California's roads;
2. Provides a descriptive account of fatalities experienced on California's roads;
3. Proposes high-level strategies to reduce fatalities for each challenge; and,
4. Includes a five-year guide for the implementation of specific projects and activities.

The California SHSP is available on the Caltrans website at:

<http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/traffops/survey/SHSP/>

## **Safety Performance Measures**

The MAP-21/FAST Act established Safety Performance Management (PM) as part of the overall Transportation Performance Management (TPM) program, which FHWA defines as a strategic

approach that uses system information to make investment and policy decision to achieve national performance goals. Refer to Section 7.1 for more information.

#### **Requirements (Shall)**

**Federal:** Title 23 CFR Part 450.306(b)(2) states the planning process will address the safety of the transportation system for the public.

**State:** None

#### **Recommendations (Should)**

**Federal:** Title 23 CFR Part 450.306(d)(4) states that RTPs should be consistent with the California Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP) and other transit safety and security planning and review processes. Title 23 CFR Part 450.324(h) states the RTP should include a safety element that incorporates or summarizes the priorities, goals, countermeasures or projects for the MPOs region contained in the SHSP.

### **6.21 Transportation Security**

A report was prepared by the American Highway Users Alliance titled “*Emergency Evacuation Report Card 2006*”. The report stated: “*The principal resources of urban evacuation are private cars and publicly provided highways. As a result of the threat of terrorism, the interstate system is reasserting itself as a major element of national security (and defense), principally due to its capacity for handling mass evacuations.*” The report conducted an initial evacuation capacity evaluation for the 37 largest urbanized areas in the United States. These urbanized areas were graded from “A” to “F”. Of the four California urbanized areas identified in the report, three (San Diego, San Francisco and Los Angeles) received a grade of “F”. Sacramento, the fourth California city identified in this report received a “D”.

Due to unexpected large-scale security incidents or natural disasters, the potential for the necessity of a wide scale evacuation exists in almost every area of California. One of the lessons learned from the terrorist attack on the World Trade Center in New York City was that effective coordination and communication among the many different operating agencies in a region is absolutely essential. Such coordination is needed to allow law enforcement and safety responses to occur in an expeditious manner, while at the same time still permitting the transportation system to handle the possibly overwhelming public response to the incident. Complementary to this is the need to make sure the public has clear and concise information about the situation and what actions they should take.

Although the immediate organizational response to security incidents and disasters will be the responsibility of law enforcement/safety agencies, there is an important role that MPOs can play in promoting coordinated planning among first responders and transit agencies in anticipation of unexpected events or natural disasters. In addition, MPOs could also provide a centralized location of information on transportation system conditions and the responses that might be useful in an emergency.

In developing the RTP, MPOs are required to consult with agencies and officials responsible for other planning activities within the region including natural disaster risk reduction. The RTP should identify the primary agencies responsible for preparing the necessary plans should a wide scale evacuation be necessary. The MPO should consult the appropriate emergency plan

for the region to determine what evacuation plans are in place. Examples of strategies that could be addressed in regional mass evacuation plans could include:

1. Signaling – Allows traffic signals to extend for up to four minutes in either red or green to allow large amounts of vehicles or pedestrians to proceed in one direction;
2. Traffic Control Guides – Deploy traffic control personnel to problem intersections to manually direct traffic;
3. Roadblocks and Barricades – Deploy various methods such as portable signs, cones or barrels;
4. Electronic Signage – Changeable message signs have been installed along a number of major routes that could be used to provide information to evacuees;
5. Lane Expansion – Involves the use of using road shoulders to increase vehicle capacity of evacuation routes;
6. Contra flow Lanes – Contra flow or lane reversal involves directing traffic to use lanes in both directions to move a large amount of vehicles in one direction;
7. Use of Mass Transit – Transit could be used to assist in the evacuation of the public should it become necessary; and,
8. Airport Use – Airports can be used as staging areas for medical and food supplies as well as evacuation.

#### **Requirements (Shalls)**

**Federal:** Title 23 CFR Part 450.306(b)(3) states the planning process will address the security of the transportation system for the public. 23 CFR 450.316(b) requires MPOs to consult with agencies and officials responsible for planning natural disaster risk reduction.

#### **Recommendations (Shoulds)**

**Federal:** Title 23 CFR Part 450.324(h) states that RTPs should be consistent with emergency relief and disaster preparedness plans, strategies and policies that support homeland security and safeguard the personal security of all motorized and non-motorized users.

## **6.22 Assessment of Capital Investment & Other Strategies**

MAP-21/FAST Act added a new requirement for RTPs to also include an assessment of capital investment and other strategies to:

1. Preserve the existing and projected transportation infrastructure;
2. Provide for multimodal capacity increases based on regional priorities and needs; and,
3. Reduce the vulnerability of the existing transportation infrastructure to natural disasters.

The timeline for implementation is outlined in 23 CFR Part 450.340(a). Prior to May 27, 2018, an MPO may adopt an RTP that has been developed using the SAFETEA-LU requirements or the provisions of the Statewide and Nonmetropolitan Transportation Planning *and* Metropolitan Transportation Planning Final Rule (23 CFR Part 450 and 771 and 49 CFR Part 613). On or after May 27, 2018, an MPO may not adopt an RTP that has not been developed according to the provisions of MAP-21/FAST Act as specified in the Planning Final Rule. MPOs are encouraged to communicate with Caltrans and FHWA/FTA to discuss schedules for RTP adoption.

The RTP may consider projects and strategies that address areas or corridors where current or projected congestions threatens the efficient functioning of key elements of the metropolitan area's transportation system.

**Requirements (Shalls)**

**Federal:** 23 CFR 450.324(f)(7)

## **6.23 Congestion Management Process**

The RTP shall describe and identify the transportation system management (TSM) and operations strategies, actions and improvements it will employ to manage and operate the urban freeway system, its corridors and major local parallel arterials for highest or increased productivity. Increased productivity can include all modes, including transit, bicycles, and pedestrians. There may be many ways to increase mobility without increasing GHG emissions. One way may be to improve the efficiency and productivity of the corridor through operational, transit and highway projects. TSM and operations strategies, actions and improvements shall include at a minimum traffic detection, traffic control, incident response and traveler information. Transportation demand strategies shall also be identified and can include, but are not limited to: Pricing, Transportation Planning, and Investment Strategies. Section 6.28 and Appendix L of the Guidelines contain additional information on strategies that can be used to manage congestion and reduce regional GHG emissions. The approach to TSM and operations shall be integrated into system planning documents.

### **Coordination of Project Programming**

Programming of projects shall be scheduled so that project sequencing in a corridor achieves the most effective performance results. In State Highway System corridors the system planning documents should identify the most effective project sequencing, including projects identified for major local arterials. System planning strategies to address performance issues can include: system evaluation and monitoring, maintenance and preservation, smart land use and demand management, Intelligent Transportation Systems, operational capacity strategies, multimodal and Complete Streets concepts.

### **Congestion Management Process in the RTP**

The RTP should identify urban freeway corridors with current and projected recurrent daily vehicle hours of delay that are a priority for preparing CSMPs and TCRs. The RTP should include by corridor all multimodal strategies, actions and improvements identified in the adopted TCR or CSMP that are needed to provide for safe and effective integrated management and operation of the multimodal transportation system across jurisdictions and modes to improve corridor performance based upon performance measurement. Approaches to improving corridor performance can include new and existing facilities, improved maintenance and operation of existing infrastructure, invest in and encouraging the use of alternative modes (such as transit, rail, bicycling and walking), encouraging smart land use, integrated corridor management strategies, among others.



The RTP should describe roles and relationships among units of local government, modal agencies, Caltrans and related agencies for managing the corridor for highest mobility benefits and for measuring and evaluating performance.

Title 23 CFR Part 450.322 applies only to the MPOs below and are federally designated Transportation Management Areas (TMAs). These TMAs shall develop a congestion management process that results in a multimodal system performance measures and strategies that can be reflected in the RTP. TMAs are defined as an urbanized area with a population over 200,000 as defined by the U.S. Census Bureau. California MPOs that are currently designated TMAs are:

1. Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG);
2. Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC);
3. San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG);
4. Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG);
5. Fresno County Council of Governments (FCOG);
6. Kern Council of Governments (KCOG);
7. San Joaquin Council of Governments (SJCOG);
8. Stanislaus Council of Governments (StanCOG);
9. Tulare County Association of Governments (TCAG); and,
10. Santa Barbara County Association of Governments (SBCAG)

## **Congestion Management Plan**

Effective with the MAP-21/FAST Act, MPOs serving a TMA may develop a congestion management plan that includes projects and strategies that will be considered in the FTIP. If developed, the MPO shall consult with employers, private and nonprofit providers of public transportation, transportation management organizations, and organizations that provide job access reverse commute projects or job-related services to low-income individuals.

If an MPO elects to develop the congestion management plan, it shall consist of the following:

- Develop regional goals to reduce VMT during peak commuting hours and improve transportation connections between areas with high job concentration and high concentrations of low-income households;
- Identify existing public transportation services, employer based commuter programs, and other existing transportation services that support access to jobs in the region; and,
- Identify proposed projects and programs to reduce congestion and increase job access opportunities.

### **Requirements (Shalls)**

**Federal:** Title 23 CFR Part 450.322(d) states the congestion management process shall be developed, established and implemented as part of the planning process.

### **Recommendations (Shoulds)**

**Federal:** Title 23 CFR Part 450.322(b) states the congestion management process should result in performance measures that can be reflected in the RTP. 23 CFR 450.322(h) provides MPOs the framework for developing a congestion management plan.

## **Regional GHG Emissions Requirements & Considerations in the RTP**

### **6.24 GHG Emissions & Targets Background**

Current law requires that the California Air Resources Board (ARB) update the regional GHG emission reduction targets every eight years. In 2017, ARB plans to update each MPO's targets for automobile and light trucks for 2020 and 2035, with these updated targets being effective on January 1, 2018 to meet the eight year requirement. In the resolution adopting the scoping plan, the ARB stated its intent that the SB 375 GHG emissions reduction targets will be the most ambitious achievable. In 2010, the first targets were established with consideration given to methodology recommendations from an appointed Regional Targets Advisory Committee (RTAC). The RTAC released its Recommendation Report entitled: *Recommendations of the Regional Targets Advisory Committee (RTAC) Pursuant to SB 375* on September 29, 2009 which is available at the following link:

<http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/sb375/rtac/report/092909/finalreport.pdf>

### **6.25 Contents of the Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS)**

#### **SCS Background**

Integrating transportation, land use, and housing, in the planning process is vital to reducing regional GHG emissions from cars and light trucks. The Sustainable Communities Strategy or SCS, was added as a new component of the RTP following the passage of SB 375 in September 2008, pursuant to Government Code Section 65080(b)(2).

For over 30 years, the primary purpose of the RTP has been to identify the transportation projects, programs and services needed to address both current conditions as well as future regional growth and to specify the major transportation projects to be programmed given the financial resources available. Pursuant to Government Code Section 65080(b)(2)(B) the SCS requires MPOs to work with local land use authorities and other appropriate entities to address regional land uses, regional housing needs, regional resource areas and farmland, as well as regional transportation needs in the RTP.

Government Code Section 65080(b)(2)(B)(vii) requires the SCS to set forth a forecasted development pattern for the region that when integrated with the transportation network, and other transportation measures and policies, will reduce regional GHG emissions from automobiles and light trucks to achieve, if there is a feasible way to do so, the regional GHG emission reduction target set by ARB. Government Code Section 65080.01(c) defines feasible as "capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, legal, social, and technological factors. In its advisory report to the ARB board, the RTAC stated that, "if a SCS for a region cannot meet its target, the SCS should still be a substantial improvement over Business As Usual (BAU) land use and transportation planning and that their regions and member cities would see substantial co-benefits as a result of implementing the SCS as planned."

If the RTP, including the SCS, does not achieve the regional GHG reduction target, the MPO can elect to either revise the SCS or prepare an Alternative Planning Strategy (APS) that is separate from the RTP. If a region must prepare an APS, that alternative scenario must

describe why the development pattern, measures, and policies in the APS are the most practicable choices for achievement of the GHG emissions reduction targets as required by Government Code Section 65080(b)(2)(I)(iii).

Government Code Section 65080(b) requires that the RTP be an internally consistent document. This means that the contents of the Policy, Action, Financial, and Sustainable Communities Strategy elements of the RTP shall be consistent with one another. As a result, transportation investments and the forecasted development pattern in the SCS should be complementary and not contradictory. For information regarding transportation projects exempt from the internal consistency provisions of SB 375 pursuant to Government Code Section 65080(b)(2)(L) please refer to Section 6.16 of these Guidelines.

### **Requirements of a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS)**

California Government Code Section 65080(b)(2)(B) requires that all MPOs shall prepare a Sustainable Communities Strategy, subject to the requirements of Part 450 of Title 23, and Part 93 of Title 40 of the CFR, including the requirement to utilize the most recent planning assumptions considering local general plans and other factors. The SCS shall:

1. Identify the general location of uses, residential densities, and building intensities within the region;
2. Identify areas within the region sufficient to house all the population of the region, including all economic segments of the population, over the course of the planning period of the regional transportation plan taking into account net migration into the region, population growth, household formation and employment growth;
3. Identify areas within the region sufficient to house an eight-year projection of the regional housing need for the region pursuant to Government Code Section 65584;
4. Identify a transportation network to service the transportation needs of the region;
5. Gather and consider the best practically available scientific information regarding resource areas and farmland in the region as defined in Government Code Section 65080.01(a) and (b);
6. Consider the state housing goals specified in Government Code Sections 65580 and 65581;
7. Set forth a forecasted development pattern for the region, which, when integrated with the transportation network, and other transportation measures and policies, will reduce the GHG emissions from automobiles and light trucks to achieve, if there is a feasible way to do so, the GHG emission reduction targets approved by the state board;
8. Allow the regional transportation plan to comply with Section 176 of the federal Clean Air Act (Title 42 U.S.C. 7506)

In addition, Government Code Section 65584.01(i)(1) states that it is the intent of the Legislature that housing planning be coordinated and integrated with the regional transportation plan. To achieve this goal the allocation plan shall allocate housing units within the region consistent with the development pattern included in the sustainable communities strategy.

#### **Requirements (Shall):**

**Federal:** Title 23 CFR Part 450 and Title 40 CFR Part 93

**State:** Government Code Section 65080, and 65584.04(i)(1)

## **6.26 SCS Development**

This section is intended to describe methods for the implementation of the statutory requirements for the development of an SCS recognizing that there is great variation among the 18 MPOs within the state and that flexibility is an important component in SCS development. The SCS shall be prepared in such a way as to allow for the quantification of regional GHG emissions reduction required pursuant to Government Code Section 65080(b)(2)(H).

### **Visualization & Mapping**

Pursuant to Title 23 CFR Part 450.316(a), an RTP is required to include visualization techniques such as GIS-based information, graphs, maps, charts, and other visual aids that are useable and understandable to the public. Additionally, Government Code Section 65080(b)(2)(F)(iii) requires that public workshops held during the development of the SCS, to the extent practicable, shall include urban simulation computer modeling to create visual representations of the SCS, and APS if applicable. Visualization techniques associated with SCS development should be documented and included in the final SCS. These visualization techniques may build upon existing federal and state requirements for the RTP and could include maps, illustrations, diagrams, and other visual aids which illustrate the SCS requirements as outlined in Government Code Section 65080(b)(2)(B).

### **SCS Planning Assumptions**

As required by Government Code Section 65080(b)(2)(B)(i) and (vii), the SCS shall identify the general location of uses, residential densities, and building intensities within the region as well as a forecasted development pattern for the region that is based upon the most recent planning assumptions considering local general plans and other factors. In addition, according to Government Code Section 65080(b)(2)(viii), the SCS must allow the RTP to comply with Section 176 of the Federal Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. Section 7506). Federal air quality conformity regulations require that land use, population and employment model assumptions are based upon the best available information and that there is a reasonable relationship between the expected land use and the envisioned transportation system. The reasonableness of a particular planning assumption is determined through consultation involving the FHWA and EPA in addition to state, local, and MPO representatives. MPOs should refer to Title 23 CFR Part 450 and Title 40 CFR Part 93 as well as the EPA document *Guidance for the Use of Latest Planning Assumptions in Transportation Conformity Determinations (Revision to January 18, 2001 Guidance Memorandum)* (see link provided below) for more information about consultation and the use of current planning assumptions.

[https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/air\\_quality/conformity/policy\\_and\\_guidance/lpa\\_guid08.pdf](https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/air_quality/conformity/policy_and_guidance/lpa_guid08.pdf)

Pursuant to Government Code Section 65080(b)(2)(K), neither the SCS nor the APS regulates the use of land, and does not supersede the land use authority of cities and counties within the region. City and county land use policies and regulations, including general plans, are not required to be consistent with the RTP, SCS or the APS.

In developing an SCS, an MPO shall consult with cities and counties about their existing general plans and foreseeable changes to their general plans over the period covered by the RTP, including RHNA, residential zoning, and programmatic actions addressed in the local housing

element and status of housing element update requirements MPOs are also required by Government Code Section 65080(b)(2)(G) to consider spheres of influence that have been adopted by the Local Agency Formation Commissions (LAFCOs) within the region during development of the SCS. Further, MPOs should consult with LAFCOs within the region regarding municipal service review boundaries, foreseeable changes to those boundaries and service capacities over the period covered by the RTP as well as any local LAFCO adopted policies regarding preservation of agricultural and open space land, island annexations, annexations, service extensions and sphere changes. MPOs are also encouraged to request the most recent Municipal Service Reviews for local agencies providing services in the region, as well as, LAFCO-prepared GIS maps, if available, for all local agency boundaries and spheres of influence in the region.

The legislative findings for SB 375 identify that: “greenhouse gas emissions from automobiles and light trucks can be substantially reduced by new vehicle technology and by the increased use of low carbon fuel. However, even taking these measures into account, it will be necessary to achieve significant additional greenhouse gas reductions from changed land use patterns and improved transportation. Without improved land use and transportation policy, California will not be able to achieve the goals of AB 32.” The legislative findings of SB 375 also recognize that: “California local governments need a sustainable source of funding to be able to accommodate patterns of growth consistent with the state’s climate, air quality, and energy conservation goals.” (Chapter 728, Statutes of 2008, Section 1(c) and (i))

In addition to the need for the SCS to be designed to achieve GHG emissions reductions, there are many other reasons why planning assumptions can be different than historical trends or existing plans and boundaries. The following is a non-exclusive list of circumstances when it may be appropriate or necessary to make an assumption that is different from historical trends or existing plans and boundaries:

1. The assumption accounts for new demographic, market, regulatory, or environmental trends that are likely to influence development choices, particularly in circumstances when it has been several years since a general plan has been updated.
2. The assumption accounts for adopted blueprints, habitat conservation plans or other plans which may accurately reflect likely future growth patterns.
3. The assumption accounts for general uses and densities within general plans that may be required to comply with state law. Examples required pursuant to Article 10.6 of the Planning and Zoning Law (housing element law) include: achieving an adequate housing site inventory for the previous or new planning period in order to meet the housing needs of all economic segments of the population; existing general plans do not yet include land use designations with zoning to accommodate the existing RHNA and cannot accommodate the next RHNA without amendment of land use designations and rezoning; local governments have not yet completed a scheduled rezoning program of an adopted housing element; or existing plans reflect ordinances, policies, voter-approved measures, or other standards which prevent the jurisdiction from accommodating the RHNA.
4. The assumption accounts for differences in the time horizons between the RTP (20 to 40 years or more) and local general plans (often 15 - 20 years).
5. The assumption accounts for increases or decreases in state, federal, or local funding of programs that influence the extent to which a program may or may not be implemented.
6. The assumption accounts for statutory requirements or other reasons identified through consultation with federal, state, and local agencies.

When planning and land use assumptions are made that are significantly different than historical trends, federal, state, and local agencies should be consulted as to whether the assumptions are reasonable, best available, and consistent with the transportation system set forth in the plan. The MPO should base its assumptions on the most reasonable forecasts taking into account changing population demographics and market demand over the life of the RTP. To the extent that they are reasonable and consistent with federal requirements, an MPO may base an SCS on planning assumptions that differ from historical trends, existing plans and boundaries. The MPO should document the assumptions made to develop the SCS.

## **Addressing Housing Needs in the SCS**

The passage of SB 375 increased the linkage of the Regional Housing Need Allocation (RHNA) process required by State Housing Element Law with the RTP development and adoption process. Regional Transportation Plans are to be updated at least every four years for nonattainment areas, and every five years for attainment areas unless an election was made to update every four years pursuant to GC 65580(b)(2)(M). Housing element updates are now to be adopted every 8 years for jurisdictions within nonattainment areas, except for those which must update every four years if they fail to adopt their housing element update within 120 days of the due date pursuant to Government Code Section 65588(e)(4). Housing elements for jurisdictions within attainment area MPOs not within MPOs are to continue to be adopted every 5 years except in those regions that elect to adopt an RTP every four years pursuant to Government Code Section 65080 (b)(2)(M).

The SCS shall accommodate the RHNA pursuant to Government Code Section 65584 and consider the state housing goals specified in Government Code Section 65580 and 65581. The development pattern of the SCS shall consider existing residential zoning obligations to accommodate the RHNA of the current housing element planning period as well as residential density implications for the pending RHNA with which the SCS is being coordinated. The SCS development pattern shall not preclude an individual community from accommodating its existing or pending RHNA.

Pursuant to Government Code Section 65080(b)(2)(B)(ii), the SCS shall identify areas within the region sufficient to house all the population of the region, including all economic segments of the population, over the course of the planning period of the regional transportation plan, taking into account net migration into the region, population growth, household formation, and employment growth. This is separate from the requirement pursuant to 65080(b)(2)(B)(iii) to identify areas sufficient to house an eight year projection of the housing need pursuant to the RHNA process in Section 65584 *et seq.*

Unlike the RHNA process which allocates a minimum amount and economic distribution of housing to be accommodated within the housing element planning period, there are not comparable, formal parameters for the entire RTP planning period. The planning period for the RTP is at least 12 years longer than the housing element planning period accommodated in the RTP.

Thus, MPOs should include an analysis within the SCS that looks forward over the entire planning period and reasonably addresses what the housing need may be and where the region can meet its housing needs for all economic segments of the population over the course of the RTP planning period. This analysis should assume a variety of housing types and densities

including multi-family densities in each jurisdiction. Documentation to support this analysis should be prepared and may include a narrative description, map, data, or other resources (or any combination thereof) that identifies where within the region this need can be met. Like all planning assumptions, assumptions related to identifying housing needs beyond the RHNA allocation period should be reevaluated each time the RTP is updated.

Government Code Section 65080(b) (2)(B)(iii) requires that the SCS identify areas within the region sufficient to house the projection of the regional housing need for the region pursuant to Government Code Section 65584. The RHNA process establishes a minimum amount of housing development capacity for each city's and county's housing element. Each city and county must demonstrate this capacity with adequate sites, and development standards and programs to accommodate the RHNA within the planning period of an updated housing element. The RHNA process includes many steps and statutorily required deadlines which are included in more detail in Appendix I. Key steps of the RHNA process for Councils of Governments (COGs) which are MPOs, or which are within or coterminous with MPO boundaries, are as follows:

1. Consultation with HCD regarding HCD's determination of RHNA (at least 26 months) prior to local governments' housing element due date: The regional planning agency is required to distribute RHNA shares to each local government at least 12 months prior to local governments' housing element due date.
2. Methodology Development for COG's RHNA Plan (more than 24 months before housing element due date): the COG, with survey information and participation of its local governments, develops methodology for allocation of the region's housing need determination.
3. Distribution of draft RHNA (at least 18 months before the due date for adoption of the housing element): the COG, based on the Draft RHNA Plan, distributes the draft RHNA of housing unit need to each city and county government in the region. The Draft RHNA Plan is first subjected to requests for revision followed by opportunity for local government appeals. This plan is developed concurrently with development of the RTP, including the SCS.
4. RHNA Plan Adoption (adopted at least one year before the housing element due date): the COG is required to adopt a Final RHNA Plan within three days submit the RHNA Plan to HCD.
5. HCD Approval of Final RHNA Plan (HCD's finding for the Final RHNA Plan is due within 60 days of receipt): the final RHNA Plan is subject to review and approval by HCD for consistency of the plan with its (prior) housing need determination for the region. If not, HCD is authorized to revise the COG allocations for a Final RHNA Plan.
6. Local Government Housing Elements (must be updated within 18 months of adoption of the RTP): each local government within the region must adopt an updated housing element specifying housing sites, policies, and programs that will accommodate its allocation of units from the Final RHNA Plan approved by HCD.

For the eight-year planning period for housing element revisions, the COG shall allocate housing units to cities and counties within the region consistent with the development pattern included in the SCS as required by Government Code Section 65584.04 (i). Government Code Section 65584.09 (a)(b)(c) also requires that if a city or county in the prior planning period failed to identify or make available adequate sites to accommodate that portion of the regional housing need allocated pursuant to Section 65584, then the city or county shall, within the first year of the planning period of the new housing element, zone or rezone adequate sites to

accommodate the un-accommodated portion of the RHNA from the prior planning period. Further, the law requires that this shall be in addition to any zoning or rezoning required to accommodate the jurisdiction's share of the regional housing need pursuant to Section 65584 for the new planning period.

**Requirements (Shall):**

**Federal:** Title 23 CFR Part 450 and Title 40 CFR Part 93

**State:** Government Code 65080, Government Code 65584.01 (c) & (d), Government Code 65583.2 (c), Government Code 65584.04 (d), (f) & (i), Government Code 65584.05 (g) & (h)

Relevant Links:

Appendix 1 of HCD Memorandum: Amendment of State Housing Element Law – AB 2348, Listing of Default Densities by Jurisdiction:

<http://www.hcd.ca.gov/hpd/hrc/plan/he/ab2348stat04ch724.pdf>

### **Addressing Regional Transportation Needs**

Government Code Section 65080 (b)(2)(B)(iv) requires that an SCS identify a transportation system to service the transportation needs of the region. While the SCS requirements for the RTP do not change the process used to establish transportation needs for the region, the SCS forecasted development pattern and transportation network, measures, and policies should complement one another to reduce regional GHG emissions from light duty trucks and automobiles. Decisions to expand or modify the transportation system should be made in recognition of the effects of transportation on development location and density, and also in recognition of the following relationships between land use and transportation:

- Transit investments need supporting levels of land use density and intensity.
- The speed of the network and the cost of travel may influence the location choices of new development.
- Placing land uses closer together and minimizing unnecessary barriers to circulation increases travel choices such that transit, walking, and bicycling become viable while also reducing transportation sector energy use and GHG emissions.

The SCS may also include transportation policies designed to reduce GHG emissions such as strategies for Transportation Demand Management (TDM) and Transportation System Management (TSM). Additional information regarding TDM, TSM and other strategies is available in Section 6.28 and Appendix L.

### **Addressing Resource Areas and Farmland**

The SCS is required pursuant to Government Code Section 65080(b)(2)(B)(v) to gather and consider the best practically available scientific information regarding resource areas and farmland in the region as defined in Government Code Section 65080.01 (a) and (b), listed below:

(a) “Resource areas” include:

- (1) All publicly owned parks and open space;



- (2) Open space or habitat areas protected by natural community conservation plans, habitat conservation plans, and other adopted natural resource protection plans;
- (3) Habitat for species identified as candidate, fully protected, sensitive, or species of special status by local, state, or federal agencies or protected by the federal Endangered Species Act of 1973, the California Endangered Species Act, or the Native Plant Protection Act;
- (4) Lands subject to conservation or agricultural easements for conservation or agricultural purposes by local governments, special districts, or nonprofit 501(c)(3) organizations, areas of the state designated by the State Mining and Geology Board as areas of statewide or regional significance pursuant to Section 2790 of the Public Resources Code, and lands under Williamson Act contracts;
- (5) Areas designated for open-space or agricultural uses in adopted open-space elements or agricultural elements of the local general plan or by local ordinance;
- (6) Areas containing biological resources as described in Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines that may be significantly affected by the sustainable communities strategy or the alternative planning strategy; and
- (7) An area subject to flooding where a development project would not, at the time of development in the judgment of the agency, meet the requirements of the National Flood Insurance Program or where the area is subject to more protective provisions of state law or local ordinance.

(b) "Farmland" means farmland that is outside all existing city spheres of influence or city limits as of January 1, 2008, and is one of the following:

- (1) Classified as prime or unique farmland or farmland of statewide importance.
- (2) Farmland classified by a local agency in its general plan that meets or exceeds the standards for prime or unique farmland or farmland of statewide importance.

The SCS may include a narrative description, map, data, or other resources (or any combination thereof), developed in consultation with the appropriate resource agencies including cities and counties, which identifies regional resource areas and farmland.

Additionally Sections 5.3, 5.4, and Appendix L of the Guidelines include more information regarding the consideration of regional environmental resource areas and farmland and advanced resource mitigation planning in RTP development.

## **Designing a Forecasted Development Pattern in the SCS**

MPOs are required to develop a forecasted development pattern for the region that, when integrated with the regional transportation network and other transportation measures and policies, will reduce regional GHG emissions from cars and light trucks to achieve, if there is a feasible way to do so, the regional targets set by ARB. In preparing the forecasted development pattern, empirical relationships between land use, transportation and the resulting GHG emissions should be considered. Such factors may include, but are not limited to:

- Destination-proximity, or the accessibility of an area to other activities.
- Density and clustering of land uses, typically measured by the number of dwelling units, shops, and/or employees per acre or square mile, floor area ratio (FAR), and other similar measurements.

- Diversity or mixture of land uses, including residential, commercial, and business land uses within buildings and/or in proximity to one another.
- Distance to transit, including rail, bus, and/or ferry.
- Design and layout of an area's transportation facilities to accommodate multiple modes of transportation.

In developing the forecasted development pattern for the SCS, local context should also be considered. MPOs, local jurisdictions, and other stakeholders should strive to create a supportive consensus on an SCS, so that the SCS may guide local jurisdictions in future general plan updates.

## **Considering Social Equity in the SCS**

The inclusion of the entire range of community interests in the development of the RTP (including the SCS) is a key element in the process, and is required by state and federal law. Providing more transportation and mobility choices such as increased transit, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities, as well as appropriate housing choices near job centers increases opportunities for all segments of the population at all income levels. Each MPO is encouraged to develop, enhance, and use visioning tools during the SCS development process enabling the public and policy makers to clearly see social equity impacts of various planning scenarios and make informed choices. Some MPOs include disadvantaged groups that are not defined by the traditional parameters of the low income and minority groups, such as groups identified as disadvantaged due to environmental impacts identified under CalEnviroScreen (established pursuant to SB 535, Chapter 830, Statutes of 2012) Social equity impacts include air quality, access to transit, access to electric vehicle charging, household transportation costs, housing costs and overall housing supply. Additional information regarding specific statutory requirements for Title VI and environmental justice considerations in the RTP is available in Section 4.2 and additional information regarding social equity factors in the public participation process is available in Section 4.3.

## **Considering Rural Communities in the SCS**

Regulatory and financing mechanisms such as Government Code Section 65080, Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund programs, CEQA incentives etc. provide a framework and incentives for infill and transit oriented development policies and projects that contribute to the achievement of regional per capita GHG emissions reductions in the RTP/SCS. The consideration of rural communities within the region in the development of the RTP (including the SCS) is a key element in the process, to ensure that regional GHG reductions and associated co-benefits such as improved access to jobs and services are not achieved at the expense of small towns and rural communities where high frequency transit and/or high density development is not feasible. The RTP process should consider policies and programs for investments in rural communities that improve sustainability and access to jobs and services and that protect resource areas, farmland, and agricultural economies. For additional information on addressing resource areas and farmland in the RTP, please see the preceding section entitled "Addressing Resource Areas and Farmland."

Government Code Section 65080 (b)(4)(C) states that the MPO or county transportation agency, whichever entity is appropriate, shall consider financial incentives for cities and counties that have resource areas or farmland, as defined in Government Code Section 65080.01, for the purposes of, for example, transportation investments for the preservation and

safety of the city street or county road system and farm to market and interconnectivity transportation needs. The MPO or county transportation agency, whichever entity is appropriate, shall also consider financial assistance for counties to address countywide service responsibilities in counties that contribute towards the GHG emission reduction targets by implementing policies for growth to occur within their cities.

In recognition of limited regional financial resources, MPOs are encouraged to pursue and assist their partner agencies in the pursuit of discretionary state and other funding sources to address resource areas, farmland, and rural sustainability in the RTP process.

**Requirements (Shall):**

**Federal:** None

**State:** Government Code Section 65080

**Specific SCS Development Requirements for MPOs in Multi-County Regions**

There are five Multi-County MPO's within California:

- Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG): covers a three county region.
- Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC): covers a nine county region in the San Francisco Bay Area.
- Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG): covers a six county region.
- Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG): covers a six county region.
- Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization (TMPO): covers a portion of Placer and El Dorado Counties.

Government Code Section 65080(b)(2)(C), (D) and (N) assigns certain responsibilities and collaboration requirements or options for the development of an SCS in multi-county MPO regions and in the San Joaquin Valley. The AMBAG and SACOG multi-county MPO regions are not specifically addressed in 65080(b)(2)(C), (D) or (N) however, **RTPAs** within these regions should work closely with the appropriate MPO when developing their RTPs for inclusion in the MPOs RTP, as these multi-county MPO regions are still required to fully comply with the SCS requirements outlined in 65080(b)(2)(B).

San Francisco Bay Area – Pursuant to Government Code Section 65080(b)(2)(C)(i), within the nine county San Francisco Bay Area region, the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) is responsible for the land use and housing related issues in the SCS. The Metropolitan Transportation Commission is responsible for identifying the regional transportation needs. ABAG and MTC are jointly responsible for setting forth a forecasted development pattern for the region that, when integrated with the transportation network, measures and policies, will reduce GHG emissions from passenger vehicles and if, feasible, achieve GHG reduction targets set by the ARB.

Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) – Within the SCAG region, there are six County Transportation Commissions (CTCs) and fourteen sub-regional COGs. Government Code Section 65080(b)(2)(C) allows a COG and a CTC to jointly develop a SCS and APS (if needed). SCAG has developed a document titled: “*Framework and Guidelines by the Southern California Association of Governments for the Development of a Sub-Regional SCS/APS*”. This document is intended to provide guidance for the development of a sub-regional SCS or APS,

and should be consulted prior to any SCS/APS related work. SCAG shall include the sub-regional work within their overall SCS contained in SCAG's RTP, to the extent that the sub-regional work is consistent with the provisions of Government Code 65080 and federal law. Please see Government Code 65080 (b)(2)(C) for specific requirements.

**San Joaquin Valley** - The following eight counties constitute the MPOs located in the San Joaquin Valley: Fresno, Kern, Kings, Madera, Merced, San Joaquin, Stanislaus and Tulare. These eight counties are located in one air quality basin and the MPOs have a long history of collaborating on the preparation of their respective RTPs particularly as it relates to the federal air quality conformity determination. Government Code section 65080 (N) stipulates that two or more of these MPOs may work together on the development of a joint SCS or APS, should they choose to do so.

**Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization (TMPO)** – Pursuant to Government Code Section 65080(b)(2)(C)(ii), within the jurisdiction of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency, as defined in Sections 66800 and 66801, TMPO shall use the Regional Plan for the Lake Tahoe Region as the sustainable community strategy, provided it complies with Government Code Section 65080(b)(2)(B)(vii) and (viii).

**Requirements (Shall):**

**Federal:** Title 23 CFR Part 450, Title 40 CFR Part 93, and Title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964

**State:** Government Code Sections 11135 and 65080

## **6.27 SCS Process, Review & Acceptance**

### **Regional GHG Emissions Reduction Targets**

State statute requires the ARB to set regional GHG emissions reduction targets for each MPO. Before setting the target for a region, ARB will exchange technical information with each MPO and the respective air quality management district. The MPO may recommend a target for its region during this process. Advanced and continuous communication and consultation between ARB and each MPO is highly recommended until the final target is adopted.

Questions regarding regional GHG emission reduction targets should be directed to ARB.

### **SCS Public Participation & Input/Consultation with Local Elected Officials**

SB 375 increased the minimum level of public participation in the regional transportation planning process as well as the consultation required with local elected officials during the development of a SCS (and APS, if applicable). For more detailed information regarding these requirements for the development of an SCS (and an APS, if applicable) please refer to Sections 4.7 and 4.8 of the RTP Guidelines.

### **California Air Resources Board Review of the SCS**

Prior to starting the public participation process adopted pursuant to Government Code 65080 (b)(2)(F), the MPO shall submit a description to the state board of the technical methodology it intends to use to estimate the GHG emissions from its SCS and, if appropriate, its APS. ARB shall respond to the MPO in a timely manner with written comments about the technical

methodology, including specifically describing any aspects of the methodology it concludes will not yield accurate estimates of GHG emissions, and suggested remedies. The MPO is encouraged to work with the ARB until the state board concludes that the technical methodology operates accurately.

After adoption of the RTP, a MPO shall submit a SCS or an APS, if one has been adopted, to the ARB for review, including the quantification of the GHG emission reductions the strategy would achieve and a description of the technical methodology used to obtain that result. Review by the ARB shall be limited to acceptance or rejection of the MPO's determination that the strategy submitted would, if implemented, achieve the GHG emission reduction targets established by ARB. The ARB shall complete its review within 60 days.

If ARB determines that the strategy submitted would not, if implemented, achieve the GHG emissions reduction targets, the MPO shall revise its strategy or adopt an APS, if not previously adopted, and submit the strategy for review pursuant to the paragraph above. At a minimum, the MPO must obtain ARB acceptance that an APS would, if implemented, achieve the GHG emission reduction targets established for that region by the state board.

Advanced and continuous communication and consultation between each MPO and ARB is encouraged until the final SCS, or APS if applicable, is adopted.

A flowchart depicting the RTP Development/Approval Process for MPOs including ARB review of the SCS, and APS if applicable, is available in Section 2.8. For additional information on the SCS Review process please refer to the California Air Resources Board SB 375 Implementation website:

<https://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/sb375/sb375.htm>

## **6.28 Land Use & Transportation Strategies to Address Regional GHG Emissions**

Better land use and transportation strategies will continue to be important to MPOs in developing their RTPs to meet local, regional and statewide mobility and economic needs while meeting the requirements of SB 375 and AB 32 to reduce regional GHG emissions. MPOs can encourage well-designed and sustainable local and regional projects that encourage reductions in GHG emissions by considering and implementing land use and transportation strategies. The strategies set forth below and in Appendix L are suggested methods that may help the MPO to reduce regional GHG emissions.

Land use strategies can include, but are not limited to:

- Mixed use, infill, and higher density development projects.
- Public transit incorporated into project design.
- Open space, parks, existing trees, and replacement trees.
- "Brownfields" and other underused property near existing public transportation and jobs developed.
- Pedestrian and bicycle-only streets and plazas within developments.
- Consideration of current and future school sites and needs regarding school-related trips.

Transportation strategies can include, but are not limited to:

- Promote ride sharing programs
- Employer-sponsored shuttle services
- Encourage or use low or zero-emission vehicles
- Create car sharing programs
- Provide shuttle service to public transit
- Incorporate bicycle-friendly intersections into street design
- Create active transportation plans
- A school district may provide bussing to students based on the distance from a school, other hazards to walking to the school, or other district criteria. Consider opportunities to incorporate existing and planned school district busing to supplement and complement public transit options.
- Consider opportunities to protect or improve designated and proposed school district safe routes to school in community wide transportation strategies and investments (e.g. transit improvements bifurcating neighborhoods near schools disrupting pedestrian/bike access).

Additional strategies include, but are not limited to:

- Pricing Strategies (can include Congestion Pricing, Road Tolling, HOT lanes and toll roads, Parking Pricing and Alternative Mode Programs)
- Transportation Planning and Investment Strategies in the Smart Mobility Framework
- Urban and suburban infill, clustered development, mixed land uses, New Urbanist design, transit-oriented development, and other “smart-growth” strategies: Strategies incorporating the “D factors” (See Professor Robert Cervero’s research as noted in Cervero, R. and K. Kockelman (1997) “Travel Demand and the 3Ds: Density, Diversity, and Design,” *Transportation Research D*, Vol. 2, pp. 199-219. Other resources used to define these factors include Fehr & Peers' *Accurate Trip Generation Estimates for Mixed-Use Projects*, and Cervero and Lee's *The Effect of Housing Near Transit Stations on Vehicle Trip Rates and Transit Trip Generation*.)
- Congestion Management improving traffic circulation to reduce vehicle idling (coordinate controlled intersections for traffic to pass more efficiently through congested areas)
- Transportation Demand Management

As regions explore various land use and transportation strategies to reduce GHG emissions in the Sustainable Communities Strategy, MPOs should consider identifying and to the extent possible, quantifying the co-benefits associated with GHG emissions reduction strategies throughout the RTP implementation processes. Co-benefits are positive externalities that result from reducing GHGs such as increased mobility, reduced air and water pollution, economic opportunities, and healthier, more equitable and sustainable communities.

The strategy suggestions listed above, and in more detail in Appendix L are applicable to MPOs. Links to various planning practice examples are also available in Appendix L.

**Planning Practice Examples:** Available in Appendix L

## **6.29 Alternative Planning Strategy (APS) Overview**

Pursuant to California Government Code Section 65080(b)(2)(H), if the SCS, prepared in compliance with 65080(b)(2)(B) or (C), is unable to reduce GHG emissions to achieve the GHG emission target established by the ARB, the MPO shall prepare an APS to the SCS showing how that GHG emissions target would be achieved through alternative development patterns, infrastructure, or additional transportation measures and policies. The APS shall be a separate document from the RTP. In preparing the APS, the MPO:

1. Shall identify the principal impediments to achieving the targets within the SCS
2. May include an alternative development pattern for the region pursuant to 65080(b)(2)(B) to (F) inclusive,
3. Shall describe how the GHG emissions reduction targets would be achieved by the APS, and why the development pattern, measures, and policies in the APS are the most practicable choices for achievement of the GHG emission reduction targets,
4. An alternative development pattern set forth in the APS shall comply with Part 450 of Title 23 of, and Part 93 of Title 40 of, the Code of Federal Regulations, except to the extent that compliance will prevent achievement of the GHG emission reduction targets approved by the ARB,
5. For purposes of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), an APS shall not constitute a land use plan, policy or regulation, and the inconsistency of a project with an alternative planning strategy shall not be a consideration in determining whether a project may have an environmental effect.

For additional information on the APS please refer to Appendix H.

## **6.30 Adaptation of the Regional Transportation System to Climate Change**

This section is intended to provide background on climate adaptation for MPOs to consider in the development of RTPs. First, an overview of climate adaptation is provided for informational purposes. Next, executive orders on climate change are discussed to provide a critical framework for MPOs. While the executive orders are directed at State agencies, they are provided to inform MPOs in the development of RTPs. State legislation is also discussed that may provide important context for MPOs to consider in development of RTPs. Lastly, several resources are provided for MPOs to consider in adaptation planning.

In 2014, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change concluded that further effects of climate change are inevitable despite planned and implemented mitigation efforts. To help regions prepare for these effects, Caltrans' 2013 report "Addressing Climate Change Adaptation in Regional Transportation Plans: A Guide for California MPOs and RTPAs<sup>1</sup>" and Caltrans Vulnerability Assessments provide methods to incorporate impacts of climate change into future long-range transportation planning and decisions. A number of studies (Risky Business<sup>2</sup>, Pacific Institute<sup>3</sup>, UC Merced and RAND Corporation<sup>4</sup>, American Society of Civil Engineers<sup>5</sup>, Next10 and U.C. Berkeley<sup>6</sup>) quantify the high costs associated with climate impacts such as rising sea levels, changing wind and precipitation patterns, increasing temperatures, and wildfire damage resulting from changes in the climate.

Adaptation planning is very important for cities and counties across California. Because of its natural and geographic diversity, California is extremely susceptible to a wide range of climate

change effects – many of which we have already begun experiencing. Examples include: rising maximum and minimum temperatures, less snowpack and earlier snowpack melt, drought and other changing precipitation patterns, increased severity of wildfires, sea-level rise, extreme weather events, which will lead to numerous changes and effects on biodiversity and habitats.

Building on decades of successful actions to reduce pollution, increase energy efficiency and mitigate the effects of climate change, California has long been at the forefront of global and national efforts to reduce the threat of a changing climate. The increasing likelihood of severe, pervasive and irreversible impacts are expected to have potentially catastrophic impacts on the transportation system resulting in flooded airports, interstate highways and roads, landslides that disrupt traffic flow and rail lines, heat waves and subsidence causing roadways to buckle; and, increased costs of transportation infrastructure operations and maintenance due to fire damage, erosion and inundation. The degree of risk for the State's transportation infrastructure system is uncertain and since climate impacts are location-specific, it makes sense to address concerns regionally.

The potential for consequences to life, health and safety, the environment, economic well-being, and other values need to be assessed in terms of probable risks and exposures, the likelihood of an event occurring (probability), and the anticipated damages that would result if it did occur (consequences).

In 2015, the Governor's Executive Order B-30-15 created a roadmap for climate adaptation progress around the foundation of prior state efforts to build climate preparedness and reduce GHG emissions. Public resources code 71155 requires that State agencies shall take into account the current and future impacts of climate change when planning, designing, building, operating, maintaining and investing in state infrastructure. The Executive Order provides further context to this statute and directs:

1. All State agencies with jurisdiction over sources of GHG emissions shall implement measures pursuant to statutory authority, to achieve reductions of GHG emissions to meet the 2030 and 2050 GHG emissions reduction targets.
2. The preparation of implementation plans for the actions recommended in California's Adaptation Strategy, the Safeguarding California Plan<sup>7</sup> and sector reports to the *California Natural Resources Agency* describing progress towards implementation.
3. State agencies to employ the following guiding principles in all planning and investment decisions:
  - Prioritize actions that both build climate preparedness and reduce GHG emissions;
  - Where possible, choose flexible and adaptive approaches to prepare for uncertain climate impacts;
  - Protect the state's most vulnerable populations; and,
  - Prioritize natural infrastructure solutions, as defined in Public resources code 71154(c)(3) (e.g., flood plain and wetlands restoration or preservation, combining levees with restored natural systems to reduce flood risk, and urban tree planning to reduce high heat days).
4. State agencies shall take climate change into account in their planning and investment decisions, and employ full life-cycle cost accounting on infrastructure projects to evaluate and compare investments and alternatives.



5. All infrastructure projects included in the state's annual Five-Year Infrastructure Plan must take into account the current and future impacts of climate change.
6. The establishment of a Technical Advisory Group through the *Governor's Office of Planning and Research* (OPR) to help State agencies incorporate climate change impacts into planning and investment decisions.

Additionally, three laws were signed in 2015 that are intended to provide important context for State agencies to collaborate with MPOs, to consider climate impacts as they formulate their RTPs:

- **AB 1482** directs ongoing updates to the Safeguarding California Plan (beginning in 2017) and requires future updates (every three years) to describe the vulnerabilities from climate change in a minimum of nine specific sectors, and the priority actions needed to reduce climate risks in each of those sectors.
- **SB 246** establishes the Integrated Climate Adaptation and Resilience Program at the *Governor's Office of Planning and Research* to coordinate regional and local efforts with the state's climate adaptation strategies; and to establish a climate adaptation clearinghouse that centralizes best scientific evidence, available climate data and information for use in planning and implementing state, regional, and local climate adaptation projects. This bill also directs the *Office of Emergency Services* to update the California Adaptation Planning Guide, within one year of an update to the Safeguarding California Plan, to provide current tools and guidance to regional and local governments and agencies that are adopting and implementing climate adaptation and community resiliency plans and projects.
- **SB 379** requires local hazard mitigation plans to incorporate climate impacts by 2021; through coordination with an update to local jurisdictions' General Plan Safety Element (see OPR's 2016 edition of the General Plan Guidelines<sup>8</sup>).

The state has developed tools and resources to help inform and empower local decision-makers to incorporate climate impacts into their work. Cal-Adapt.org<sup>9</sup> is an online platform created in 2011 by the California Energy Commission to synthesize the best available climate science and generate spatially-explicit visualizations for local policymakers and the general public. Planners can find sophisticated locality-specific projections for many temperature metrics, wind and precipitation patterns, wildfire risk, snowpack and sea-level rise. The Adaptation Planning Guide<sup>10</sup>, released by the Natural Resources Agency in 2012, helps regions and communities prepare for those projected impacts. The *Governor's Office of Planning and Research* has incorporated these resources into the 2016 General Plan Guidelines to create comprehensive planning processes for local governments.

MPOs should begin to address climate change adaptation in their long-range transportation plans in collaboration with State agencies, as transportation infrastructure projects that do not consider the impacts of climate may not be eligible to receive state funds. The following Caltrans documents and other resources are useful for climate adaptation planning, including "Addressing Climate Change Adaptation in Regional Transportation Plans: A Guide for California MPOs and RTPAs", Cal-Adapt.org, and other state resources (see Climate Adaptation Resources table below). Design and planning standards should be re-evaluated to address future conditions. MPOs should consult Safeguarding California's transportation chapter, the California Coastal Commission Sea Level Rise Policy Guidance, and where possible, local

General Plan safety elements and Hazard Mitigation Plan documents, as well as other relevant local, regional, and state plans, resources and documents.

References:

1. [http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tpp/offices/orip/climate\\_change/documents/FR3\\_CA\\_Climate\\_Change\\_Adaptation\\_Guide\\_2013-02-26\\_.pdf#zoom=65](http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tpp/offices/orip/climate_change/documents/FR3_CA_Climate_Change_Adaptation_Guide_2013-02-26_.pdf#zoom=65)
2. <http://riskybusiness.org/site/assets/uploads/2015/09/California-Report-WEB-3-30-15.pdf>
3. [http://www.pacinst.org/reports/sea\\_level\\_rise/](http://www.pacinst.org/reports/sea_level_rise/)
4. <http://www.energy.ca.gov/2009publications/CEC-500-2009-048/CEC-500-2009-048-D.PDF>
5. <http://ascelibrary.org/doi/pdfplus/10.1061/9780784479193>
6. <http://www.energy.ca.gov/2009publications/CEC-500-2009-014/CEC-500-2009-014-D.PDF>
7. <http://resources.ca.gov/docs/climate/safeguarding/Transportation%20Sector%20Plan.pdf>
8. [https://www.opr.ca.gov/s\\_generalplanguidelines.php](https://www.opr.ca.gov/s_generalplanguidelines.php)
9. <http://cal-adapt.org/>
10. [http://resources.ca.gov/climate/safeguarding/adaptation\\_policy\\_guide/](http://resources.ca.gov/climate/safeguarding/adaptation_policy_guide/)

**Planning Practice Examples:** Available in Appendix L

<b>Climate Adaptation Resources for RTPAs and MPOs</b>		
<i>Title of Resource</i>	<i>Origin and Use</i>	<i>Website</i>
2013 - Addressing Climate Change Adaptation in Regional Transportation Plans: <i>A Guide for California MPOs and RTPAs</i>	Caltrans	<a href="http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tpp/offices/orip/climate_change/documents/FR3_CA_Climate_Change_Adaptation_Guide_2013-02-26_.pdf#zoom=65">http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tpp/offices/orip/climate_change/documents/FR3_CA_Climate_Change_Adaptation_Guide_2013-02-26_.pdf#zoom=65</a>
Guidance on Incorporating Sea Level Rise: For use in the planning and development of Project Initiation Documents	Caltrans	<a href="http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tpp/offices/orip/climate_change/documents/guide_incorp_slr.pdf#zoom=65">http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tpp/offices/orip/climate_change/documents/guide_incorp_slr.pdf#zoom=65</a>
Cal-Adapt.org	Energy Commission	<a href="http://www.cal-adapt.org">www.cal-adapt.org</a>
Adaptation Planning Guide	Office of Emergency Services	<a href="http://resources.ca.gov/climate/safeguarding/adaptation_policy_guide/">http://resources.ca.gov/climate/safeguarding/adaptation_policy_guide/</a>
2014 Safeguarding California Plan (California's Adaptation Strategy)	Natural Resources Agency	<a href="http://resources.ca.gov/docs/climate/Final_Safeguarding_CA_Plan_July_31_2014.pdf">http://resources.ca.gov/docs/climate/Final_Safeguarding_CA_Plan_July_31_2014.pdf</a>
2016 Safeguarding California: Implementation Action Plans, Transportation Sector	Natural Resources Agency and the State Transportation Agency	<a href="http://resources.ca.gov/docs/climate/safeguarding/Transportation%20Sector%20Plan.pdf">http://resources.ca.gov/docs/climate/safeguarding/Transportation%20Sector%20Plan.pdf</a>
State of California Sea-Level Rise Document	Ocean Protection Council	<a href="http://www.opc.ca.gov/2013/04/update-to-the-sea-level-rise-guidance-document/">http://www.opc.ca.gov/2013/04/update-to-the-sea-level-rise-guidance-document/</a>
2016 General Plan Guidelines	Governor's Office of Planning and Research	<a href="https://www.opr.ca.gov/s_generalplanguidelines.php">https://www.opr.ca.gov/s_generalplanguidelines.php</a>
California Coastal Commission Sea Level Rise Policy Guidance	California Coastal Commission	<a href="http://www.coastal.ca.gov/climate/slrguidance.html">http://www.coastal.ca.gov/climate/slrguidance.html</a>

# Chapter 7

## Transportation Performance Management

Page Left Intentionally Blank

# TRANSPORTATION PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT

## 7.0 Introduction

Performance management provides the opportunity to ensure efficient and effective investment of transportation funds by refocusing on established goals, increasing accountability and transparency, and improving project decision-making. This chapter is intended to provide an overview of Federal and State requirements and recommendations for performance management applications in the RTP. MAP-21/FAST Act require States and MPOs to implement a performance-based approach in the scope of the statewide and nonmetropolitan *and* metropolitan transportation planning process. In addition to federal performance-based planning, the State of California has articulated through statute, regulation, executive order, and legislative intent language, numerous state policies and goals for the transportation system, the environment, the economy, and social equity.

There are different applications of performance management – performance measures, performance targets, and performance monitoring indicators or metrics. Performance measures are used to model travel demand and allow the long-range forecasting of transportation network and system-level performance (e.g. Walk, bike, transit, and carpool mode share, corridor travel times by mode, percentage of population within 0.5 mile of a high frequency transit stop). Performance targets are numeric goals established to enable the quantifiable assessment of performance measures. Performance monitoring indicators or metrics include field data such as vehicle miles traveled, mode share, fatalities/injuries, transit access, change in agricultural land, and CO2 emissions.

## 7.1 Federal Performance Goals & Measures

The cornerstone of the federal highway program transformation is the transition to a performance and outcome-based program. MAP-21/FAST Act integrate performance into many federal transportation programs and contains several performance elements. States and MPOs will invest resources in projects to achieve individual targets that collectively will make progress toward national goals. The national performance goals for the Federal highway programs as established in MAP-21, 23 U.S.C. Section 150(b), are as follows:

- Safety - To achieve a significant reduction in traffic fatalities and serious injuries on all public roads.
- Infrastructure Condition - To maintain the highway infrastructure asset system in a state of good repair.
- Congestion Reduction - To achieve a significant reduction in congestion on the National Highway System.
- System Reliability - To improve the efficiency of the surface transportation system
- Freight Movement and Economic Vitality - To improve the national freight network, strengthen the ability of rural communities to access national and international trade markets, and support regional economic development.
- Environmental Sustainability - To enhance the performance of the transportation system while protecting and enhancing the natural environment.
- Reduced Project Delivery Delays - To reduce project costs, promote jobs and the economy, and expedite the movement of people and goods by accelerating project

completion through eliminating delays in the project development and delivery process, including reducing regulatory burdens and improving agencies' work practices.

The national performance measures will assess the progress toward the national goals listed above. National performance measures [23 U.S.C. Section 150(c) and 49 U.S.C. Section 5326(c) and Section 5329(d)] will address the following issues:

- For the National Highway Performance Program (NHPP):
  - Pavement conditions on the Interstate system and remainder of the National Highway System,
  - Bridge conditions on the NHS,
  - Performance of the Interstate system and remainder of the NHS
- For the Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP):
  - Number and rate per vehicle mile traveled of fatalities
  - Number and rate per vehicle mile traveled of serious injuries
- For the Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program (CMAQ):
  - Traffic congestion
  - On-road mobile source emissions
  - Freight movement on the Interstate system
- Public transportation:
  - State of good repair
  - Safety

The FHWA/FTA have developed final rules to implement the MAP-21/FAST Act Transportation Management Program (TPM), as summarized below. Section 1203 of MAP-21 identifies the national transportation goals and requires the U.S. DOT Secretary to promulgate a rule to establish performance measures in specified Federal-aid highway program areas listed above. The FHWA has issued three separate rules to meet this requirement: (1) Safety Performance Measures; (2) Pavement and Bridge Condition Measures; and, (3) System Performance Measures. These three rules together will establish a set of performance measures for Caltrans and MPOs to use as required by MAP-21. FTA is responsible for developing rules related to public transportation and transit asset management. The FHWA and FTA work together on additional rules for: Statewide and Nonmetropolitan Transportation Planning *and* Metropolitan Transportation Planning; Additional Authorities for Planning and Environmental Linkages; and, MPO Coordination & Planning Area Reform. A future update of the RTP Guidelines will capture any “shoulds” or “shalls” resulting from the rulemaking process.

## **Safety Performance Measures**

The MAP-21/FAST Act established Safety Performance Management (PM) as part of the overall Transportation Performance Management (TPM) program, which FHWA defines as a strategic approach that uses system information to make investment and policy decision to achieve national performance goals. The first in a series of three related rules, the Safety PM final rule, was published on March 16, 2016 with an effective date of April 14, 2016. This final rule supports the HSIP, as it establishes safety performance measure requirements for the purpose of carrying out the HSIP and to assess fatalities and serious injuries on all public roads.

The Safety PM establishes five performance measures as the five-year rolling averages for:

1. Number of Fatalities
2. Rate of Fatalities per 100 million Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)

3. Number of Serious Injuries
4. Rate of Serious Injuries per 100 million VMT, and
5. Number of Non-motorized Fatalities and Non-motorized Serious Injuries.

The Safety PM regulation also establishes the process for Caltrans and MPOs to establish and report their safety targets, and the process that FHWA will use to assess whether Caltrans has met or made significant progress toward meeting their safety targets.

The California HSIP is available at:

<http://dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/hsip.html>

## **Pavement & Bridge Condition Measures**

The second final rule, Pavement & Bridge Condition was published on January 18, 2017 with an effective date of February 17, 2017 and established measures for Caltrans to use to carry out the NHPP and to assess the condition of the following: pavements on the NHS (excluding the Interstate System), bridges on the NHS, and pavements on the Interstate System. The NHPP is a core Federal-aid highway program that provides support for the condition and performance of the NHS and the construction of new facilities on the NHS, and ensures that investments of Federal-aid funds in highway construction are directed to support progress toward the achievement of performance targets established in a State's asset management plan for the NHS. This rule provides regulations for the new performance aspects of the NHPP, which address: measures, targets, and reporting. Caltrans shall coordinate with relevant MPOs on the selection of targets in accordance with 23 U.S.C. 135(d)(2)(B)(i)(II) to ensure consistency to maximum extent practicable.

The Pavement & Bridge Condition final rule establishes six performance measures:

Four Measures of Pavement Condition:

Two Measures for Interstate System Pavement Condition:

1. Percentage of Pavements on the Interstate System in Good Condition;
2. Percentage of Pavements on the Interstate System in Poor Condition;

Two Measures for NHS Pavement Condition:

3. Percentage of Pavements on the NHS (excluding the Interstate System) in Good Condition;
4. Percentage of Pavements on the NHS (excluding the Interstate System) in Poor Condition;

Two Measures of Bridge Condition:

5. Percentage of NHS Bridges in Good Condition; and,
6. Percentage of NHS Bridges in Poor Condition.

## **System Performance Measures**

The third in a series of three related rules, System Performance Measures, was published on January 18, 2017 with an effective date of February 17, 2017. Caltrans and MPOs will implement the regulation to assess the performance of the Interstate and non-Interstate NHS for the purpose of carrying out the NHPP; to assess freight movement on the Interstate System; and to assess traffic congestion and on-road mobile source emissions for the purpose of carrying out the CMAQ Program. This third performance measure rule also includes a



discussion that summarizes all three of the national performance management measures final rules and the comprehensive regulatory impact analysis to include all three final rules.

Caltrans will be expected to use the information and data generated as a result of the new regulations to make better informed transportation planning and programming decisions. The new performance aspects of the Federal-aid program will allow FHWA/FTA to better communicate a national performance story and more reliably assess the impacts of Federal funding investments. Caltrans shall coordinate with relevant MPOs on the selection of targets in accordance with 23 U.S.C. 135(d)(2)(B)(i)(II) to ensure consistency to maximum extent practicable.

The System Performance Measures final rule establishes seven performance measures:

Three Measures of System Performance:

1. Percentage of Reliable Person-Miles Traveled on the Interstate;
2. Percentage of Reliable Person-Miles Traveled on the non-Interstate NHS;
3. Percent Change in CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from 2017, generated by on-road mobile sources on the NHS;
4. A measure that will evaluate truck travel time reliability on the Interstate system (average truck reliability index);

Three measures that will assess the CMAQ Program:

5. Total emissions reductions for applicable criteria pollutants, for non-attainment and maintenance areas;

Two measures to assess traffic congestion:

6. Annual Hours of Peak Hour Excessive Delay Per Capita; and,
7. Modal Share; Specifically, the percent of non-single occupancy vehicle travel, including travel avoided by telecommuting.

## **Transit Asset Management**

The Transit Asset Management final rule was published on July 26, 2016 with an effective date of October 1, 2016. This final rule establishes state good repair standards and four state of good repair performance measures:

- Equipment: (non-revenue) service vehicles;
- Rolling stock;
- Infrastructure: rail fixed-guideway, track, signals, and systems; and,
- Facilities.

As similarly required in the Safety PM for the target setting process, to the extent practicable, transit providers must coordinate with Caltrans and MPOs in the selection of State and MPO performance targets.

## **7.2 Federal Performance-Based Approach & RTP Requirements**

The Statewide and Nonmetropolitan Transportation Planning *and* Metropolitan Transportation Planning Final Rule was published May 27, 2016 with an effective date of June 27, 2016. This final rule requires MPOs to implement the performance-based approach in the scope of the metropolitan transportation planning process. First, MPOs, in coordination with the State and public transportation providers, will establish, to the maximum extent practicable, an appropriate target setting framework. Federal regulations define the implementation timeline for satisfying the new requirements for MPOs as two years from the effective date of each rule establishing performance measures under 23 U.S.C. 150(c), 49 U.S.C. 5326, and 49 U.S.C. 5329 FHWA/FTA. Two years on or after the effective date of each rule establishing performance measures, an MPO may only adopt an RTP that has been developed according to the provisions and requirements of MAP-21/FAST Act as specified in the respective Final Rules.

This section is intended to provide a summary of the additional requirements specific to RTP development. The federally required performance-based approach specifically added two components to the RTP:

1. A description of the performance measures and performance targets used in assessing the performance of the transportation system in accordance with 23 CFR 450.306(d); and,
2. A system performance report and subsequent updates evaluating the condition and performance of the transportation system with respect to the performance targets described in 23 CFR 450.306(d), including –
  - a. Progress achieved by the MPO in meeting the performance targets in comparison with system performance recorded in previous reports, including baseline data; and,
  - b. For MPOs that voluntarily elect to develop multiple scenarios, an analysis of how the preferred scenario has improved the conditions and performance of the transportation system and how changes in local policies and investments have impacted the costs necessary to achieve the identified performance targets.

It is important to note that failure to consider any factor specified in the Performance-Based Approach, 23 CFR 450.306 (d), shall not be reviewable by any court under Title 23 U.S.C., 49 U.S.C. Chapter 53, Subchapter II of Title 5 U.S.C. Chapter 5, or Title 5 U.S.C. Chapter 7 in any matter affecting an RTP, TIP, a project or strategy, or the certification of a metropolitan transportation planning process.

The FHWA maintains a Performance Based Planning and Programming Guidebook to help identify potential packages of strategies to achieve performance-based objectives, as well as the data and tools used to determine which strategies may be most effective, available at:

[http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/planning/performance\\_based\\_planning/pbpp\\_guidebook/page06.cfm](http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/planning/performance_based_planning/pbpp_guidebook/page06.cfm)

### **Requirements (Shall)**

**Federal:** 23 CFR 450.306; 23 CFR 450.324(f)(3) & (4); 23 CFR 450.340(e) & (f)

### **7.3 State Goals & Performance Measures**

Pursuant to 23 CFR 450.324(f)(3), every RTP shall include a description of the performance measures and performance targets used in assessing the performance of the transportation system in accordance with §450.306(d) which requires that the long-range planning process provide for the establishment and use of a performance-based approach to transportation decision-making to support national goals. Additionally, SB 375 requires MPOs to demonstrate how to achieve regional GHG emissions reduction targets, if feasible, established by ARB. SB 743 revised CEQA to “[m]ore appropriately balance the needs of congestion management with statewide goals related to infill development, promotion of public health through active transportation, and reduction of GHGs.” Pursuant to SB 743, the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research is required to provide an alternative to Level of Service (LOS) for analyzing transportation impacts under CEQA to more appropriately balance the needs of congestion management with statewide goals related to infill development, promotion of public health through active transportation, and reduction of GHG emissions. To accomplish this, OPR is currently updating the CEQA Guidelines. Please see Chapter 5 for more information on incorporating CEQA requirements into the RTP process. MPOs shall identify performance measures, according to available resources and capacity. As part of the public process of developing the RTP, MPOs are strongly encouraged to consider and discuss regional performance measures that integrate established state policies and goals, according to the region’s available resources and capacity.

Regional Transportation Plans are developed to reflect regional and local priorities and goals and they are also instruments that can be used by federal and state agencies to demonstrate how regional agency efforts contribute to those federal and state agencies meeting their own transportation system goals. A clear articulation of regional goals helps regions select projects in furtherance of their own goals, but also helps the federal and state government understand how the regional plans will contribute to statewide or nationwide goals. The RTP vision, goals and related performance measures are developed through a bottom-up process that involves input from stakeholders in the region, including the MPO member jurisdictions and the public. The RTP, including goals and performance measures, are formally adopted at the discretion of the MPO governing board. Some regional performance measures are based on the regional Blueprint plans which were the predecessors of the SCS under SB 375. The number and type of measures that a region chooses can vary widely depending on the region’s unique vision, goals and an assessment of feasibility to measure. Tradeoffs between performance measure thresholds should be clearly identified and priorities set to avoid confusion about plan objectives, because some of these measures may compete or conflict with one another. The following are state policies and goals that MPOs are encouraged to use in the development of their performance measures. This is not an exclusive list, and MPOs may establish additional measures appropriate to the region.

- Preserve transportation infrastructure
- Improve mobility and accessibility
- Reduce GHG and improve air quality
- Improve public health, e.g., increase physical activity
- Conserve land and natural resources
- Encourage sustainable land use patterns
- Increase supply of affordable housing
- Improve jobs and housing balance
- Improve mobility and accessibility for low-income and disadvantaged communities

- Support economic development
- Increase safety and security of the transportation system for motorized and non-motorized users

If existing modeling and data are a limitation for some MPOs, qualitative goals may be used instead of quantitative measures. The Policy element of the RTP would include the goals and objectives, and the Action element is what would provide the result/s. For example, the Action element would provide a comparison of what is being measured, how it is measured and the results and analysis of the eventual outcomes. In small urban areas, to support performance-based planning consistent with federal law, developing partnerships with neighboring jurisdictions, and collecting data and information is recommended.

The goals and objectives in the FTIP/RTIP and ITIP should be linked and consistent with the goals and objectives of the RTP. Performance measures in the RTP set the context for judging the effectiveness of the FTIP as a program, by furthering the RTP goals and objectives, whereas, the STIP Guidelines address performance measures of specific projects. Government Code Section 14530.1 (b)(5) requires more detailed project specific “objective criteria for meeting system performance and cost effectiveness of candidate projects” in the STIP Guidelines (Section 19). For additional information on the STIP and the Fund Estimate (FE), please refer to Caltrans Division of Transportation Programming website at:

<http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/transprog/ctcliaison.htm>.

In the context of SB 375, performance measures are essential to assessing and comparing alternative transportation and land use scenarios before selecting the preferred RTP/SCS scenario that, if feasible, not only meets the region’s GHG reduction target, but also provides substantive co-benefits while supporting social equity. They are also critical for tracking the progress of an SCS. ARB staff analyzes performance measures that are related to the land use and transportation strategies in the SCS to determine whether they provide supportive, qualitative evidence that the SCS could meet its GHG targets. The more robust the MPO’s performance measurement, the better an MPO can substantiate its GHG determinations. MPOs are encouraged to clearly communicate the elements of the SCS (both strategies and investments) that are driving change in the region and resulting in the forecasted outcomes.

On highway projects, Caltrans considers system condition and performance measurements for interregional planning and the setting of State planning and programming activities. The State and MPO performance measures will focus on interregional trips between, into and through the regions. Caltrans coordinates its performance measure activity with MPOs. MPOs are encouraged to develop and implement their own performance measures above and beyond the federal requirements for regional roads, transit, rail, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, etc.

### **Requirements (Shalls)**

**State:** California Government Code Section 65080(b)(2) (SB 375 Targets)

**Planning Practice Examples:** Available in Appendix K and Appendix L

## 7.4 **Performance Monitoring**

Regions should also consider using performance monitoring indicators to measure plan performance. Pursuant to Government Code 65080(b)(1)(A-F), the Policy element of MPOs with populations that exceed 200,000 persons may quantify a set of indicators including, but not limited to measures of mobility and traffic congestion; road and bridge maintenance and rehabilitation needs; means of travel; safety reliability and security; and, equity and accessibility. The level of detail and qualitative or quantitative nature of the indicators should be determined by modeling capacity and data availability. The requirements of Government Code Section 65080(b)(1)(A-F) specify that this section may be met utilizing existing sources of information. No additional traffic counts, household surveys, or other sources of data shall be required.

In 2011, the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) received grant funding from the Strategic Growth Council to collaborate with other California MPOs and state agencies to identify common statewide performance monitoring indicators related to SB 375 implementation. While performance measures rely mostly on modeled or forecasted data, performance monitoring indicators rely directly on observed data. MPOs use travel demand models or Geographic Information Systems analyses to forecast performance measures. Ideally monitoring indicators would be considered together and be consistent with modeling performance measures. The following table identifies nine indicators that can be monitored using statewide and regional data sources as reflected in the *Statewide Performance Monitoring Indicators for Transportation Planning Final Report* (SANDAG, 2013), available at:

[http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tpp/offices/ocp/ATLC/documents/august\\_15\\_2013/document\\_links/indicator.pdf](http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tpp/offices/ocp/ATLC/documents/august_15_2013/document_links/indicator.pdf).

Table 1: Proposed Performance Monitoring Indicators					
ID	Inventory Ref. (Appendix B)	MAP-21 Category	Statewide Performance Monitoring Observed Data	Performance Measure (Model Based)	Referenced In
Congestion Reduction					
1	A-8 / A-1	VMT	√	√	SB 375 & MAP-21
		a. VMT per capita*	√	√	SB 375 & MAP-21
		b. Percent of Congested Freeway/ Highway Vehicle Miles [PeMS]	√	√	SB 375 & MAP-21
2	A-16/A-18	Mode Share (Travel to work)*	√	√	SB 375 & MAP-21
Infrastructure Condition					
3	-	State of Good Repair	√		MAP-21
		a. Highways			
		b. Local Streets			
		c. Highway Bridges			
		d. Transit Assets			
System Reliability					
4	A-65	Freeway/Highway Buffer Index [PeMS]	√	√	MAP-21
Safety					
5	A-39	Fatalities/Serious Injuries	√	√	MAP-21
		a. Fatalities/Serious Injuries per capita*			
		b. Fatalities/Serious Injuries per VMT*			
Economic Vitality					
6	C-33	Transit Accessibility (Housing and jobs within 0.5 miles of transit stops with frequent transit service)*	√	√	SB 375
7	A-84	Travel Time to Jobs	√	√	SB 375 & MAP-21
Environmental Sustainability					
8	B-1/B-5	Change in Agricultural Land*	√	√	SB 375
9	E-5	CO <sub>2</sub> Emissions Reduction per capita (modeled data)*		√	SB 375 & MAP-21
* Indicator relates to Public Health			[PeMS]	Indicator for MPOs that have access to PeMS data	

The following table provides a summary of potential performance metrics for rural county Regional Transportation Planning Agencies as outlined in the report, *Transportation Performance Measures for Rural Counties in California* (Rural Counties Task Force, 2015), at:

[http://www.ruralcountiestaskforce.org/Assets/Resources/PerformanceMeasures/Final\\_Report-PerfMonIndicators\\_StudySept2015.pdf](http://www.ruralcountiestaskforce.org/Assets/Resources/PerformanceMeasures/Final_Report-PerfMonIndicators_StudySept2015.pdf).

These metrics were developed according to the following criteria:

- Measurement-based rather than model-based;
- Alignment with California state transportation goals and objectives;
- Capability of informing current goals and objectives of each rural and small-urban RTPA;
- Applicability across all rural and small-urban regions;
- Capability of being linked to specific decisions on transportation investments; and
- Normalized for population to provide equitable comparisons to urban regions.

Metric	Source	Website
Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) Per Capita By Locality By Facility Ownership Local vs. Tourist	Mobility Reporting	<a href="http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/traffops/sysmgtp/MPR/index.htm">http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/traffops/sysmgtp/MPR/index.htm</a>
	California DOF	<a href="http://www.dof.ca.gov/research/demographic/reports/estimates/e-2/view.php">http://www.dof.ca.gov/research/demographic/reports/estimates/e-2/view.php</a>
	HPMS	<a href="http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tsip/hpms/hpmslibrary/prd/2013prd/2013PRD-revised.pdf">http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tsip/hpms/hpmslibrary/prd/2013prd/2013PRD-revised.pdf</a>
Peak V/C Ratio or Thresholds	Traffic Counts: K and D Factors	<a href="http://traffic-counts.dot.ca.gov/">http://traffic-counts.dot.ca.gov/</a>
Journey to Work Mode Share	American Community Survey	<a href="http://factfinder.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/index.xhtml">http://factfinder.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/index.xhtml</a>
Total Accident Cost Per VMT Per Capita	Transportation Injury Mapping System	<a href="http://tims.berkeley.edu/login.php?next=/tools/bc/main1.php#">http://tims.berkeley.edu/login.php?next=/tools/bc/main1.php#</a>
	SWITRS TASAS	<a href="http://iswitrs.chp.ca.gov/Reports/jsp/userLogin.jsp">http://iswitrs.chp.ca.gov/Reports/jsp/userLogin.jsp</a> <a href="#">Caltrans Public Information Request Form</a>
Transit Operating Cost per Revenue Mile	Local Transit Providers	
Distressed Lane Miles  Total and % Total By Jurisdiction By Facility Type	Federal Highway Administration	<a href="http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/tpm/rule/pmfactsheet.pdf">http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/tpm/rule/pmfactsheet.pdf</a>
	Regional or local pavement management system	<a href="https://www.federalregister.gov/articles/2015/01/05/2014-30085/national-performance-management-measures-assessing-pavement-condition-for-the-national-highway">https://www.federalregister.gov/articles/2015/01/05/2014-30085/national-performance-management-measures-assessing-pavement-condition-for-the-national-highway</a>
Pavement Condition Index (PCI) for Local Roads	Regional or local pavement management system	
Land Use Efficiency	Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP) DOF Annual population estimates	<a href="http://www.conservation.ca.gov/dlrp/fmmp">http://www.conservation.ca.gov/dlrp/fmmp</a>

### Recommendation (Shoulds)

**State:** California Government Code Section 65080.

**Planning Practice Examples:** Available in Appendix L

# APPENDICES

- A. Federal and State Transportation Planning Flowchart
- B. State and Federal Programming Process Flowchart
- C. Regional Transportation Plan Checklist (to be completed by MPO prior to submitting the draft and final RTP to Caltrans and CTC)
- D. Title 23 CFR Part 450 Appendix A – Linking Transportation Planning and NEPA Processes
- E. Integration of the Planning and NEPA Processes
- F. MPO Air Quality Conformity Checklist
- G. SB 375 and SB 575 Statutory Language
- H. Alternative Planning Strategy (APS)
- I. RHNA and RTP Development Information
- J. Glossary of Transportation Terms
- K. AB 441 – Promoting Health and Health Equity in MPO RTPs
- L. Planning Practice Examples




Page Left Intentionally Blank

## **Appendix A**

### **Federal and State Transportation Planning Process Flowchart**

Page Left Intentionally Blank

# Regional Transportation Planning and Programming Process




Page Left Intentionally Blank

## **Appendix B**

### **State and Federal Programming Process Flowchart**

Page Left Intentionally Blank

# State and Federal Programming Process





Page Left Intentionally Blank

## **Appendix C**

### **Regional Transportation Plan Checklist**

Page Left Intentionally Blank

## **Regional Transportation Plan Checklist**

(Revised December 2016)

*(To be completed electronically in Microsoft Word format by the MPO and submitted along with the draft and final RTP to Caltrans)*

**Name of MPO:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Date Draft RTP Completed:** \_\_\_\_\_

**RTP Adoption Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

**What is the Certification Date of the Environmental Document (ED)?** \_\_\_\_\_

**Is the ED located in the RTP or is it a separate document?** \_\_\_\_\_

*By completing this checklist, the MPO verifies the RTP addresses all of the following required information within the RTP.*

### **Regional Transportation Plan Contents**

#### **General**

1. Does the RTP address no less than a 20-year planning horizon? (23 CFR 450.324(a))
2. Does the RTP include both long-range and short-range strategies/actions? (23 CFR 450.324(b))
3. Does the RTP address issues specified in the policy, action and financial elements identified in California Government Code Section 65080?
4. Does the RTP address the 10 issues specified in the Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) component as identified in Government Code Sections 65080(b)(2)(B) and 65584.04(i)(1)?
  - a. Identify the general location of uses, residential densities, and building intensities within the region?
  - b. Identify areas within the region sufficient to house all the population of the region, including all economic segments of the population over the course of the planning period of the regional transportation plan taking into account net migration into the region, population growth, household formation and employment growth?
  - c. Identify areas within the region sufficient to house an eight-year projection of the regional housing need for the region pursuant to Government Code Section 65584?

Yes/No	Page #

	Yes/No	Page #
d. Identify a transportation network to service the transportation needs of the region?		
e. Gather and consider the best practically available scientific information regarding resource areas and farmland in the region as defined in subdivisions (a) and (b) of Government Code Section 65080.01?		
f. Consider the state housing goals specified in Sections 65580 and 65581?		
g. Utilize the most recent planning assumptions, considering local general plans and other factors?		
h. Set forth a forecasted development pattern for the region, which, when integrated with the transportation network, and other transportation measures and policies, will reduce the greenhouse gas emissions from automobiles and light trucks to achieve, if there is a feasible way to do so, the greenhouse gas emission reduction targets approved by the ARB?		
i. Provide consistency between the development pattern and allocation of housing units within the region (Government Code 65584.04(i)(1)?		
j. Allow the regional transportation plan to comply with Section 176 of the federal Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. Section 7506)?		
4. Does the RTP include Project Intent i.e. Plan Level Purpose and Need Statements?		
5. Does the RTP specify how travel demand modeling methodology, results and key assumptions were developed as part of the RTP process? (Government Code 14522.2)		

### Consultation/Cooperation

1. Does the RTP contain a public involvement program that meets the requirements of Title 23, CFR 450.316(a)?		
(i) Providing adequate public notice of public participation activities and time for public review and comment at key decision points, including a reasonable opportunity to comment on the proposed metropolitan transportation plan and the TIP;		
(ii) Providing timely notice and reasonable access to information about transportation issues and processes;		
(iii) Employing visualization techniques to describe metropolitan transportation plans and TIPs;		
(iv) Making public information (technical information and meeting notices) available in electronically accessible formats and means, such as the World Wide Web;		
(v) Holding any public meetings at convenient and accessible locations and times;		
(vi) Demonstrating explicit consideration and response to public input received during the development of the metropolitan transportation plan and the TIP;		

		Yes/No	Page #
(vii) Seeking out and considering the needs of those traditionally underserved by existing transportation systems, such as low-income and minority households, who may face challenges accessing employment and other services;			
(viii) Providing an additional opportunity for public comment, if the final metropolitan transportation plan or TIP differs significantly from the version that was made available for public comment by the MPO and raises new material issues that interested parties could not reasonably have foreseen from the public involvement efforts;			
(ix) Coordinating with the statewide transportation planning public involvement and consultation processes under subpart B of this part; and			
(x) Periodically reviewing the effectiveness of the procedures and strategies contained in the participation plan to ensure a full and open participation process.			
2.	Does the RTP contain a summary, analysis, and report on the disposition of significant written and oral comments received on the draft metropolitan transportation plan as part of the final metropolitan transportation plan and TIP that meets the requirements of 23 CFR 450.316(a)(2), as applicable?		
3.	Did the MPO/RTPA consult with the appropriate State and local representatives including representatives from environmental and economic communities; airport; transit; freight during the preparation of the RTP? (23 CFR 450.316(b))		
4.	Did the MPO/RTPA who has federal lands within its jurisdictional boundary involve the federal land management agencies during the preparation of the RTP? (23 CFR 450.316(d))		
5.	Where does the RTP specify that the appropriate State and local agencies responsible for land use, natural resources, environmental protection, conservation and historic preservation consulted? (23 CFR 450.324(g))		
6.	Did the RTP include a comparison with the California State Wildlife Action Plan and (if available) inventories of natural and historic resources? (23 CFR 450.324(g)(1&2))		
7.	Did the MPO/RTPA who has a federally recognized Native American Tribal Government(s) and/or historical and sacred sites or subsistence resources of these Tribal Governments within its jurisdictional boundary address tribal concerns in the RTP and develop the RTP in consultation with the Tribal Government(s)? (23 CFR 450.316(c))		
8.	Does the RTP address how the public and various specified groups were given a reasonable opportunity to comment on the plan using the participation plan developed under 23 CFR part 450.316(a)? (23 CFR 450.316(a)(i))		
9.	Does the RTP contain a discussion describing the private sector involvement efforts that were used during the development of the plan? (23 CFR 450.316(a))		

10. Does the RTP contain a discussion describing the coordination efforts with regional air quality planning authorities? (23 CFR 450.316(a)(2)) **(MPO nonattainment and maintenance areas only)**
11. Is the RTP coordinated and consistent with the Public Transit-Human Services Transportation Plan? (23 CFR 450.306(h))
12. Were the draft and adopted RTP posted on the Internet? (23 CFR 450.324(k))
13. Did the RTP explain how consultation occurred with locally elected officials? (Government Code 65080(D))
14. Did the RTP outline the public participation process for the sustainable communities strategy? (Government Code 65080(E))
15. Was the RTP adopted on the estimated date provided in writing to State Department of Housing and Community Development to determine the Regional Housing Need Allocation and planning period (start and end date) and align the local government housing element planning period (start and end date) and housing element adoption due date 18 months from RTP adoption date? (Government Code 65588(e)(5))

Yes/No	Page #

### Title VI and Environmental Justice

1. Does the public participation plan describe how the MPO will seek out and consider the needs of those traditionally underserved by existing transportation system, such as low-income and minority households, who may face challenges accessing employment and other services? (23 CFR 450.316 (a)(1)(vii))
2. Has the MPO conducted a Title VI analysis that meets the legal requirements described in Section 4.2?
3. Has the MPO conducted an Environmental Justice analysis that meets the legal requirements described in Section 4.2?


### Modal Discussion

1. Does the RTP discuss intermodal and connectivity issues?
2. Does the RTP include a discussion of highways?
3. Does the RTP include a discussion of mass transportation?
4. Does the RTP include a discussion of the regional airport system?
5. Does the RTP include a discussion of regional pedestrian needs?


Yes/No	Page #

6. Does the RTP include a discussion of regional bicycle needs?
7. Does the RTP address the California Coastal Trail? (Government Code 65080.1) (For MPOs and RTPAs located along the coast only)
8. Does the RTP include a discussion of rail transportation?
9. Does the RTP include a discussion of maritime transportation (if appropriate)?
10. Does the RTP include a discussion of goods movement?

### Programming/Operations


1. Is the RTP consistent (to the maximum extent practicable) with the development of the regional ITS architecture? (23 CFR 450.306(g))
2. Does the RTP identify the objective criteria used for measuring the performance of the transportation system?
3. Does the RTP contain a list of un-constrained projects?

### Financial


1. Does the RTP include a financial plan that meets the requirements identified in 23 CFR part 450.324(f)(11)?
2. Does the RTP contain a consistency statement between the first 4 years of the fund estimate and the 4-year STIP fund estimate? (65080(b)(4)(A))
3. Do the projected revenues in the RTP reflect Fiscal Constraint? (23 CFR part 450.324(f)(11)(ii))
4. Does the RTP contain a list of financially constrained projects? Any regionally significant projects should be identified. (Government Code 65080(4)(A))
5. Do the cost estimates for implementing the projects identified in the RTP reflect “year of expenditure dollars” to reflect inflation rates? (23 CFR part 450.324(f)(11)(iv))
6. After 12/11/07, does the RTP contain estimates of costs and revenue sources that are reasonably expected to be available to operate and maintain the freeways, highway and transit within the region? (23 CFR 450.324(f)(11)(i))
7. Does the RTP contain a statement regarding consistency between the projects in the RTP and the ITIP? (2016 STIP Guidelines Section 33)
8. Does the RTP contain a statement regarding consistency between the projects in the RTP and the RTIP? (2016 STIP Guidelines Section 19)



Yes/No	Page #

9. Does the RTP address the specific financial strategies required to ensure the identified TCMs from the SIP can be implemented? (23 CFR part 450.324(f)(11)(vi) **(nonattainment and maintenance MPOs only)**)

## Environmental

1. Did the MPO/RTPA prepare an EIR or a program EIR for the RTP in accordance with CEQA guidelines?
2. Does the RTP contain a list of projects specifically identified as TCMs, if applicable?
3. Does the RTP contain a discussion of SIP conformity, if applicable?
4. Does the RTP specify mitigation activities? (23 CFR part 450.324(f)(10))
5. Where does the EIR address mitigation activities?
6. Did the MPO/RTPA prepare a Negative Declaration or a Mitigated Negative Declaration for the RTP in accordance with CEQA guidelines?
7. Does the RTP specify the TCMs to be implemented in the region? **(federal nonattainment and maintenance areas only)**

[illegible]

**I have reviewed the above information and certify that it is correct and complete.**

(Must be signed by MPO Executive Director  
or designated representative)

---

Date

---

Print Name

---

Title

## **Appendix D**

### **Title 23 CFR Part 450 Appendix A – Linking Transportation Planning and NEPA Processes**

Page Left Intentionally Blank

## **Appendix A to Title 23 CFR Part 450--Linking the Transportation Planning and NEPA Processes**

### **Background and Overview**

This Appendix provides additional information to explain the linkage between the transportation planning and project development/National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) processes. It is intended to be non-binding and should not be construed as a rule of general applicability.

For 40 years, the Congress has directed that Federally funded highway and transit projects must flow from metropolitan and Statewide transportation planning processes (pursuant to 23 U.S.C. 134-135 and 49 U.S.C. 5303-5306). Over the years, the Congress has refined and strengthened the transportation planning process as the foundation for project decisions, emphasizing public involvement, consideration of environmental and other factors, and a Federal role that oversees the transportation planning process but does not second-guess the content of transportation plans and programs.

Despite this statutory emphasis on transportation planning, the environmental analyses produced to meet the requirements of the NEPA of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4231 et seq.) have often been conducted de novo, disconnected from the analyses used to develop long-range transportation plans, Statewide and metropolitan Transportation Improvement Programs (STIPs/TIPs), or planning-level corridor/subarea/feasibility studies. When the NEPA and transportation planning processes are not well coordinated, the NEPA process may lead to the development of information that is more appropriately developed in the planning process, resulting in duplication of work and delays in transportation improvements.

The purpose of this Appendix is to change this culture, by supporting congressional intent that Statewide and metropolitan transportation planning should be the foundation for highway and transit project decisions. This Appendix was crafted to recognize that transportation planning processes vary across the country. This document provides details on how information, analysis, and products from transportation planning can be incorporated into and relied upon in NEPA documents under existing laws, regardless of when the Notice of Intent has been published. This Appendix presents environmental review as a continuum of sequential study, refinement, and expansion performed in transportation planning and during project development/NEPA, with information developed and conclusions drawn in early stages utilized in subsequent (and more detailed) review stages.

The information below is intended for use by State departments of transportation (State DOTs), metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs), and public transportation operators to clarify the circumstances under which transportation planning level choices and analyses can be adopted or incorporated into the process required by NEPA. Additionally, the FHWA and the FTA will work with Federal environmental, regulatory, and resource agencies to incorporate the principles of this Appendix in their day-to-day NEPA policies and procedures related to their involvement in highway and transit projects.

This Appendix does not extend NEPA requirements to transportation plans and programs. The Transportation Efficiency Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21) and the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU) specifically exempted transportation plans and programs from NEPA review. Therefore, initiating the NEPA process as part of, or concurrently with, a transportation planning study does not subject transportation plans and programs to NEPA.

Implementation of this Appendix by States, MPOs, and public transportation operators is voluntary. The degree to which studies, analyses, or conclusions from the transportation planning process can be incorporated into the project development/NEPA processes will depend upon how well they meet certain standards established by NEPA regulations and guidance. While some transportation planning processes already meet these standards, others will need some modification.

The remainder of this Appendix document utilizes a "Question and Answer" format, organized into three primary categories ("Procedural Issues," "Substantive Issues," and "Administrative Issues").

#### **I. Procedural Issues:**

##### **1. In what format should the transportation planning information be included?**

To be included in the NEPA process, work from the transportation planning process must be documented in a form that can be appended to the NEPA document or incorporated by reference. Documents may be incorporated by reference if they are readily available so as to not impede agency or public review of the action. Any document incorporated by reference must be "reasonably available for inspection by potentially interested persons within the time allowed for comment." Incorporated materials must be cited in the NEPA document and their contents briefly described, so that the reader understands why the document is cited and knows where to look for further information. To the extent possible, the documentation should be in a form such as official actions by the MPO, State DOT, or public transportation operator and/or correspondence within and among the organizations involved in the transportation planning process.

##### **2. What is a reasonable level of detail for a planning product that is intended to be used in a NEPA document? How does this level of detail compare to what is considered a full NEPA analysis?**

For purposes of transportation planning alone, a planning-level analysis does not need to rise to the level of detail required in the NEPA process. Rather, it needs to be accurate and up-to-date, and should adequately support recommended improvements in the Statewide or metropolitan long-range transportation plan.

The SAFETEA-LU requires transportation planning processes to focus on setting a context and following acceptable procedures. For example, the SAFETEA-LU requires a "discussion of the types of potential environmental mitigation activities" and potential areas for their implementation, rather than details on specific strategies. The SAFETEA-LU also emphasizes consultation with Federal, State, and Tribal land management, wildlife, and regulatory agencies.

However, the Environmental Assessment (EA) or Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) ultimately will be judged by the standards applicable under the NEPA regulations and guidance from the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ). To the extent the information incorporated from the transportation planning process, standing alone, does not contain all of the information or analysis required by NEPA, then it will need to be supplemented by other information contained in the EIS or EA that would, in conjunction with the information from the plan, collectively meet the requirements of NEPA. The intent is not to require NEPA studies in the transportation planning process. As an option, the NEPA analyses prepared for project development can be integrated with transportation planning studies (see the response to Question 9 for additional information).

3. What type and extent of involvement from Federal, Tribal, State, and local environmental, regulatory, and resource agencies is needed in the transportation planning process in order for planning-level decisions to be more readily accepted in the NEPA process?

Sections 3005, 3006, and 6001 of the SAFETEA-LU established formal consultation requirements for MPOs and State DOTs to employ with environmental, regulatory, and resource agencies in the development of long-range transportation plans. For example, metropolitan transportation plans now ``shall include a discussion of the types of potential environmental mitigation activities and potential areas to carry out these activities, including activities that may have the greatest potential to restore and maintain the environmental functions affected by the [transportation] plan," and that these planning-level discussions ``shall be developed in consultation with Federal, State, and Tribal land management, wildlife, and regulatory agencies." In addition, MPOs ``shall consult, as appropriate, with State and local agencies responsible for land use management, natural resources, environmental protection, conservation, and historic preservation concerning the development of a long-range transportation plan," and that this consultation ``shall involve, as appropriate, comparison of transportation plans with State conservation plans or maps, if available, or comparison of transportation plans to inventories of natural or historic resources, if available." Similar SAFETEA-LU language addresses the development of the long-range Statewide transportation plan, with the addition of Tribal conservation plans or maps to this planning-level ``comparison."

In addition, section 6002 of the SAFETEA-LU established several mechanisms for increased efficiency in environmental reviews for project decision-making. For example, the term ``lead agency" collectively means the U. S. Department of Transportation and a State or local governmental entity serving as a joint lead agency for the NEPA process. In addition, the lead agency is responsible for inviting and designating ``participating agencies" (i.e., other Federal or non-Federal agencies that may have an interest in the proposed project). Any Federal agency that is invited by the lead agency to participate in the environmental review process for a project shall be designated as a participating agency by the lead agency unless the invited agency informs the lead agency, in writing, by the deadline specified in the invitation that the invited agency:

(a) Has no jurisdiction or authority with respect to the project; (b) has no expertise or information relevant to the project; and (c) does not intend to submit comments on the project.

Past successful examples of using transportation planning products in NEPA analysis are based on early and continuous involvement of environmental, regulatory, and resource agencies. Without this early coordination, environmental, regulatory, and resource agencies are more likely to expect decisions made or analyses conducted in the transportation planning process to be revisited during the NEPA process. Early participation in transportation planning provides environmental, regulatory, and resource agencies better insight into the needs and objectives of the locality. Additionally, early participation provides an important opportunity for environmental, regulatory, and resource agency concerns to be identified and addressed early in the process, such as those related to permit applications. Moreover, Federal, Tribal, State, and local environmental, regulatory, and resource agencies are able to share data on particular resources, which can play a critical role in determining the feasibility of a transportation solution with respect to environmental impacts. The use of other agency planning outputs can result in a transportation project that could support multiple goals (transportation, environmental, and community). Further, planning decisions by these other agencies may have impacts on long-range transportation plans and/or the STIP/TIP, thereby providing important input to the transportation planning process and advancing integrated decision-making.

4. What is the procedure for using decisions or analyses from the transportation planning process?

The lead agencies jointly decide, and must agree, on what processes and consultation techniques are used to determine the transportation planning products that will be incorporated into the NEPA process. At a minimum, a robust scoping/early coordination process (which explains to Federal and State environmental, regulatory, and resource agencies and the public the information and/or analyses utilized to develop the planning products, how the purpose and need was developed and refined, and how the design concept and scope were determined) should play a critical role in leading to informed decisions by the lead agencies on the suitability of the transportation planning information, analyses, documents, and decisions for use in the NEPA process. As part of a rigorous scoping/early coordination process, the FHWA and the FTA should ensure that the transportation planning results are appropriately documented, shared, and used.

5. To what extent can the FHWA/FTA provide up-front assurance that decisions and additional investments made in the transportation planning process will allow planning-level decisions and analyses to be used in the NEPA process?

There are no guarantees. However, the potential is greatly improved for transportation planning processes that address the "3-C" planning principles (comprehensive, cooperative, and continuous); incorporate the intent of NEPA through the consideration of natural, physical, and social effects; involve environmental, regulatory, and resource agencies; thoroughly document the transportation planning process information, analysis, and decision; and vet the planning results through the applicable public involvement processes.

6. What considerations will the FHWA/FTA take into account in their review of transportation planning products for acceptance in project development/NEPA?

The FHWA and the FTA will give deference to decisions resulting from the transportation planning process if the FHWA and FTA determine that the planning process is

consistent with the "3-C" planning principles and when the planning study process, alternatives considered, and resulting decisions have a rational basis that is thoroughly documented and vetted through the applicable public involvement processes. Moreover, any applicable program-specific requirements (e.g., those of the Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program or the FTA's Capital Investment Grant program) also must be met.

The NEPA requires that the FHWA and the FTA be able to stand behind the overall soundness and credibility of analyses conducted and decisions made during the transportation planning process if they are incorporated into a NEPA document. For example, if systems-level or other broad objectives or choices from the transportation plan are incorporated into the purpose and need Statement for a NEPA document, the FHWA and the FTA should not revisit whether these are the best objectives or choices among other options. Rather, the FHWA and the FTA review would include making sure that objectives or choices derived from the transportation plan were: Based on transportation planning factors established by Federal law; reflect a credible and articulated planning rationale; founded on reliable data; and developed through transportation planning processes meeting FHWA and FTA statutory and regulatory requirements. In addition, the basis for the goals and choices must be documented and included in the NEPA document. The FHWA/FTA reviewers do not need to review whether assumptions or analytical methods used in the studies are the best available, but, instead, need to assure that such assumptions or analytical methods are reasonable, scientifically acceptable, and consistent with goals, objectives, and policies set forth in long-range transportation plans. This review would include determining whether: (a) Assumptions have a rational basis and are up-to-date and (b) data, analytical methods, and modeling techniques are reliable, defensible, reasonably current, and meet data quality requirements.

## **II. Substantive Issues**

General Issues To Be Considered:

### **7. What should be considered in order to rely upon transportation planning studies in NEPA?**

The following questions should be answered prior to accepting studies conducted during the transportation planning process for use in NEPA. While not a "checklist," these questions are intended to guide the practitioner's analysis of the planning products:

- a. How much time has passed since the planning studies and corresponding decisions were made?
- b. Were the future year policy assumptions used in the transportation planning process related to land use, economic development, transportation costs, and network expansion consistent with those to be used in the NEPA process?
- c. Is the information still relevant/valid?
- d. What changes have occurred in the area since the study was completed?
- e. Is the information in a format that can be appended to an environmental document or reformatted to do so?



- f. Are the analyses in a planning-level report or document based on data, analytical methods, and modeling techniques that are reliable, defensible, and consistent with those used in other regional transportation studies and project development activities?
- g. Were the FHWA and FTA, other agencies, and the public involved in the relevant planning analysis and the corresponding planning decisions?
- h. Were the planning products available to other agencies and the public during NEPA scoping?
- i. During NEPA scoping, was a clear connection between the decisions made in planning and those to be made during the project development stage explained to the public and others? What was the response?
- j. Are natural resource and land use plans being informed by transportation planning products, and vice versa?

**Purpose and Need:**

**8. How can transportation planning be used to shape a project's purpose and need in the NEPA process?**

A sound transportation planning process is the primary source of the project purpose and need. Through transportation planning, State and local governments, with involvement of stakeholders and the public, establish a vision for the region's future transportation system, define transportation goals and objectives for realizing that vision, decide which needs to address, and determine the timeframe for addressing these issues. The transportation planning process also provides a potential forum to define a project's purpose and need by framing the scope of the problem to be addressed by a proposed project. This scope may be further refined during the transportation planning process as more information about the transportation need is collected and consultation with the public and other stakeholders clarifies other issues and goals for the region.

23 U.S.C. 139(f), as amended by the SAFETEA-LU Section 6002, provides additional focus regarding the definition of the purpose and need and objectives. For example, the lead agency, as early as practicable during the environmental review process, shall provide an opportunity for involvement by participating agencies and the public in defining the purpose and need for a project. The Statement of purpose and need shall include a clear Statement of the objectives that the proposed action is intended to achieve, which may include: (a) Achieving a transportation objective identified in an applicable Statewide or metropolitan transportation plan; (b) supporting land use, economic development, or growth objectives established in applicable Federal, State, local, or Tribal plans; and (c) serving national defense, national security, or other national objectives, as established in Federal laws, plans, or policies.

The transportation planning process can be utilized to develop the purpose and need in the following ways:

- (a) Goals and objectives from the transportation planning process may be part of the project's purpose and need Statement;

(b) A general travel corridor or general mode or modes (e.g., highway, transit, or a highway/transit combination) resulting from planning analyses may be part of the project's purpose and need Statement;

(c) If the financial plan for a metropolitan transportation plan indicates that funding for a specific project will require special funding sources (e.g., tolls or public-private financing), such information may be included in the purpose and need Statement; or

(d) The results of analyses from management systems (e.g., congestion, pavement, bridge, and/or safety) may shape the purpose and need Statement.

The use of these planning-level goals and choices must be appropriately explained during NEPA scoping and in the NEPA document. Consistent with NEPA, the purpose and need Statement should be a Statement of a transportation problem, not a specific solution. However, the purpose and need Statement should be specific enough to generate alternatives that may potentially yield real solutions to the problem at-hand. A purpose and need Statement that yields only one alternative may indicate a purpose and need that is too narrowly defined.

Short of a fully integrated transportation decision-making process, many State DOTs develop information for their purpose and need Statements when implementing interagency NEPA/Section 404 process merger agreements. These agreements may need to be expanded to include commitments to share and utilize transportation planning products when developing a project's purpose and need.

9. Under what conditions can the NEPA process be initiated in conjunction with transportation planning studies?

The NEPA process may be initiated in conjunction with transportation planning studies in a number of ways. A common method is the "tiered EIS," in which the first-tier EIS evaluates general travel corridors, modes, and/or packages of projects at a planning level of detail, leading to the refinement of purpose and need and, ideally, selection of the design concept and scope for a project or series of projects. Subsequently, second-tier NEPA review(s) of the resulting projects would be performed in the usual way. The first-tier EIS uses the NEPA process as a tool to involve environmental, regulatory, and resource agencies and the public in the planning decisions, as well as to ensure the appropriate consideration of environmental factors in these planning decisions.

Corridor or subarea analyses/studies are another option when the long-range transportation plan leaves open the possibility of multiple approaches to fulfill its goals and objectives. In such cases, the formal NEPA process could be initiated through publication of a NOI in conjunction with a corridor or subarea planning study. Similarly, some public transportation operators developing major capital projects perform the mandatory planning Alternatives Analysis required for funding under FTA's Capital Investment Grant program [49 U.S.C. 5309(d) and (e)] within the NEPA process and combine the planning Alternatives Analysis with the draft EIS.

**Alternatives:**

10. In the context of this Appendix, what is the meaning of the term "alternatives"?

This Appendix uses the term "alternatives" as specified in the NEPA regulations (40 CFR 1502.14), where it is defined in its broadest sense to include everything from major modal alternatives and location alternatives to minor design changes that would mitigate

adverse impacts. This Appendix does not use the term as it is used in many other contexts (e.g., "prudent and feasible alternatives" under Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act, the "Least Environmentally Damaging Practicable Alternative" under the Clean Water Act, or the planning Alternatives Analysis in 49 U.S.C. 5309(d) and (e)).

11. Under what circumstances can alternatives be eliminated from detailed consideration during the NEPA process based on information and analysis from the transportation planning process?

There are two ways in which the transportation planning process can begin limiting the alternative solutions to be evaluated during the NEPA process: (a) Shaping the purpose and need for the project; or (b) evaluating alternatives during planning studies and eliminating some of the alternatives from detailed study in the NEPA process prior to its start. Each approach requires careful attention, and is summarized below.

(a) **Shaping the Purpose and Need for the Project:** The transportation planning process should shape the purpose and need and, thereby, the range of reasonable alternatives. With proper documentation and public involvement, a purpose and need derived from the planning process can legitimately narrow the alternatives analyzed in the NEPA process. See the response to Question 8 for further discussion on how the planning process can shape the purpose and need used in the NEPA process.

For example, the purpose and need may be shaped by the transportation planning process in a manner that consequently narrows the range of alternatives that must be considered in detail in the NEPA document when:

(1) The transportation planning process has selected a general travel corridor as best addressing identified transportation problems and the rationale for the determination in the planning document is reflected in the purpose and need Statement of the subsequent NEPA document;

(2) The transportation planning process has selected a general mode (e.g., highway, transit, or a highway/transit combination) that accomplishes its goals and objectives, and these documented determinations are reflected in the purpose and need Statement of the subsequent NEPA document; or

(3) The transportation planning process determines that the project needs to be funded by tolls or other non-traditional funding sources in order for the long-range transportation plan to be fiscally constrained or identifies goals and objectives that can only be met by toll roads or other non-traditional funding sources, and that determination of those goals and objectives is reflected in the purpose and need Statement of the subsequent NEPA document.

(b) **Evaluating and Eliminating Alternatives During the Transportation Planning Process:** The evaluation and elimination of alternatives during the transportation planning process can be incorporated by reference into a NEPA document under certain circumstances. In these cases, the planning study becomes part of the NEPA process and provides a basis for screening out alternatives. As with any part of the NEPA process, the analysis of alternatives to be incorporated from the process must have a rational basis that has been thoroughly documented (including documentation of the necessary and appropriate vetting through the applicable public involvement processes). This record should be made available for public review during the NEPA scoping process.

See responses to Questions 4, 5, 6, and 7 for additional elements to consider with respect to acceptance of planning products for NEPA documentation and the response to Question 12 on the information or analysis from the transportation planning process necessary for supporting the elimination of an alternative(s) from detailed consideration in the NEPA process.

For instance, under FTA's Capital Investment Grant program, the alternatives considered in the NEPA process may be narrowed in those instances that the planning Alternatives Analysis required by 49 U.S.C. 5309(e) is conducted as a planning study prior to the NEPA review. In fact, the FTA may be able to narrow the alternatives considered in detail in the NEPA document to the No-Build (No Action) alternative and the Locally Preferred Alternative. Alternatives must meet the following criteria if they are deemed sufficiently considered by a planning Alternatives Analysis under FTA's Capital Investment Grant program conducted prior to NEPA without a programmatic NEPA analysis and documentation:

During the planning Alternatives Analysis, all of the reasonable alternatives under consideration must be fully evaluated in terms of their transportation impacts; capital and operating costs; social, economic, and environmental impacts; and technical considerations;

There must be appropriate public involvement in the planning Alternatives Analysis;

The appropriate Federal, State, and local environmental, regulatory, and resource agencies must be engaged in the planning Alternatives Analysis;

The results of the planning Alternatives Analysis must be documented;

The NEPA scoping participants must agree on the alternatives that will be considered in the NEPA review; and

The subsequent NEPA document must include the evaluation of alternatives from the planning Alternatives Analysis.

The above criteria apply specifically to FTA's Capital Investment Grant process. However, for other transportation projects, if the planning process has included the analysis and stakeholder involvement that would be undertaken in a first tier NEPA process, then the alternatives screening conducted in the transportation planning process may be incorporated by reference, described, and relied upon in the project-level NEPA document. At that point, the project-level NEPA analysis can focus on the remaining alternatives.

12. What information or analysis from the transportation planning process is needed in an EA or EIS to support the elimination of an alternative(s) from detailed consideration?

The section of the EA or EIS that discusses alternatives considered but eliminated from detailed consideration should:

(a) Identify any alternatives eliminated during the transportation planning process (this could include broad categories of alternatives, as when a long-range transportation plan selects a general travel corridor based on a corridor study, thereby eliminating all alternatives along other alignments);

(b) Briefly summarize the reasons for eliminating the alternative; and

(c) Include a summary of the analysis process that supports the elimination of alternatives (the summary should reference the relevant sections or pages of the analysis or study) and incorporate it by reference or append it to the NEPA document.

Any analyses or studies used to eliminate alternatives from detailed consideration should be made available to the public and participating agencies during the NEPA scoping process and should be reasonably available during comment periods.

Alternatives passed over during the transportation planning process because they are infeasible or do not meet the NEPA "purpose and need" can be omitted from the detailed analysis of alternatives in the NEPA document, as long as the rationale for elimination is explained in the NEPA document. Alternatives that remain "reasonable" after the planning-level analysis must be addressed in the EIS, even when they are not the preferred alternative. When the proposed action evaluated in an EA involves unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources, NEPA requires that appropriate alternatives be studied, developed, and described.

### **Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences:**

#### **13. What types of planning products provide analysis of the affected environment and environmental consequences that are useful in a project-level NEPA analysis and document?**

The following planning products are valuable inputs to the discussion of the affected environment and environmental consequences (both its current State and future State in the absence of the proposed action) in the project-level NEPA analysis and document:

- Regional development and growth analyses;
- Local land use, growth management, or development plans; and
- Population and employment projections.

The following are types of information, analysis, and other products from the transportation planning process that can be used in the discussion of the affected environment and environmental consequences in an EA or EIS:

(a) Geographic information system (GIS) overlays showing the past, current, or predicted future conditions of the natural and built environments;

(b) Environmental scans that identify environmental resources and environmentally sensitive areas;

(c) Descriptions of airsheds and watersheds;

(d) Demographic trends and forecasts;

(e) Projections of future land use, natural resource conservation areas, and development; and

(f) The outputs of natural resource planning efforts, such as wildlife conservation plans, watershed plans, special area management plans, and multiple species habitat conservation plans.

However, in most cases, the assessment of the affected environment and environmental consequences conducted during the transportation planning process will not be detailed or current enough to meet NEPA standards and, thus, the inventory and evaluation of affected resources and the analysis of consequences of the alternatives will need to be supplemented with more refined analysis and possibly site-specific details during the NEPA process.

**14. What information from the transportation planning process is useful in describing a baseline for the NEPA analysis of indirect and cumulative impacts?**

Because the nature of the transportation planning process is to look broadly at future land use, development, population increases, and other growth factors, the planning analysis can provide the basis for the assessment of indirect and cumulative impacts required under NEPA. The consideration in the transportation planning process of development, growth, and consistency with local land use, growth management, or development plans, as well as population and employment projections, provides an overview of the multitude of factors in an area that are creating pressures not only on the transportation system, but on the natural ecosystem and important environmental and community resources. An analysis of all reasonably foreseeable actions in the area also should be a part of the transportation planning process. This planning-level information should be captured and utilized in the analysis of indirect and cumulative impacts during the NEPA process.

To be used in the analysis of indirect and cumulative impacts, such information should:

- (a) Be sufficiently detailed that differences in consequences of alternatives can be readily identified;
- (b) Be based on current data (e.g., data from the most recent Census) or be updated by additional information;
- (c) Be based on reasonable assumptions that are clearly Stated; and/or
- (d) Rely on analytical methods and modeling techniques that are reliable, defensible, and reasonably current.

**Environmental Mitigation:**

**15. How can planning-level efforts best support advance mitigation, mitigation banking, and priorities for environmental mitigation investments?**

A lesson learned from efforts to establish mitigation banks and advance mitigation agreements and alternative mitigation options is the importance of beginning interagency discussions during the transportation planning process. Development pressures, habitat alteration, complicated real estate transactions, and competition for potential mitigation sites by public and private project proponents can encumber the already difficult task of mitigating for "like" value and function and reinforce the need to examine mitigation strategies as early as possible.

Robust use of remote sensing, GIS, and decision support systems for evaluating conservation strategies are all contributing to the advancement of natural resource and environmental planning. The outputs from environmental planning can now better inform transportation planning processes, including the development of mitigation strategies, so that transportation and conservation goals can be optimally met. For example, long-

range transportation plans can be screened to assess the effect of general travel corridors or density, on the viability of sensitive plant and animal species or habitats. This type of screening provides a basis for early collaboration among transportation and environmental staffs, the public, and regulatory agencies to explore areas where impacts must be avoided and identify areas for mitigation investments. This can lead to mitigation strategies that are both more economical and more effective from an environmental stewardship perspective than traditional project-specific mitigation measures.

### **III. Administrative Issues:**

#### **16. Are Federal funds eligible to pay for these additional, or more in depth, environmental studies in transportation planning?**

Yes. For example, the following FHWA and FTA funds may be utilized for conducting environmental studies and analyses within transportation planning: FHWA planning and research funds, as defined under 23 CFR Part 420 (e.g., Metropolitan Planning (PL), Statewide Planning and Research (SPR), National Highway System (NHS), Surface Transportation Program (STP), and Equity Bonus); and FTA planning and research funds (49 U.S.C. 5303 and 49 U.S.C. 5313(b)), urban formula funds (49 U.S.C. 5307), and (in limited circumstances) transit capital investment funds (49 U.S.C. 5309).

The eligible transportation planning-related uses of these funds may include: (a) Conducting feasibility or subarea/corridor needs studies and (b) developing system-wide environmental information/inventories (e.g., wetland banking inventories or standards to identify historically significant sites). Particularly in the case of PL and SPR funds, the proposed expenditure must be closely related to the development of transportation plans and programs under 23 U.S.C. 134-135 and 49 U.S.C. 5303-5306.

For FHWA funding programs, once a general travel corridor or specific project has progressed to a point in the preliminary engineering/NEPA phase that clearly extends beyond transportation planning, additional in-depth environmental studies must be funded through the program category for which the ultimate project qualifies (e.g., NHS, STP, Interstate Maintenance, and/or Bridge), rather than PL or SPR funds.

Another source of funding is FHWA's Transportation Enhancement program, which may be used for activities such as: conducting archeological planning and research; developing inventories such as those for historic bridges and highways, and other surface transportation-related structures; conducting studies to determine the extent of water pollution due to highway runoff; and conducting studies to reduce vehicle-caused wildlife mortality while maintaining habitat connectivity.

The FHWA and the FTA encourage State DOTs, MPOs, and public transportation operators to seek partners for some of these studies from environmental, regulatory, and resource agencies, non-government organizations, and other government and private sector entities with similar data needs, or environmental interests. In some cases, these partners may contribute data and expertise to the studies, as well as funding.

#### **17. What staffing or organizational arrangements may be helpful in allowing planning products to be accepted in the NEPA process?**

Certain organizational and staffing arrangements may support a more integrated approach to the planning/NEPA decision-making continuum. In many cases, planning organizations do not have environmental expertise on staff or readily accessible. Likewise, the review and regulatory responsibilities of many environmental, regulatory, and resource agencies make involvement in the transportation planning process a challenge for staff resources.

These challenges may be partially met by improved use of the outputs of each agency's planning resources and by augmenting their capabilities through greater use of GIS and remote sensing technologies (see <http://www.gis.fhwa.dot.gov/> for additional information on the use of GIS). Sharing databases and the planning products of local land use decision-makers and State and Federal environmental, regulatory, and resource agencies also provide efficiencies in acquiring and sharing the data and information needed for both transportation planning and NEPA work.

Additional opportunities such as shared staff, training across disciplines, and (in some cases) reorganizing to eliminate structural divisions between planning and NEPA practitioners may also need to be considered in order to better integrate NEPA considerations into transportation planning studies. The answers to the following two questions also contain useful information on training and staffing opportunities.

18. How have environmental, regulatory, and resource agency liaisons (Federally- and State DOT-funded positions) and partnership agreements been used to provide the expertise and interagency participation needed to enhance the consideration of environmental factors in the planning process?

For several years, States have utilized Federal and State transportation funds to support focused and accelerated project review by a variety of local, State, Tribal, and Federal agencies. While Section 1309(e) of the TEA-21 and its successor in SAFETEA-LU section 6002 speak specifically to transportation project streamlining, there are other authorities that have been used to fund positions, such as the Intergovernmental Cooperation Act (31 U.S.C. 6505). In addition, long-term, on-call consultant contracts can provide backfill support for staff that are detailed to other parts of an agency for temporary assignments. At last count (as of 2003), 246 positions were being funded. Additional information on interagency funding agreements is available at: <http://environment.fhwa.dot.gov/strmlng/igdocs/index.htm>.

Moreover, every State has advanced a variety of stewardship and streamlining initiatives that necessitate early involvement of environmental, regulatory, and resource agencies in the project development process. Such process improvements have: addressed the exchange of data to support avoidance and impact analysis; established formal and informal consultation and review schedules; advanced mitigation strategies; and resulted in a variety of programmatic reviews. Interagency agreements and work plans have evolved to describe performance objectives, as well as specific roles and responsibilities related to new streamlining initiatives. Some States have improved collaboration and efficiency by co-locating environmental, regulatory, and resource and transportation agency staff.



19. What training opportunities are available to MPOs, State DOTs, public transportation operators and environmental, regulatory, and resource agencies to assist in their understanding of the transportation planning and NEPA processes?

Both the FHWA and the FTA offer a variety of transportation planning, public involvement, and NEPA courses through the National Highway Institute and/or the National Transit Institute. Of particular note is the Linking Planning and NEPA Workshop, which provides a forum and facilitated group discussion among and between State DOT; MPO; Federal, Tribal, and State environmental, regulatory, and resource agencies; and FHWA/FTA representatives (at both the executive and program manager levels) to develop a State-specific action plan that will provide for strengthened linkages between the transportation planning and NEPA processes.

Moreover, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service offers Green Infrastructure Workshops that are focused on integrating planning for natural resources ("green infrastructure") with the development, economic, and other infrastructure needs of society ("gray infrastructure").

Robust planning and multi-issue environmental screening requires input from a wide variety of disciplines, including information technology; transportation planning; the NEPA process; and regulatory, permitting, and environmental specialty areas (e.g., noise, air quality, and biology). Senior managers at transportation and partner agencies can arrange a variety of individual training programs to support learning curves and skill development that contribute to a strengthened link of the transportation planning and NEPA processes. Formal and informal mentoring on an intra-agency basis can be arranged. Employee exchanges within and between agencies can be periodically scheduled, and persons involved with professional leadership programs can seek temporary assignments with partner agencies.

#### **IV. Additional Information on this Topic**

Valuable sources of information are FHWA's environment website (<http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/index.htm>) and FTA's environmental streamlining website (<http://www.environment.fta.dot.gov>).

Another source of information and case studies is NCHRP Report 8-38 (Consideration of Environmental Factors in Transportation Systems Planning), which is available at <http://www4.trb.org/trb/crp.nsf/All+Projects/NCHRP+8-38>.

In addition, AASHTO's Center for Environmental Excellence website is continuously updated with news and links to information of interest to transportation and environmental professionals ([www.transportation.environment.org](http://www.transportation.environment.org)).

## **Appendix E**

### **Integration of the Planning and NEPA Processes**

Page Left Intentionally Blank

Date: February 22, 2005  
Subject: Integration of Planning and NEPA Processes  
In Reply Refer To: HCC-30  
From: D.J. Gribbin /s/  
Chief Counsel, Federal Highway Administration  
  
Judith S. Kaleta /s/  
Acting Chief Counsel, Federal Transit Administration  
To: Cindy Burbank, Associate Administrator  
Office of Planning, Environment and Realty, FHWA  
  
David A. Vozzolo, Deputy Associate Administrator  
Office of Planning and Environment, FTA

## **I. Issue**

You have asked for guidance regarding the extent to which the results of the transportation planning process can be used in and relied upon in the NEPA process.

In response to your request, this memorandum outlines the current law; describes the transportation planning products that can be used in the NEPA process and under what conditions; and explains the roles of Federal agencies and the public in reviewing transportation planning products used in NEPA analyses and documents.

## **II. Background**

The transportation planning process required by 23 U.S.C. 134 and 135 and 49 U.S.C. 5303-5306 sets the stage for future development of transportation projects. As part of the transportation planning process, States and local metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs) must develop long-range transportation plans to address projected transportation needs. In addition, they must create transportation improvement programs (TIPs or STIPs), which identify a list of priority projects to be carried out in the next three years to implement the plan. To receive Federal funding, transportation projects must come from a TIP or STIP. As a result, much of the data and decision making undertaken by state and local officials during the planning process carry forward into the project development activities that follow the TIP or STIP. This means that the planning process and the environmental assessment required during project development by the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) (42 U.S.C. 4231 *et seq.*) should work in tandem, with the results of the transportation planning process feeding into the NEPA process. Congress has put great emphasis on the transportation planning process for shaping transportation decisions, and has retained and refined that emphasis in surface transportation law over decades.

In practice, though, the environmental analyses produced during the NEPA process are sometimes disconnected from the analyses used to prepare transportation plans, transportation improvement programs, and supporting corridor or subarea studies.

Analyses and decisions occurring during transportation planning can be ignored or redone in the NEPA process, resulting in a duplication of work and delays in implementation of transportation projects. The sharp separation between the work done during the transportation planning process and the NEPA analysis and documentation process is not necessary. In fact, current law provides authority for and even encourages the integration of the information and products developed in highway and transit planning process into the NEPA process. This memorandum provides guidance on how this information and these products can be incorporated into and relied upon in NEPA analyses and documents under existing laws.

### III. Legal Analysis of Current Law on Integrating Planning and NEPA

The transportation planning process is a detailed, Congressionally mandated procedure for developing long-range transportation plans and shorter-range transportation improvement programs. These procedures were initially enacted in the 1960s and were codified in Title 23 and Title 49 of the U.S. Code. See 23 U.S.C. 134 and 135 and 49 U.S.C. 5303-5306. In 1991, the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 substantially expanded the planning provisions. They have been subsequently revisited and refined by Congress in various transportation bills, but the basic framework has remained intact. The procedures identify the State and local agencies with primary responsibility for transportation planning. They also identify agencies and other interested parties who should be given an opportunity to participate in the transportation planning process and describe their appropriate level of involvement. The statute spells out the planning factors that must be considered, including, among other factors, the protection and enhancement of the environment. 23 U.S.C. 134(f) and 135(c).<sup>1</sup> The transportation planning process undertaken by States and MPOs is periodically reviewed and, if found to be adequate, certified by FHWA and FTA. The Federal government does not approve the transportation plans developed by State or local officials, and although FTA and FHWA jointly approve the Statewide TIP such an approval does not constitute a Federal action subject to review under NEPA.<sup>2</sup> This is the process that Congress constructed to shape transportation decisions for Federally funded projects.

In order to be eligible for Federal funding, projects must come from a plan created by this process. Federal action subject to NEPA is needed to approve these Federal aid projects. Because of the continuity between the planning and project development processes, the NEPA analysis for a transportation project needs to be reviewed in the context of this transportation planning process.

NEPA and the government-wide regulations that carry out NEPA (40 C.F.R. Parts 1500 *et seq.*) clearly contemplate the integration of the NEPA process with planning processes. Specifically, Section 102(2)(A) of NEPA direct all Federal agencies to "utilize a systemic, interdisciplinary approach which will insure the integrated use of natural and social sciences and the environmental design arts in *planning* and decision making. [Emphasis added] The regulations issued by the President's Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) amplify the statutory directive:

- 40 C.F.R. 1501.1(a) requires decision makers to "integrate[e] the NEPA process *into early planning* to ensure appropriate consideration of NEPA's policies and to eliminate delay;

- 40 C.F.R. 1501.1(b) emphasizes the need for "cooperative consultation among agencies *before the environmental impact statement is prepared*, rather than "submission of adversary comments on a completed document;
- 40 C.F.R. 1501.1(d) emphasizes the importance of "[I]dentifying at an early stage the significant environmental issues deserving of study, by de-emphasizing "insignificant issues and "narrowing the scope of the environmental impact statement accordingly;
- 40 C.F.R. 1501.2 requires that Federal agencies "integrate the NEPA process with *other planning at the earliest possible time* to ensure that planning and [agency] decisions reflect environmental values. . .

Likewise, the NEPA regulations adopted by the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) emphasize the tie between NEPA and transportation planning:

- 23 C.F.R. 771.105(a) provides that "To the fullest extent possible, all environmental investigations, reviews and consultations be coordinated as a single process. . . and
- 23 C.F.R. 771.105(b) directs that "Alternative courses of action be evaluated and decisions be made in the best overall public interest based upon a balanced consideration of the need for safe and efficient transportation; of the social, economic and environmental impacts of the proposed transportation improvement; and of national, State and local environmental protection goals.

Thus, the organic statute, the government-wide NEPA regulations, and the specific FHWA and FTA regulations all strongly support the integration of the NEPA process with the transportation planning process.

Case law on the issue of the use of transportation planning studies and decisions in the NEPA process is not extensive. However, to the extent they exist, court decisions have consistently supported the reliance in the NEPA process on work done in the planning process. For example, in *North Buckhead Civic Association v. Skinner*, 903 F. 2d 1533 (11th Cir. 1990), the Plaintiffs challenged the purpose and need articulated in the EIS for a multi-lane limited access highway connecting two existing highways. The purpose and need was derived from a series of planning studies conducted by the Atlanta Regional Commission. Plaintiffs argued that the purpose and need was crafted in a way that the proposed highway was "conclusively presumed to be required and a rail alternative perfunctorily dismissed for its failure to fully satisfy the objectives of the project. The Court of Appeals disagreed with the Plaintiffs, stating that their objections reflected "a fundamental misapprehension of the role of federal and state agencies in the community planning process established by the Federal-Aid Highway Act. The Court went on to explain that the Federal-Aid Highway Act contemplated "a relationship of cooperation between federal and local authorities; each governmental entity plays a specific role in the development and execution of a local transportation project. The Court emphasized that federal agencies did not have responsibility for long range local planning, and found that the "federal, state and local officials complied with federally mandated regional planning procedures in developing the need and purpose section of the EIS. 903 F.3d at 1541-42. Although the Court in *Buckhead* acknowledged the validity of a purpose and need based on the results of the planning study, it did not in any way scale back the holdings of other cases relating to purpose and need which caution agencies not to write

purpose and need statements so narrowly as to "define competing 'reasonable alternatives' out of consideration (and even out of existence). *Simmons v. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers*, 120 F.3d 664 (7th Cir. 1997). (In this case, the Army Corps of Engineers failed to question city's insistence on one approach for supplying water and gave no independent thought to the feasibility of alternatives, both single source and separate source supply options. On this basis, the EIS was found to be inadequate.)

In *Carmel-by-the-Sea v. U.S. DOT*, 123 F.3d 1142 (9th Cir. 1997), the Plaintiffs challenged the sufficiency of an EIS for failing to adequately consider the proposed project's growth-inducing effects. The Ninth Circuit disagreed, finding that the EIS satisfied this requirement by referencing several local planning documents that specifically included construction of the highway in their growth plans and which discussed overall growth targets and limits. In addition, the Court found that achieving "Level of Service C, an objective derived from the local congestion management plan, was an appropriate part of the purpose and need statement (although ultimately the EIS was found inadequate on cumulative impact grounds). Similarly, in *Laguna Greenbelt, Inc. v. U.S. DOT*, 42 F.3d 517 (9th Cir. 1994), the court held that the absence of a more thorough discussion in an EIS of induced growth, an issue that was sufficiently analyzed in referenced state materials, does not violate NEPA. However, regardless of the source, the analysis of induced growth must be in sufficient detail and must provide an analytical basis for its assumptions in order to be adequate under NEPA. See *Senville v. Peters*, 327 F.Supp.2d 335, 349 (Vt. 2004) (In this case, the District Court found an FEIS, before it was supplemented by FHWA, to be inadequate because it contained only a "sketchy discussion of induced growth and failed to support its assumptions with any analysis.)

In *Utahns for Better Transportation v. U.S. DOT*, 305 F.3d 1152 (10th Cir. 2002), as modified on rehearing, 319 F.3d 1207 (10th Cir. 2003), Plaintiffs contended that the FEIS was inadequate because it failed to consider reducing travel demand through alternative land use scenarios in combination with mass transit. Noting that "reasonable alternatives must be non-speculative, the Tenth Circuit found that Plaintiffs had not demonstrated a deficiency in the FEIS on this basis (although it was ultimately found inadequate on other grounds). The Court stated that "Land use is a local and regional matter, and that, in this case, the corridor at issue would involve the jurisdiction of several local and regional governmental entities whose cooperation would be necessary to make an alternative land use scenario a reality. The fact that these entities had clearly declined to alter their land use plans in such a way was justification for not considering this alternative. 305 F.3d at 1172. [3](#)

In *Sierra Club v. U.S. Department of Transportation*, 310 F.Supp.2d 1168 (D. Nevada 2004), Plaintiffs made several challenges to the EIS for a proposed highway project. One of these challenges alleged that FHWA relied on understated population and traffic forecasts. However, the Nevada District Court found that FHWA's reliance on the forecasts and modeling efforts of the designated metropolitan planning organization responsible for developing transportation plans and programs for the area was reasonable. In addition, Plaintiffs argued that the EIS had improperly rejected a fixed guideway as a reasonable alternative under NEPA. The Court disagreed, finding that FHWA reasonably relied on a "major investment study<sup>4</sup> conducted as part of its planning process to establish that such an alternative (1) would not meet the project's purpose and need, even when considered as part of a transportation strategy, (2) was too costly

and (3) depended on connections to other portions of such a system for which construction was uncertain.<sup>5</sup>

As demonstrated by these cases, Courts have sanctioned the use of information from the planning process in a NEPA analysis and document. This is consistent with the opening language in NEPA advocating the integration of environmental considerations in both planning and decision-making. Consequently, products from the transportation planning process can be used in the NEPA analysis and documentation prepared for a transportation project.

#### **IV. Legal Guidance on How Products from the Planning Process Can Be Used In the NEPA Process**

For studies, analyses or conclusions from the transportation planning process to be used in the NEPA process, they must meet certain standards established by NEPA. This is because the information and products coming from the planning process must be sufficiently comprehensive that the Federal government may reasonably rely upon them in its NEPA analysis and documentation. Transportation planning processes vary greatly from locality to locality. Some transportation planning processes will already meet these standards, while others might need some modification to do so. Below is a discussion of where products from the transportation planning process might be incorporated into a NEPA analysis and documentation (purpose and need, alternatives, affected environment, and, to a more limited extent, environmental consequences in terms of land use, indirect and cumulative impacts, etc.), along with the NEPA standards they must first meet.

In addition to what is discussed below, these planning products must come from a transportation planning process that complied with current transportation planning requirements (e.g., provided an opportunity for public involvement and considered relevant planning factors). Interested State, local, tribal and Federal agencies should be included in the transportation planning processes, and must be given a reasonable opportunity to comment upon the long range transportation plan and transportation improvement program. Finally, any work from the planning process must have been documented and available for public review during the planning process. Such documentation should be in a form that can easily be appended to the NEPA document or incorporated by reference.<sup>6</sup>

#### **Purpose and Need**

The "purpose and need statement in a NEPA document is where the planning process and the NEPA process most clearly intersect. A sound planning process is a primary source of the project purpose and need. It is through the planning process that state and local governments determine what the transportation needs of an area are, which of transportation needs they wish to address, and in what time frame they wish to address them. Indeed, that is what the law requires from the planning process and actually prevents projects that do not come from the planning process from going forward.

The purpose and need statement, at a minimum, is a statement of the transportation problem to be solved by the proposed project. It is often presented in two parts: broad goals and objectives, and a description of the transportation conditions (congestion,



safety, etc.) underlying the problem. The long-range transportation plan also includes goals and objectives similar to "purpose and need but on a broader scale, since it typically covers a wider area and spans at least twenty years. These goals and objectives are often identified through extensive public outreach, sometimes called "visioning or "alternative futures exercises. The purpose and need statement for a transportation project should be consistent with and based on the goals and objectives developed during the planning process.

Getting input from Federal agencies as transportation goals and objectives are developed during the planning process is advisable and would be consistent with the cooperative relationship envisioned by statute and reinforced by courts. Such participation would give Federal agencies a better insight into the needs and objectives of the locality and would also provide an important opportunity for Federal concerns to be identified and addressed early in the process. These concerns could include issues that might be raised by Federal agencies in considering permit applications for projects designed to implement the transportation plan. However, the responsibility for local planning lies with the metropolitan planning organization or the State, not the Federal government.

In many cases, the goals and objectives in the transportation plan are supported by a needs assessment and problem statement describing current transportation problems to be addressed. Although the goals and objectives in the long-range transportation plan will be broader than what is appropriate for a specific project, they can be the foundation for the purpose and need to be used in a NEPA document. For example, they can be used to generate corridor-level purpose and need statements, during planning, for use in NEPA documents. The challenge is to ensure what comes from the long-range transportation plan is not so general as to generate a range of alternatives that are not responsive to the problem to be solved.

NEPA calls for a purpose and need statement to briefly specify the underlying purpose and need to which the agency is responding in proposing the alternatives including the proposed action. A purpose and need statement can be derived from the transportation planning process. The purpose and need statement:

- Should be a statement of the transportation problem (not a statement of a solution);
- Should be based on articulated planning factors and developed through a certified planning process;
- Should be specific enough so that the range of alternatives developed will offer real potential for solutions to the transportation problem;
- Must not be so specific as to "reverse engineer a solution; and
- May reflect other priorities and limitations in the area, such as environmental resources, growth management, land use planning, and economic development.

## **Alternatives**

Under NEPA, an EIS must rigorously explore and objectively evaluate all reasonable alternatives, and briefly explain the rationale for eliminating any alternatives from detailed study.<sup>7</sup> "Reasonable alternatives are described in Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) guidance as including "those that are practical or feasible from the

technical and economic standpoint and using common sense. *Forty Most Asked Questions Concerning CEQ's NEPA Regulations*, Question #2a (March 23, 1981). An alternative is not "reasonable if it does not satisfy the purpose and need,<sup>8</sup> but it may be reasonable even if it is outside the jurisdiction of the proposing agency to implement.

The transportation planning process frequently takes steps to refine the purpose and need statement that results in narrowing or screening the range of alternatives. Regional planning considerations may be the basis for refining the purpose and need statement, which might then have the effect of eliminating some alternatives from detailed consideration. For example, network connectivity across a geographic barrier such as a river may dictate a particular transportation mode or a general alignment. The plan may also identify where a locality wants housing, commercial development, agriculture, etc.—all of which might drive the need for transportation improvements in particular corridors.

When a long-range transportation plan leaves open the possibility of multiple approaches to fulfill its goals and objectives, a subarea or corridor study could be conducted to "zoom in on a particular area. This study would evaluate alternative investment strategies, engineering constraints, fiscal constraints, and environmental considerations in this area, and could narrow the range of possible alternatives to those that will meet the goals and objectives of the broader long-range transportation plan in that particular subarea or corridor. At the conclusion of such a study, the remaining alternatives might simply consist of a single corridor or mode choice with location and design options.

On a broad scale, a decision about whether projects located in particular subareas or corridors would satisfy the transportation goals and objectives of a locality can be made in these subarea or corridor studies. These studies can therefore be used in and relied on in an EIS to refine the purpose and need statement, thereby narrowing the range of alternatives to be considered by eliminating some alternatives from further detailed study. When conducting subarea or corridor screening studies during the planning process, State and local agencies should keep in mind the principles of NEPA and should be sure to document their procedures and rationales. To be incorporated into an EIS, the analysis of alternatives conducted in the subarea or corridor study should be consistent with the standard of NEPA requiring consideration of reasonable alternatives. Alternatives that remain "reasonable after the planning level analysis must be addressed in the NEPA process, even when they are clearly not the preferred alternative.<sup>9</sup> Alternatives passed over during the transportation planning process because they are infeasible or because they do not meet the NEPA "purpose and need can be omitted from the detailed analysis of alternatives in the NEPA analyses and documentation, so long as the rationale for omitting them is documented in the NEPA document. That documentation can either be appended to the EIS or the specific transportation planning documents can be summarized in the EIS and incorporated by reference. The NEPA review would then have to consider the alternatives that survive the planning study, plus any additional reasonable alternatives identified during NEPA scoping that may not have been considered during the planning process. All reasonable alternatives considered in the draft and final EIS should be presented in a "comparative form that sharply defines the issues and provides a clear basis for a choice by the decision maker and the public. 40 C.F.R. 1502.14.

Finally, any planning study being relied upon as a basis for eliminating alternatives from detailed study should be identified during the NEPA scoping process and available for public review. Since a major purpose of the scoping process is to identify alternatives to be evaluated, the public should be given the opportunity to comment on determinations made in the planning process to eliminate alternatives.

Therefore, if the planning process is used to screen or narrow the range of alternatives, by excluding certain alternatives from detailed study or by prescribing modes or corridors for transportation development which results in eliminating alternative modes or corridors from detailed study, then the planning-based analysis of alternatives:

- Should describe the rationale for determining the reasonableness of the alternative or alternatives;
- Should include an explanation of why an eliminated alternative would not meet the purpose and need or was otherwise unreasonable; and
- Should be made available for public review during the NEPA scoping process and comment period.

Under FTA's New Starts program, the alternatives considered during the NEPA process may be narrowed even further by eliminating alternatives from detailed study in those instances when the Alternatives Analysis required by 49 U.S.C. 5309(e) is conducted as a planning study prior to the NEPA review.<sup>10</sup> In fact, FTA may narrow the alternatives considered in detail in the NEPA analysis and documentation to the No-Build (No-Action) alternative and the "Locally Preferred Alternative". The following criteria must be met if alternatives are eliminated from detailed study by a planning Alternatives Analysis conducted prior to the NEPA review:

- During the planning Alternatives Analysis, all of the reasonable alternatives under consideration must be fully evaluated in terms of their transportation impacts, capital and operating costs, social, economic, and environmental impacts, and technical considerations;
- There must be appropriate public involvement in the planning Alternatives Analysis;
- The appropriate Federal, State, and local resource agencies must be engaged in the planning Alternatives Analysis;
- The results of the planning Alternatives Analysis must be documented;
- The NEPA scoping participants must agree on the alternatives that will be considered in the NEPA review; and
- The NEPA document must incorporate by reference the evaluation of alternatives from the planning Alternatives Analysis.

If, during the NEPA process, new reasonable alternatives not considered during the planning Alternatives Analysis are identified or new information about eliminated alternatives comes to light, those alternatives must be evaluated during the NEPA process.

### **Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences**

The EIS must present a description of the environment in the area that would be affected by the proposed action and alternatives and their environmental consequences. 40

C.F.R. 1502.15 and 1502.16. In the development of the long-range transportation plan and a corridor or subarea studies, a similar assessment of the environment in the area and environmental consequences should typically have been conducted. Such planning-level assessments might include developing and utilizing geographic information system overlays of the area; providing information on air- and water-sheds; identifying the location of environmental resources with respect to the proposed project and alternatives; conducting environmental "scans" of the area of impact; and utilizing demographic trends and forecasts developed for the area. The discussion in the planning process of development growth, and consistency with local land use, growth management or development plans, as well as population and employment projections, would be particularly valuable for use in determining the affected environment and the scope of cumulative impacts assessment and possible indirect impacts of the proposed transportation improvement. Any relevant parts of such transportation planning process analysis, conducted in the planning process or by other sources and used in plan development, can be incorporated by reference and relied upon in the NEPA analysis and documentation.

The CEQ regulations require the action agency preparing an EIS to assess the environmental consequences of the proposed action and any reasonable alternatives. The CEQ regulation contains a detailed list of all of the types of environmental consequences that must be discussed, including direct, indirect and cumulative impacts and their significance, as well as means to mitigate adverse environmental impacts. These consequences must be discussed for each alternative and should be presented in a comparative form. 40 C.F.R. 1502.16. In transportation planning, the development of transportation plans and programs is guided by seven planning factors (23 U.S.C. 134(f)(1) and 23 U.S.C. 135(c)(1)), one of which is to "protect and enhance the environment, promote energy conservation, and improve the quality of life. As such, there generally is a broad consideration of the environmental effects of transportation decisions for a region.<sup>11</sup> To the extent relevant, this analysis can be incorporated into the "environmental consequences section of an environmental assessment or impact statement performed under NEPA. However, in most cases the assessment of environmental consequences conducted during the planning process will not be detailed enough to meet NEPA standards and thus will need to be supplemented.

Nonetheless, the planning process often can be a source of information for the evaluation of cumulative and indirect impacts required under NEPA. 40 C.F.R. 1502.16, 1508.7 and 1508.8. The nature of the planning process is to look broadly at future land use, development, population increases, and other growth factors. This analysis could provide the basis for the assessment of cumulative and indirect impacts required under NEPA. Investigating these impacts at the planning level can also provide insight into landscape, watershed or regional mitigation opportunities that will provide mitigation for multiple projects.

An EIS may incorporate information regarding future land use, development, demographic changes, etc. from the transportation planning process to form a common basis for comparing the direct, indirect and cumulative impacts of all alternatives. When an analysis of the environmental consequences from the transportation planning process is incorporated into an EIS it:

- Should be presented in a way that differentiates among the consequences of the proposed action and other reasonable alternatives;
- Should be in sufficient detail to allow the decision maker and the public to ascertain the comparative merits and demerits of the alternatives; and
- Must be supplemented to the extent it does not adequately address all of the elements required by the CEQ and FHWA/FTA NEPA regulations.

## **V. Legal Guidance on Weight to be Given to Planning Products Incorporated into NEPA Analyses and Documents**

Responsibility for NEPA analyses and documents on Federally funded or approved highway and transit projects ultimately rests with FHWA and FTA, since they are taking the federal action subject to NEPA. FHWA and FTA have an obligation to independently evaluate and review a NEPA analysis and document, even when some of the information contained in it has been prepared by the State or other local agency. 42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(D); 40 C.F.R. 1506.5 Under NEPA and other relevant environmental laws such as the Endangered Species Act, the Clean Water Act, or the Clean Air Act, other agencies also must be given an opportunity to review and comment on NEPA documents and analysis. Federal agencies that have jurisdiction by law have an independent responsibility under NEPA and, upon the request of the lead agency, shall be "cooperating agencies."<sup>12</sup> Tribes and state and local agencies with jurisdiction by law and all agencies with special expertise may, upon the request of the lead agency, be "cooperating agencies in the NEPA process. 40 C.F.R. 1501.6 and 1508.5.

However, while imposing on Federal agencies the obligation to independently evaluate information in NEPA analyses and documents, Congress also affirmed that NEPA does not apply to the transportation planning process because it is not a Federal action:

"Since plans and programs described in this [transportation planning] section are subject to a reasonable opportunity for public comment, since individual projects included in the plans and programs are subject to review under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.), and since decisions by the Secretary concerning plans and programs described in this section have not been reviewed under such Act as of January 1, 1997, any decision by the Secretary concerning a plan or program described in this section shall not be considered to be a Federal action subject to review under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.)."

23 U.S.C 134(o) and 135(i). The transportation planning process is a local function, which, by statute, is undertaken by State and local governments. The Department of Transportation has an oversight role, but it does not conduct the process and, therefore, there is no Federal action to trigger the application of NEPA. This is different than the "big picture planning processes undertaken by other Federal agencies with respect to lands that they manage, where action by the Federal agency is involved and NEPA applies."<sup>13</sup>

The affirmation in Sections 134(o) and 135(i) that the decisions made by State and local governments during the transportation planning process are exempt from NEPA is based on a Fifth Circuit decision, *Atlanta Coalition on the Transportation Crisis, Inc. v. Atlanta Regional Commission*, 599 F.2d 1333 (5th Cir. 1979). In this case, plaintiffs sought declaratory judgment that an EIS was required for a regional transportation plan

developed by the Atlanta Regional Commission in compliance with the FHWA and FTA planning regulations. The plan proposed a comprehensive transportation system for the Atlanta area. It included an analysis of projected regional transportation needs through the year 2000 and identified the general location and the mode (i.e. highway or transit) for recommended transportation corridors to meet those needs. The Fifth Circuit denied plaintiff's request for an EIS, finding that "Congress did not intend NEPA to apply to state, local or private actions; hence, the statute speaks only to 'federal agencies' and requires impact statements only as to 'major federal actions.'" 559 F.2d at 1344. Specifically, the Court stated:

"The fact is that the [regional plan] was developed by ARC in conjunction with state and local authorities, and no federal agency had any significant hand in determining, or made any decision concerning, its substantive aspects. Under the statutes, those decisions are entrusted to the state and local agencies, not FHWA or [FTA]. Moreover, the plan, as a plan will never be submitted to a federal agency for review or approval. And while the planning process was so structured so as to preserve the eligibility for federal funding of projects included within the resulting plan, it has been consistently held that the possibility of federal funding in the future does not make the project or projects 'major federal action' during the planning stage."

[Cites omitted] 599 F.2d at 1346. The Court further found that certification or funding of the planning process by FHWA and FTA did not amount to a "major federal action as defined in the NEPA regulations. 559 F.3d at 1344; 40 C.F.R. 1508.18. The Court concluded by again emphasizing: "We have no doubt but that the [regional plan] embodies important decisions concerning the future growth of the Atlanta area that will have a continuing and significant effect on the human environment. But at the risk of belaboring the point, we reemphasize that those decisions have been made by state and local authorities, will not be reviewed by any federal agency, and obligate no federal funds. The defendants therefore need not prepare an impact statement on the [regional plan]. 559 F.3d at 1349.

This theme is echoed in other court decisions involving local planning processes. Early in the development of NEPA law, Courts recognized that deference to local planning was appropriate in the NEPA process. In *Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission v. U.S. Postal Service*, 487 F.2d 1029 (U.S. App. D.C. 1973), the Postal Service determined that the construction of a bulk mail facility would have no significant impact since, under the locality's zoning laws, the postal facility was a "permitted use at the location proposed by the Postal Service. In analyzing this issue, the Court noted: "The question of significance takes on a distinctive case in the context of land use planning. The Court went on to state: "When local zoning regulations and procedures are followed in site location decisions by the Federal Government, there is an assurance that such 'environmental' effects as flow from the special uses of land—the safety of the structures, cohesiveness of neighborhoods, population density, crime control, and esthetics—will be no greater than demanded by the residents acting through their elected representatives. 487 F.2d at 165-66. The Court acknowledged, however, that local planning was not sufficient to effectuate NEPA, and that actions of the Federal government might have implications beyond those evaluated in the planning process: "For example, whereas the Federal Government might legitimately defer to New York City zoning in matters of, say, population density, a different issue would be posed by the location within the city of an atomic reactor. Its peculiar hazards would not be limited



to the citizens of New York, nor could they control them. 487 F.2d at 166. See also *Preservation Coalition, Inc. v. Pierce*, 667 F.2d 851 (C.A. Idaho 1982) (citing *Maryland-National Capital Park* and upholding a finding of no significant impact when a Federal project conformed to existing land use patterns, zoning and local plans).

The Fifth Circuit followed a similar line of reasoning in *Isle of Hope Historical Association v. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers*, 646 F. 2d 215 (5th Cir. 1981). In this case, the Court held that, in preparing an EIS, the Corps of Engineers properly relied on information and answers from the local government regarding planning and zoning issues. The Corps had consulted with county officials to determine whether planning documents had been adopted and whether there was any inconsistency between the proposed project and the local zoning regulations. Plaintiffs challenged this part of the EIS, alleging that it had not adequately discussed the planning documents at issue nor disclosed inconsistencies between the zoning regulations and the proposed project. The Court upheld the Corps' reliance on the county officials' responses, stating that "For the Corps in this case to follow planning documents which the county had not adopted or to engage independent analysis of inconsistencies which those specifically charged with zoning enforcement did not find would make the Corps in effect a planning and zoning review board. . . The proper function of the Corps was to assess the environmental impact of the [proposed project], not to act as a zoning interpretation or appeal board. 646 F.2d at 221.[14](#)

This respect for local sovereignty in making planning decisions has been reinforced more recently in the context of transportation planning. In *North Buckhead Civic Association v. Skinner* (discussed previously in Section III of this Memorandum), the 11th Circuit emphasized that "NEPA does not confer the power or responsibility for long range local planning on Federal or state agencies. 903 F. 3d at 1541-42. See also *Sierra Club v. U.S. Department of Transportation*, 350 F.Supp.2d 1168, 1193 (D. Nevada 2004), where the Court said: "[A] federal agency does not violate NEPA by relying on prior studies and analyses performed by local and state agencies. This approach is also consistent with the statutory provision describing the Federal-State relationship for the Federal-aid highway program: 'The authorization of the appropriation of Federal funds or their availability for expenditure under this chapter shall in no way infringe on the sovereign rights of the States to determine which projects shall be federally financed. 23 U.S.C.

145(a). In conducting its NEPA analysis, FHWA and FTA must take into account Congressional direction regarding its statutory authority to act. See *Citizens Against Burlington, Inc. v. Busey*, 938 F.2d 190 (C.A.D.C. 1991).[15](#)

When it enacts a provision of law, Congress is presumed to have in mind previous laws relating to the same subject matter. To the greatest extent possible, new statutes should be read in accord with prior statutes, and should be construed together in harmony. N. Singer, *Statutes and Statutory Construction*, 6th Ed., Vol. 2B, Sec. 51.02. A Federal agency's independent obligation to evaluate planning products incorporated into the NEPA process must be performed in a way that is consistent with the Congressional direction that NEPA does not apply to local transportation planning and consistent with court decisions recognizing the sovereignty of local governments in making local transportation planning decisions. Federal agencies should ensure transportation planning decisions have a rational basis and are based on accurate data, but should not use the NEPA process as a venue for substituting federal judgment for local judgment by

requiring reconsideration of systems-level objectives or choices that are properly made during the local transportation planning process.[16](#)

The transportation planning process and the NEPA process work in harmony when the planning process provides the basis or foundation for the purpose and need statement in a NEPA document. To the extent regional or systems-level analyses and choices in the transportation planning process help to form the purpose and need statement for a NEPA document, such planning products should be given great weight by FHWA and FTA, consistent with Congressional and Court direction to respect local sovereignty in planning. This approach is also consistent with a letter to Secretary Mineta dated May 12, 2003, from James Connaughton, Chairman of CEQ, on purpose and need statements in NEPA documents:

"Federal courts generally have been deferential in their review of a lead agency's 'purpose and need' statements, absent a finding that an agency acted in an arbitrary or capricious manner. They have recognized that federal agencies should respect the role of local and state authorities in the transportation planning process and appropriately reflect the results of that process in the federal agency's NEPA analysis of purpose and need [citing to *North Buckhead*]."

Further, in his letter, the Chairman states that, even though other Federal agencies must be provided an opportunity to comment, they "should afford substantial deference to the transportation agency's articulation of purpose and need when the proposal is a transportation project."[17](#)

Therefore, if transportation planning studies and conclusions have properly followed the transportation planning process, then they can be incorporated into the purpose and need statement and, further, can be used to help draw bounds around alternatives that need to be considered in detail. For example, if systems-level or other broad objectives or choices[18](#) from the transportation plan are incorporated into the purpose and need statement used in a NEPA document, FHWA and FTA should not revisit whether these are the best objectives or choices among other options. Rather, their review would include making sure that objectives or choices derived from the transportation plan were based on transportation planning factors established by federal law; reflect a credible and articulated planning rationale; are founded on reliable data; and were developed through a transportation planning process meeting FHWA and FTA statutory and regulatory requirements. In addition, the basis for the objectives and choices must be documented and included in the NEPA document. In such cases, alternatives falling outside a purpose and need statement derived from objectives or choices identified in the planning process do not need to be considered in detail.

*FHWA and FTA should independently review regional analyses or studies of transportation needs conducted during the transportation planning process at a similar level. FHWA and FTA reviewers do not need to review whether assumptions or analytical methods used in the studies are the best available, but, instead, need to assure that such assumptions or analytical methods are reasonable and scientifically acceptable. This review would include determining whether assumptions have a rational basis and are up-to-date and data, analytical methods, and modeling techniques are reliable, defensible, and reasonably current. This approach preserves the sovereignty of*



*state and local governments in making local planning decisions but in a way that is consistent with the principles and procedures of NEPA.*

Nonetheless, additional scrutiny may be required if the results of the planning process are more specific than needed for regional or systems-level planning. Such results might actually be part of project development, which is outside of the planning jurisdiction of local agencies. Project development often involves a Federal action and therefore would be subject to NEPA. See 23 U.S.C. 134(o) and 135(i). In addition, the information the Federal agencies rely upon in the NEPA process based on underlying transportation planning work cannot be inaccurate, false or misleading. See *Sierra Club v. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers*, 701 F. 2d 1011, 1035 (where the court required a supplementation or re-evaluation of the NEPA analyses and documentation where the Corps unquestioningly relied on inaccurate information and did not investigate, on its own, the accuracy of the fisheries data submitted to it to support a permit for a landfill in the Hudson river to accommodate the Westway highway project.)

In conducting reviews under NEPA, Federal agencies should defer to planning products incorporated into the NEPA process to the extent that they involve decisions or analysis within the jurisdiction of the local planning agency. The focus of the Federal agency's review should be whether the planning information is adequate to meet the standards of NEPA, not whether the decisions made by the planning authority are correct. This would be consistent with the specific roles assigned by Congress to local and Federal authorities and consistent with court decisions admonishing Federal agencies to respect the sovereignty of local authorities in developing local plans.

## **VI. Conclusion**

This memorandum provides guidance on how transportation planning level information and products may be used to focus the documentation prepared to comply with NEPA when Federal approvals are needed to build a transportation project. Federal law and regulations and best practices ensure that much information that is relevant to the NEPA process is in fact developed during the planning process. Both Federal transportation law and NEPA law strongly suggest that to the extent practicable, the NEPA process should use and build on the decision made and information developed during the planning process. Of course, where the transportation planning process fails to address or document issues, the NEPA analyses and documentation may have to supplement the information developed during the planning process.

Original signed by D.J. Gribbin and Judith S. Kaleta

---

<sup>1</sup> Protection of the environment is reinforced in the FHWA and FTA regulations clarifying the factors to be considered in the transportation planning process (e.g., States and MPOs must analyze the "overall social, economic, energy and environmental effects of transportation decisions. . . 23 CFR 450.208 and 450.316.

<sup>2</sup> As stated in the planning provisions of Title 23, "any decision by the Secretary concerning a plan or program described in this section shall not be considered to be a Federal action subject to review under NEPA. 23 U.S.C. 134(o); see also 23 U.S.C. 135(i). These provisions are discussed more fully in Section V of this memorandum.

<sup>3</sup> Note, however, an alternative is not "speculative or "unreasonable merely because it is outside the jurisdiction of the proposing agency. 40 C.F.R. 1402.14 (c). In some cases, an agency might be required to consider an alternative outside its jurisdiction. For example, in *Muckleshoot Indian Tribe v. United States Forest Service*, 177 F.3d 800 (9th Cir. 1999), the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals found that the lack of funds for an alternative was not sufficient to render it "speculative when the Forest Service could have at least made a request for additional funding. The facts in the *Muckleshoot* case are different than the *Utahns* case, where the local agencies had clearly declined to exercise the alternative.

<sup>4</sup> Corridor-level "Major Investment Studies were for a time required under FTA and FHWA's planning regulations where a need for a major metropolitan transportation investment was identified and Federal funds were potentially involved. Major investment studies were intended to refine the system-wide transportation plan and lead to decisions on the design concept and scope of the project, in consultation with other interested agencies. In addition, they were intended to be used as input to EISs and EAs. 23 C.F.R. 450.318. In Section 1308 of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century, the Secretary was directed to eliminate the separate requirement for major investment studies and instead to integrate it with the planning analyses required under the FTA and FHWA planning statutes "as part of the analyses required to be undertaken pursuant to the planning provisions of Title 23, United States Code and Chapter 53 of Title 49, United States Code, and the National Environmental Policy Act of 1959 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) for Federal-aid highway and transit projects.. Pub.. 105-178 (June 9, 1998). Although no longer required, "major investment studies continue to be allowed at the discretion of the State or local agency.

It is telling, however, that a good many State and local agencies continue to prepare "major investment studies (and similar corridor and sub-area analyses) on their own volition, because they have found it very valuable to vet the merits and weaknesses of various alternatives—both modal and alignment—before they even initiate the NEPA analyses and documentation. Moreover, FTA requires Metropolitan Planning Organizations and/or transit agencies contemplating major capital investment ("new starts) projects to prepare a planning-level corridor study, know as an "Alternatives Analysis, either before or during a Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the purpose of narrowing the range of alternatives for study in a subsequent NEPA analysis and document(s) by eliminating some alternatives from further detailed study. See also footnote 10.

<sup>5</sup> Plaintiffs have appealed this decision, and the Ninth Circuit has stayed further construction on the project pending the outcome of the appeal. *Order Granting Stay*, Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals, No. CV-02-00578-PMP (July 27, 2004).

<sup>6</sup> Documents may be incorporated by reference if they do not impede agency or public review of the action. Any document incorporated by reference must be "reasonably available for inspection by potentially interested persons within the time allowed for comment. Incorporated materials must be cited in the NEPA document and their contents briefly described. 40 C.F.R. 1502.21.

<sup>7</sup> 40 C.F.R. 1502.14 The term "alternatives is also used in many other contexts (for example, "prudent and feasible alternatives under Section 4(f) of the Department of

Transportation Act, the "Least Environmentally Damaging Practicable Alternative under the Clean Water Act, or the "Alternatives Analysis under FTA's New Starts program). This memorandum only uses the term as defined under NEPA. At the planning stage of any project, however, a determination should be made as to whether the alternatives to be considered will need to be used to satisfy multiple requirements at the planning and NEPA review stages. If so, during planning the alternatives chosen for consideration and the analysis of those alternatives should reflect the multiple statutory objectives that must be addressed.

8 In some cases, an alternative may be reasonable even if it just partially satisfies the purpose and need. See *NRDC v. Morton*, 458 F.2d 827, 836 (C.A.D.C. 1972).

9 Under the requirements for FTA's New Starts Program, however, under the appropriate circumstances, reasonable alternatives may be eliminated from detailed study during a rigorous planning-level Alternatives Analysis (including an evaluation of environmental consequences) conducted before the issuance of a NEPA Notice of Intent to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement. This is discussed later in this section.

10 FTA offers applicant sponsors the opportunity to conduct the Alternatives Analysis before NEPA begins or alternatively, to conduct the Alternatives Analysis concurrently with the NEPA DEIS.

11 Specifically, the FHWA/FTA transportation planning regulations (23 C.F.R. Part 450 and 49 C.F.R. Part 613) require inclusion of the overall social, economic, energy and environmental effects of transportation decisions (including consideration of the effects and impacts of the plan on human, natural and man-made environment such as housing, employment and community development, consultation with appropriate resource and permit agencies to ensure early and continued coordination with environmental resource protection and management plans, and appropriate emphasis on transportation-related air quality problems). 23 C.F.R. 450.316(a)(13).

12 Nonetheless, a cooperating agency may, in response to a lead agency's request for assistance in preparing an EIS, reply that other program commitments preclude any involvement or the degree of involvement requested in the action that is subject to the EIS. 40 C.F.R. 1501.6(c).

13 For example, NEPA applies to the general management plans prepared and approved by the National Park Service for each unit of the National Park System (Chapter 2, "Management Policies, at [www.nps.gov/policy/mp/chapter2.htm](http://www.nps.gov/policy/mp/chapter2.htm)), and applies to resource management plans prepared and approved by the Bureau of Land Management to maximize resource values of federal lands and resources (43 C.F.R. 1601.0-6).

14 Of course, the reliance on the underlying local plan does not excuse the analysis of the impacts of the project within the context of that plan. Cf. *Sierra Club Illinois Chapter v. U.S. Department of Transportation*, 962 F. 2d 1037, 1042 (N.D. Ill. 1997).

15 In this case, plaintiffs challenged the Federal Aviation Administration's EIS on an application by the Toledo Port Authority for a cargo hub in Toledo. Plaintiffs alleged that the FAA should have considered alternatives outside of Toledo. The Court disagreed,

finding that Congress had made clear that the location of cargo hubs was to be made by local authorities and not by the Federal government, stating: "Where the Federal government acts, not as a proprietor, but to approve and support a project being sponsored by a local government or private applicant, the Federal agency is necessarily more limited. In the latter instance, the Federal government's consideration of alternatives may accord substantial weight to the preferences of the applicant and/or sponsor in the siting and design of the project. 938 F.2d at 197.

[16](#) This would not constrain the Environmental Protection Agency's authority under Section 309 of the Clean Air Act to refer concerns to the President's Council on Environmental Quality regarding impacts on public health or welfare or environmental quality. 42 U.S.C. 7609.

[17](#) See, also, *Citizens Against Burlington, Inc. v. Busey, id.*, At 938 F.2d 190, 195-96 (C.A.D.C. 1991), stating "When an agency is asked to sanction a specific plan, see 40 C.F.R. § 1508.18(b)(4), the agency should take into account the needs and goals of the parties involved in the application. [Citations omitted]; *Louisiana Wildlife Federation, Inc. v. York*, 761 F.2d 1044 (5th Cir. 1985), stating "Under [the Corps'] Guidelines, therefore, not only is it permissible for the Corps to consider the applicant's objective; the Corps has a duty to take into account the objectives of the applicant's project. Indeed, it would be bizarre if the Corps were to ignore the purpose for which the applicant seeks a permit and to substitute a purpose it deems more suitable.

[18](#) Examples of such planning objectives or choices that courts have accepted for use in the purpose and need statement for a NEPA document are (1) the need for a multi-lane highway connecting two other highways (*North Buckhead Civic Association v. Skinner*, 903 F.2d at 1537) and (2) the need for a particular level of service (*Carmel-by-the-Sea v. U.S. DOT*, 123 F.3d at 1156). In *Atlanta Coalition on the Transportation Crisis v. Atlanta Regional Commission*, the court discusses the distinction between "systems planning and "project planning, and describes the Atlanta "systems plan as "an analysis of projected regional transportation needs through the year 2000 [identifying] the general location and the mode (i.e., highway or mass transit) of recommended transportation corridors to meet those needs. 599 F.2d at fn.2 and at 1341

Page Left Intentionally Blank

## **Appendix F**

### **MPO Air Quality Conformity Checklist**

Page Left Intentionally Blank

# Conformity Analysis Documentation

## Checklist for MPO TIPs/RTPs

<b>40 CFR</b>	<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Page</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<a href="#">§93.102</a>	Document the applicable pollutants and precursors for which EPA designates the area as nonattainment or maintenance. Describe the nonattainment or maintenance area and its boundaries.		
<a href="#">§93.104 (b, c)</a>	Document the date that the MPO officially adopted, accepted or approved the TIP/RTP and made a conformity determination. Include a copy of the MPO resolution. Include the date of the last prior conformity finding.		
<a href="#">§93.104 (e)</a>	If the conformity determination is being made to meet the timelines included in this section, document when the new motor vehicle emissions budget was approved or found adequate.		
<a href="#">§93.106</a>	If the metropolitan planning area is in a serious, severe, or extreme ozone nonattainment area and/or serious carbon monoxide nonattainment area and contains an urbanized population over 200,000, then RTP must specifically describe the transportation system envisioned for future years called "horizon years."		
<a href="#">§93.106 (a)(2)ii</a>	Describe the regionally significant additions or modifications to the existing transportation network that are expected to be open to traffic in each analysis year. Document that the design concept and scope of projects allows adequate model representation to determine intersections with regionally significant facilities, route options, travel times, transit ridership and land use.		
<a href="#">§93.108</a>	Document the TIP/RTP is fiscally constrained consistent with DOT's metropolitan planning regulations at <a href="#">(23 CFR 450)</a> in order to be found in conformity.		
<a href="#">§93.109 (a, b)</a>	Document that the TIP/RTP complies with any applicable conformity requirements of air quality implementation plans (SIPs) and court orders.		
<a href="#">§93.109 (c-k)</a>	Provide either a table or text description that details, for each pollutant and precursor, whether the interim emissions tests and/or the budget test apply for conformity. Indicate which emissions budgets have been found adequate by EPA, and which budgets are currently applicable for what analysis years.		
<a href="#">§93.110 (a, b)</a>	Document the use of latest planning assumptions (source and year) at the "time the conformity analysis begins," including current and future population, employment, travel and congestion. Document the use of the most recent available vehicle registration data. Document the date upon which the conformity analysis was begun.		
<b>USDOT/EPA guidance</b>	Documents planning assumptions are less than 5 years old at the time the conformity analysis begins. If assumptions are older than 5 years documents justification for not reviewing and updating assumptions at least every 5 years.		
<a href="#">§93.110 (c,d,e,f)</a>	Document any changes in transit operating policies and assumed ridership levels since the previous conformity determination. Document the use of the latest transit fares and road and bridge tolls. Document the use of the latest information on the effectiveness of TCMs and other SIP measures that have been implemented. Document the key assumptions and show that they were agreed to through Interagency and public consultation.		
<a href="#">§93.111</a>	Document the use of the latest emissions model approved by EPA.		



<b>40 CFR</b>	<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Page</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<a href="#">§93.112</a>	Document fulfillment of the interagency and public consultation requirements outlined in a specific implementation plan according to <a href="#">§51.390</a> or, if a SIP revision has not been completed, according to <a href="#">§93.105</a> and <a href="#">23 CFR 450</a> . Include documentation of consultation on conformity tests and methodologies as well as responses to written comments.		
<a href="#">§93.113</a>	Document timely implementation of all TCMs in approved SIPs. Document that implementation is consistent with schedules in the applicable SIP and document whether anything interferes with timely implementation. Document any delayed TCMs in the applicable SIP and describe the measures being taken to overcome obstacles to implementation.		
<a href="#">§93.114</a>	Document that the conformity analyses performed for the TIP is consistent with the analysis performed for the Plan, in accordance with <a href="#">23 CFR 450.324(f)(2)</a> .		
<a href="#">§93.115</a>	Describe how the projects come from a conforming RTP and TIP. If this criterion is not satisfied, the project must satisfy all criteria in Table 1 of <a href="#">§93.109(b)</a> for a project not from a RTP and TIP.		
<a href="#">§93.118 (a, c, e)</a>	<u>For areas with SIP budgets:</u> Document that emissions from the transportation network for each applicable pollutant and precursor, including projects in any associated donut area that are in the Statewide TIP and regionally significant non-Federal projects, are consistent with any adequate or approved motor vehicle emissions budget for all pollutants and precursors in applicable SIPs.		
<a href="#">§93.118 (b)</a>	Document for which years consistency with motor vehicle emissions budgets must be shown.		
<a href="#">§93.118 (d)</a>	Document the use of the appropriate analysis years in the regional emissions analysis for areas with SIP budgets, and the analysis results for these years. Document any interpolation performed to meet tests for years in which specific analysis is not required.		
<a href="#">§93.119</a> <sup>1</sup>	<u>For areas without applicable SIP budgets:</u> Document that emissions from the transportation network for each applicable pollutant and precursor, including projects in any associated donut area that are in the Statewide TIP and regionally significant non-Federal projects, are consistent with the requirements of the “Action/Baseline”, “Action/1990” and/or “Action/2002” interim emissions tests as applicable.		
<a href="#">§93.119 (g)</a>	Document the use of the appropriate analysis years in the regional emissions analysis for areas without applicable SIP budgets. The regional emissions analysis must be performed for analysis years that are no more than ten years apart. The first analysis year must be no more than five years beyond the year in which the conformity determination is being made. The last year of the timeframe of the conformity determination (as described under <a href="#">§93.106(d)</a> ) must also be an analysis year.		
<a href="#">§93.119 (h,i)</a>	Document how the baseline and action scenarios are defined for each analysis year.		
<a href="#">§93.122 (a)(1)</a>	Document that all regionally significant federal and non-Federal projects in the nonattainment/maintenance area are explicitly modeled in the regional emissions analysis. For each project, identify by which analysis it will be open to traffic. Document that VMT for non-regionally significant Federal projects is accounted for in the regional emissions analysis		

<b>40 CFR</b>	<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Page</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<a href="#">§93.122(a)(2, 3)</a>	Document that only emission reduction credits from TCMs on schedule have been included or that partial credit has been taken for partially implemented TCMs. Document that the regional emissions analysis only includes emissions credit for projects, programs, or activities that require regulatory action if: the regulatory action has been adopted; the project, program, activity or a written commitment is included in the SIP; EPA has approved an opt-in to the program, EPA has promulgated the program, or the Clean Air Act requires the program (indicate applicable date). Discuss the implementation status of these programs and the associated emissions credit for each analysis year.		
<a href="#">§93.122(a)(4,5,6)</a>	For nonregulatory measures that are not included in the STIP, include written commitments from appropriate agencies. Document that assumptions for measures outside the transportation system (e.g. fuels measures) are the same for baseline and action scenarios. Document that factors such as ambient temperature are consistent with those used in the SIP unless modified through interagency consultation.		
<a href="#">§93.122(b)(1)(i)</a> <sup>2</sup>	Document that a network-based travel model is in use that is validated against observed counts for a base year no more than 10 years before the date of the conformity determination. Document that the model results have been analyzed for reasonableness and compared to historical trends and explain any significant differences between past trends and forecasts (for per capita vehicle-trips, VMT, trip lengths mode shares, time of day, etc.).		
<a href="#">§93.122(b)(1)(ii)</a> <sup>2</sup>	Document the land use, population, employment, and other network-based travel model assumptions.		
<a href="#">§93.122(b)(1)(iii)</a> <sup>2</sup>	Document how land use development scenarios are consistent with future transportation system alternatives, and the reasonable distribution of employment and residences for each alternative.		
<a href="#">§93.122(b)(1)(iv)</a> <sup>2</sup>	Document use of capacity sensitive assignment methodology and emissions estimates based on a methodology that differentiates between peak and off-peak volumes and speeds, and bases speeds on final assigned volumes.		
<a href="#">§93.122(b)(1)(v)</a> <sup>2</sup>	Document the use of zone-to-zone travel impedances to distribute trips in reasonable agreement with the travel times estimated from final assigned traffic volumes. Where transit is a significant factor, document that zone-to-zone travel impedances used to distribute trips are used to model mode split.		
<a href="#">§93.122(b)(1)(vi)</a> <sup>2</sup>	Document how travel models are reasonably sensitive to changes in time, cost, and other factors affecting travel choices.		
<a href="#">§93.122(b)(2)</a> <sup>2</sup>	Document that reasonable methods were used to estimate traffic speeds and delays in a manner sensitive to the estimated volume of travel on each roadway segment represented in the travel model.		
<a href="#">§93.122(b)(3)</a> <sup>2</sup>	Document the use of HPMS, or a locally developed count-based program or procedures that have been chosen through the consultation process, to reconcile and calibrate the network-based travel model estimates of VMT.		
<a href="#">§93.122(d)</a>	In areas not subject to <a href="#">§93.122(b)</a> , document the continued use of modeling techniques or the use of appropriate alternative techniques to estimate vehicle miles traveled		
<a href="#">§93.122(e, f)</a>	Document, in areas where a SIP identifies construction-related PM10 or PM 2.5 as significant pollutants, the inclusion of PM10 and/or PM 2.5 construction emissions in the conformity analysis.		
<a href="#">§93.122(g)</a>	If appropriate, document that the conformity determination relies on a previous regional emissions analysis and is consistent with that analysis.		

<b>40 CFR</b>	<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Page</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<a href="#">§93.126</a> , <a href="#">§93.127</a> , <a href="#">§93.128</a>	Document all projects in the TIP/RTP that are exempt from conformity requirements or exempt from the regional emissions analysis. Indicate the reason for the exemption (Table 2, Table 3, traffic signal synchronization) and that the interagency consultation process found these projects to have no potentially adverse emissions impacts.		

<sup>1</sup> Note that some areas are required to complete both interim emissions tests.

<sup>2</sup> 40 CFR 93.122(b) refers only to serious, severe and extreme ozone areas and serious CO areas above 200,000 population

#### Disclaimers

This checklist is intended solely as an informational guideline to be used in reviewing Transportation Plans and Transportation Improvement Programs for adequacy of their conformity documentation. It is in no way intended to replace or supercede the Transportation Conformity regulations of 40 CFR Parts 51 and 93, the Statewide and Metropolitan Planning Regulations of 23 CFR Part 450 or any other EPA, FHWA or FTA guidance pertaining to transportation conformity or statewide and metropolitan planning. This checklist is not intended for use in documenting transportation conformity for individual transportation projects in nonattainment or maintenance areas. 40 CFR Parts 51 and 93 contain additional criteria for project-level conformity determinations.

## **Appendix G**

### **SB 375 and SB 575 STATUTORY LANGUAGE**

Page Left Intentionally Blank

**SB 375 Statutory Language (signed September 30, 2008)**  
**and**  
**SB 575 Statutory Language (signed October 11, 2009)**  
(these changes are shown in underlined text)

**Government Code Section 14522**

14522. In cooperation with the regional transportation planning agencies, the commission may prescribe study areas for analysis and evaluation by such agencies and guidelines for the preparation of the regional transportation plans.

**Government Code Section 14522.1**

**CTC Maintains RTP Guidelines**

14522.1. (a) (1) The commission, in consultation with the department and the State Air Resources Board, shall maintain guidelines for travel demand models used in the development of regional transportation plans by federally designated metropolitan planning organizations.

(2) Any revision of the guidelines shall include the formation of an advisory committee that shall include representatives of the metropolitan planning organizations, the department, organizations knowledgeable in the creation and use of travel demand models, local governments, and organizations concerned with the impacts of transportation investments on communities and the environment. Before amending the guidelines, the commission shall hold two workshops on the guidelines, one in northern California and one in southern California. The workshops shall be incorporated into regular commission meetings.

(b) The guidelines shall, at a minimum and to the extent practicable, taking into account such factors as the size and available resources of the metropolitan planning organization, account for all of the following:

(1) The relationship between land use density and household vehicle ownership and vehicle miles traveled in a way that is consistent with statistical research.

(2) The impact of enhanced transit service levels on household vehicle ownership and vehicle miles traveled.

(3) Changes in travel and land development likely to result from highway or passenger rail expansion.

(4) Mode splitting that allocates trips between automobile, transit, carpool, and bicycle and pedestrian trips. If a travel demand model is unable to forecast bicycle and pedestrian trips, another means may be used to estimate those trips.

(5) Speed and frequency, days, and hours of operation of transit service.

## **Government Code Section 14522.2**

### **Travel Demand Models**

14522.2. (a) A metropolitan planning organization shall disseminate the methodology, results, and key assumptions of whichever travel demand models it uses in a way that would be useable and understandable to the public.

(b) Transportation planning agencies other than those identified in paragraph (1) of subdivision (a) of Section 14522.1, cities, and counties are encouraged, but not required, to utilize travel demand models that are consistent with the guidelines in the development of their regional transportation plans.

## **Government Code Section 65080**

### **RTP Development**

65080. (a) Each transportation planning agency designated under Section 29532 or 29532.1 shall prepare and adopt a regional transportation plan directed at achieving a coordinated and balanced regional transportation system, including, but not limited to, mass transportation, highway, railroad, maritime, bicycle, pedestrian, goods movement, and aviation facilities and services. The plan shall be action-oriented and pragmatic, considering both the short-term and long-term future, and shall present clear, concise policy guidance to local and state officials. The regional transportation plan shall consider factors specified in Section 134 of Title 23 of the United States Code. Each transportation planning agency shall consider and incorporate, as appropriate, the transportation plans of cities, counties, districts, private organizations, and state and federal agencies.

### **RTP Contents**

(b) The regional transportation plan shall be an internally consistent document and shall include all of the following:

(1) A policy element that describes the transportation issues in the region, identifies and quantifies regional needs, and describes the desired short-range and long-range transportation goals, and pragmatic objective and policy statements. The objective and policy statements shall be consistent with the funding estimates of the financial element. The policy element of transportation planning agencies with populations that exceed 200,000 persons may quantify a set of indicators including, but not limited to, all of the following:

(A) Measures of mobility and traffic congestion, including, but not limited to, daily vehicle hours of delay per capita and vehicle miles traveled per capita.

(B) Measures of road and bridge maintenance and rehabilitation needs, including, but not limited to, roadway pavement and bridge conditions.

(C) Measures of means of travel, including, but not limited to, percentage share of all trips (work and nonwork) made by all of the following:

(i) Single occupant vehicle.

(ii) Multiple occupant vehicle or carpool.

(iii) Public transit including commuter rail and intercity rail.

(iv) Walking.

(v) Bicycling.

(D) Measures of safety and security, including, but not limited to, total injuries and fatalities assigned to each of the modes set forth in subparagraph (C).

(E) Measures of equity and accessibility, including, but not limited to, percentage of the population served by frequent and reliable public transit, with a breakdown by income bracket, and percentage of all jobs accessible by frequent and reliable public transit service, with a breakdown by income bracket.

(F) The requirements of this section may be met utilizing existing sources of information. No additional traffic counts, household surveys, or other sources of data shall be required.

### **ARB Develops Regional Greenhouse Gas Emission Targets**

(2) A sustainable communities strategy prepared by each metropolitan planning organization as follows:

(A) No later than September 30, 2010, the State Air Resources Board shall provide each affected region with greenhouse gas emission reduction targets for the automobile and light truck sector for 2020 and 2035, respectively.

### **Role of the Regional Targets Advisory Committee**

(i) No later than January 31, 2009, the state board shall appoint a Regional Targets Advisory Committee to recommend factors to be considered and methodologies to be used for setting greenhouse gas emission reduction targets for the affected regions. The committee shall be composed of representatives of the metropolitan planning organizations, 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, planning organizations, environmental justice organizations, affordable housing organizations, and others. The advisory committee shall transmit a report with its recommendations to the state board no later than September 30, 2009. In recommending factors to be considered and methodologies to be used, the advisory committee may consider any relevant issues, including, but not limited to, data needs, modeling techniques, growth forecasts, the impacts of regional jobs-housing balance on interregional travel and greenhouse gas emissions, economic and demographic trends, the magnitude of greenhouse gas reduction benefits from a variety of land use and transportation strategies, and appropriate methods to describe regional targets and to monitor performance in attaining those targets. The state board shall consider the report prior to setting the targets.

(ii) Prior to setting the targets for a region, the state board shall exchange technical information with the metropolitan planning organization and the affected air district. The metropolitan planning organization may recommend a target for the region. The metropolitan planning organization shall hold at least one public workshop within the region after receipt of the report from the advisory committee. The state board shall release draft targets for each region no later than June 30, 2010.

(iii) In establishing these targets, the state board shall take into account greenhouse gas emission reductions that will be achieved by improved vehicle emission standards, changes in fuel composition, and other measures it has approved that will reduce greenhouse gas emissions in the affected regions, and prospective measures the state board plans to adopt to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from other greenhouse gas



emission sources as that term is defined in subdivision (i) of Section 38505 of the Health and Safety Code and consistent with the regulations promulgated pursuant to the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 (Division 12.5(commencing with Section 38500) of the Health and Safety Code).

(iv) The state board shall update the regional greenhouse gas emission reduction targets every eight years consistent with each metropolitan planning organization's timeframe for updating its regional transportation plan under federal law until 2050. The state board may revise the targets every four years based on changes in the factors considered under clause (iii) above. The state board shall exchange technical information with the Department of Transportation, metropolitan planning organizations, local governments, and affected air districts and engage in a consultative process with public and private stakeholders prior to updating these targets.

(v) The greenhouse gas emission reduction targets may be expressed in gross tons, tons per capita, tons per household, or in any other metric deemed appropriate by the state board.

### **Preparation of the SCS**

(B) Each metropolitan planning organization shall prepare a sustainable communities strategy, subject to the requirements of Part 450 of Title 23 of, and Part 93 of Title 40 of, the Code of Federal Regulations, including the requirement to utilize the most recent planning assumptions considering local general plans and other factors. The sustainable communities strategy shall (i) identify the general location of uses, residential densities, and building intensities within the region; (ii) identify areas within the region sufficient to house all the population of the region, including all economic segments of the population, over the course of the planning period of the regional transportation plan taking into account net migration into the region, population growth, household formation and employment growth; (iii) identify areas within the region sufficient to house an eight-year projection of the regional housing need for the region pursuant to Section 65584; (iv) identify a transportation network to service the transportation needs of the region; (v) gather and consider the best practically available scientific information regarding resource areas and farmland in the region as defined in subdivisions (a) and (b) of Section 65080.01; (vi) consider the state housing goals specified in Sections 65580 and 65581; (vii) set forth a forecasted development pattern for the region, which, when integrated with the transportation network, and other transportation measures and policies, will reduce the greenhouse gas emissions from automobiles and light trucks to achieve, if there is a feasible way to do so, the greenhouse gas emission reduction targets approved by the state board; and (viii) allow the regional transportation plan to comply with Section 176 of the federal Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. Sec. 7506).

### **Role of ABAG in the San Francisco Bay Area**

(C)(i) Within the jurisdiction of the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, as defined by Section 66502, the Association of Bay Area Governments shall be responsible for clauses (i), (ii), (iii), (v), and (vi), the Metropolitan Transportation Commission shall be responsible for clauses (iv) and (viii); and the Association of Bay Area Governments and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission shall jointly be responsible for clause (vii) of subparagraph (B).

### **Use of Regional Plan for the Lake Tahoe Region**

(ii) Within the jurisdiction of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency, as defined in Sections 66800 and 66801, the Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization shall use the Regional Plan for the Lake Tahoe Region as the sustainable community strategy, provided it complies with clauses (vii) and (viii) of subparagraph (B).

### **Role of Subregions in the Development of an SCS**

(D) In the region served by the multicounty transportation planning agency described in Section 130004 of the Public Utilities Code, a subregional council of governments and the county transportation commission may work together to propose the sustainable communities strategy and an alternative planning strategy, if one is prepared pursuant to subparagraph (I), for that subregional area. The metropolitan planning organization may adopt a framework for a subregional sustainable communities strategy or a subregional alternative planning strategy to address the intraregional land use, transportation, economic, air quality, and climate policy relationships. The metropolitan planning organization shall include the subregional sustainable communities strategy for that subregion in the regional sustainable communities strategy to the extent consistent with this section and federal law and approve the subregional alternative planning strategy, if one is prepared pursuant to subparagraph (I), for that subregional area to the extent consistent with this section. The metropolitan planning organization shall develop overall guidelines, create public participation plans pursuant to subparagraph (F), ensure coordination, resolve conflicts, make sure that the overall plan complies with applicable legal requirements, and adopt the plan for the region.

### **MPO Consults with Local Elected Officials**

(E) The metropolitan planning organization shall conduct at least two informational meetings in each county within the region for members of the board of supervisors and city councils on the sustainable communities strategy and alternative planning strategy, if any. The metropolitan planning organization may conduct only one informational meeting if it is attended by representatives of the county board of supervisors and city council members representing a majority of the cities representing a majority of the population in the incorporated areas of that county. Notice of the meeting or meetings shall be sent to the clerk of the board of supervisors and to each city clerk. The purpose of the meeting or meetings shall be to discuss the sustainable communities strategy and the alternative planning strategy, if any, including the key land use and planning assumptions to the members of the board of supervisors and the city council members in that county and to solicit and consider their input and recommendations.

### **SCS Public Participation Plan and Public Input**

(F) Each metropolitan planning organization shall adopt a public participation plan, for development of the sustainable communities strategy and an alternative planning strategy, if any, that includes all of the following:

(i) Outreach efforts to encourage the active participation of a broad range of stakeholder groups in the planning process, consistent with the agency's adopted Federal Public Participation Plan, including, but not limited to, affordable housing advocates,

transportation advocates, neighborhood and community groups, environmental advocates, home builder representatives, broad-based business organizations, landowners, commercial property interests, and homeowner associations.

(ii) Consultation with congestion management agencies, transportation agencies, and transportation commissions.

(iii) Workshops throughout the region to provide the public with the information and tools necessary to provide a clear understanding of the issues and policy choices. At least one workshop shall be held in each county in the region. For counties with a population greater than 500,000, at least three workshops shall be held. Each workshop, to the extent practicable, shall include urban simulation computer modeling to create visual representations of the sustainable communities strategy and the alternative planning strategy.

(iv) Preparation and circulation of a draft sustainable communities strategy and an alternative planning strategy, if one is prepared, not less than 55 days before adoption of a final regional transportation plan.

(v) At least three public hearings on the draft sustainable communities strategy in the regional transportation plan and alternative planning strategy, if one is prepared. If the metropolitan transportation organization consists of a single county, at least two public hearings shall be held. To the maximum extent feasible, the hearings shall be in different parts of the region to maximize the opportunity for participation by members of the public throughout the region.

(vi) A process for enabling members of the public to provide a single request to receive notices, information, and updates.

### **SCS – Spheres of Influence**

(G) In preparing a sustainable communities strategy, the metropolitan planning organization shall consider spheres of influence that have been adopted by the local agency formation commissions within its region.

### **Comparing SCS Reductions to ARB Targets**

(H) Prior to adopting a sustainable communities strategy, the metropolitan planning organization shall quantify the reduction in greenhouse gas emissions projected to be achieved by the sustainable communities strategy and set forth the difference, if any, between the amount of that reduction and the target for the region established by the state board.

### **APS Development**

(I) If the sustainable communities strategy, prepared in compliance with subparagraph (B) or (D), is unable to reduce greenhouse gas emissions to achieve the greenhouse gas emission reduction targets established by the state board, the metropolitan planning organization shall prepare an alternative planning strategy to the sustainable communities strategy showing how those greenhouse gas emission targets would be achieved through alternative development patterns, infrastructure, or additional transportation measures or policies. The alternative planning strategy shall be a separate document from the regional transportation plan, but it may be adopted concurrently with the regional transportation

plan. In preparing the alternative planning strategy, the metropolitan planning organization:

(i) Shall identify the principal impediments to achieving the targets within the sustainable communities strategy.

(ii) May include an alternative development pattern for the region pursuant to subparagraphs (B) to (G), inclusive.

(iii) Shall describe how the greenhouse gas emission reduction targets would be achieved by the alternative planning strategy, and why the development pattern, measures, and policies in the alternative planning strategy are the most practicable choices for achievement of the greenhouse gas emission reduction targets.

(iv) An alternative development pattern set forth in the alternative planning strategy shall comply with Part 450 of Title 23 of, and Part 93 of Title 40 of, the Code of Federal Regulations, except to the extent that compliance will prevent achievement of the greenhouse gas emission reduction targets approved by the state board.

(v) For purposes of the California Environmental Quality Act (Division 13 commencing with Section 21000) of the Public Resources Code, an alternative planning strategy shall not constitute a land use plan, policy, or regulation, and the inconsistency of a project with an alternative planning strategy shall not be a consideration in determining whether a project may have an environmental effect.

#### **MPOs Technical Methodology for Estimating Its Regional GHG Emissions**

(J) (i) Prior to starting the public participation process adopted pursuant to subparagraph (F) of paragraph (2) of subdivision (b) of Section 65080, the metropolitan planning organization shall submit a description to the state board of the technical methodology it intends to use to estimate the greenhouse gas emissions from its sustainable communities strategy and, if appropriate, its alternative planning strategy. The state board shall respond to the metropolitan planning organization in a timely manner with written comments about the technical methodology, including specifically describing any aspects of that methodology it concludes will not yield accurate estimates of greenhouse gas emissions, and suggested remedies. The metropolitan planning organization is encouraged to work with the state board until the state board concludes that the technical methodology operates accurately.

#### **ARB Review of the SCS or APS**

(ii) After adoption, a metropolitan planning organization shall submit a sustainable communities strategy or an alternative planning strategy, if one has been adopted, to the state board for review, including the quantification of the greenhouse gas emission reductions the strategy would achieve and a description of the technical methodology used to obtain that result. Review by the state board shall be limited to acceptance or rejection of the metropolitan planning organization's determination that the strategy submitted would, if implemented, achieve the greenhouse gas emission reduction targets established by the state board. The state board shall complete its review within 60 days.

(iii) If the state board determines that the strategy submitted would not, if implemented, achieve the greenhouse gas emission reduction targets, the metropolitan planning organization shall revise its strategy or adopt an alternative planning strategy, if not previously adopted, and submit the strategy for review pursuant to clause (ii). At a

minimum, the metropolitan planning organization must obtain state board acceptance that an alternative planning strategy would, if implemented, achieve the greenhouse gas emission reduction targets established for that region by the state board.

### **Local Land Use Authority**

(K) Neither a sustainable communities strategy nor an alternative planning strategy regulates the use of land, nor, except as provided by subparagraph (I), shall either one be subject to any state approval. Nothing in a sustainable communities strategy shall be interpreted as superseding the exercise of the land use authority of cities and counties within the region. Nothing in this section shall be interpreted to limit the state board's authority under any other provision of law. Nothing in this section shall be interpreted to authorize the abrogation of any vested right whether created by statute or by common law. Nothing in this section shall require a city's or county's land use policies and regulations, including its general plan, to be consistent with the regional transportation plan or an alternative planning strategy. Nothing in this section requires a metropolitan planning organization to approve a sustainable communities strategy that would be inconsistent with Part 450 of Title 23 of, or Part 93 of Title 40 of, the Code of Federal Regulations and any administrative guidance under those regulations. Nothing in this section relieves a public or private entity or any person from compliance with any other local, state, or federal law.

### **Exemption of Transportation Projects - Programming**

(L) Nothing in this section requires projects programmed for funding on or before December 31, 2011, to be subject to the provisions of this paragraph if they (i) are contained in the 2007 or 2009 Federal Statewide Transportation Improvement Program, (ii) are funded pursuant to Chapter 12.49 (commencing with Section 8879.20) of Division 1 of Title 2, or (iii) were specifically listed in a ballot measure prior to December 31, 2008, approving a sales tax increase for transportation projects. Nothing in this section shall require a transportation sales tax authority to change the funding allocations approved by the voters for categories of transportation projects in a sales tax measure adopted prior to December 31, 2010. For purposes of this subparagraph, a transportation sales tax authority is a district, as defined in Section 7252 of the Revenue and Taxation Code, that is authorized to impose a sales tax for transportation purposes.

### **Adoption of RTPs**

(M) A metropolitan planning organization, or a regional transportation planning agency not within a metropolitan planning organization, that is required to adopt a regional transportation plan not less than every five years, may elect to adopt the plan not less than every four years. This election shall be made by the board of directors of the metropolitan planning organization or regional transportation planning agency no later than June 1, 2009, or thereafter 54 months prior to the statutory deadline for the adoption of housing elements for the local jurisdictions within the region, after a public hearing at which comments are accepted from members of the public and representatives of cities and counties within the region covered by the metropolitan planning organization or regional transportation planning agency. Notice of the public hearing shall be given to the general public and by mail to cities and counties within the region no later than 30 days prior to

the date of the public hearing. Notice of election shall be promptly given to the Department of Housing and Community Development. The metropolitan planning organization or the regional transportation planning agency shall complete its next regional transportation plan within three years of the notice of election.

### **San Joaquin Valley – SCS/APS**

(N) Two or more of the metropolitan planning organizations for Fresno County, Kern County, Kings County, Madera County, Merced County, San Joaquin County, Stanislaus County, and Tulare County may work together to develop and adopt multiregional goals and policies that may address interregional land use, transportation, economic, air quality, and climate relationships. The participating metropolitan planning organizations may also develop a multiregional sustainable communities strategy, to the extent consistent with federal law, or an alternative planning strategy for adoption by the metropolitan planning organizations. Each participating metropolitan planning organization shall consider any adopted multiregional goals and policies in the development of a sustainable communities strategy and, if applicable, an alternative planning strategy for its region.

### **RTPs Action Element**

(3) An action element that describes the programs and actions necessary to implement the plan and assigns implementation responsibilities. The action element may describe all transportation projects proposed for development during the 20-year or greater life of the plan. The action element shall consider congestion management programming activities carried out within the region.

### **RTPs Financial Element**

(4) (A) A financial element that summarizes the cost of plan implementation constrained by a realistic projection of available revenues. The financial element shall also contain recommendations for allocation of funds. A county transportation commission created pursuant to Section 130000 of the Public Utilities Code shall be responsible for recommending projects to be funded with regional improvement funds, if the project is consistent with the regional transportation plan. The first five years of the financial element shall be based on the five-year estimate of funds developed pursuant to Section 14524. The financial element may recommend the development of specified new sources of revenue, consistent with the policy element and action element.

(B) The financial element of transportation planning agencies with populations that exceed 200,000 persons may include a project cost breakdown for all projects proposed for development during the 20-year life of the plan that includes total expenditures and related percentages of total expenditures for all of the following:

- (i) State highway expansion.
- (ii) State highway rehabilitation, maintenance, and operations.
- (iii) Local road and street expansion.
- (iv) Local road and street rehabilitation, maintenance, and operation.
- (v) Mass transit, commuter rail, and intercity rail expansion.
- (vi) Mass transit, commuter rail, and intercity rail rehabilitation, maintenance, and operations.
- (vii) Pedestrian and bicycle facilities.

- (viii) Environmental enhancements and mitigation.
- (ix) Research and planning.
- (x) Other categories.

### **Incentives to Cities and Counties to Comply for SB 375**

(C) The metropolitan planning organization or county transportation agency, whichever entity is appropriate, shall consider financial incentives for cities and counties that have resource areas or farmland, as defined in Section 65080.01, for the purposes of, for example, transportation investments for the preservation and safety of the city street or county road system and farm to market and interconnectivity transportation needs. The metropolitan planning organization or county transportation agency, whichever entity is appropriate, shall also consider financial assistance for counties to address countywide service responsibilities in counties that contribute towards the greenhouse gas emission reduction targets by implementing policies for growth to occur within their cities.

### **Other Factors of Local Significance**

(c) Each transportation planning agency may also include other factors of local significance as an element of the regional transportation plan, including, but not limited to, issues of mobility for specific sectors of the community, including, but not limited to, senior citizens.

### **RTP Adoption Dates and RTP Guidelines**

(d) Except as otherwise provided in this subdivision, each transportation planning agency shall adopt and submit, every four years, an updated regional transportation plan to the California Transportation Commission and the Department of Transportation. A transportation planning agency located in a federally designated air quality attainment area or that does not contain an urbanized area may at its option adopt and submit a regional transportation plan every five years. When applicable, the plan shall be consistent with federal planning and programming requirements and shall conform to the regional transportation plan guidelines adopted by the California Transportation Commission. Prior to adoption of the regional transportation plan, a public hearing shall be held after the giving of notice of the hearing by publication in the affected county or counties pursuant to Section 6061.

### **Definitions**

65080.01. The following definitions apply to terms used in Section 65080:

(a) "Resource areas" include (1) all publicly owned parks and open space; (2) open space or habitat areas protected by natural community conservation plans, habitat conservation plans, and other adopted natural resource protection plans; (3) habitat for species identified as candidate, fully protected, sensitive, or species of special status by local, state, or federal agencies or protected by the federal Endangered Species Act of 1973, the California Endangered Species Act, or the Native Plant Protection Act; (4) lands subject to conservation or agricultural easements for conservation or agricultural purposes by local governments, special districts, or nonprofit 501(c)(3) organizations, areas of the state designated by the State Mining and Geology Board as areas of statewide or regional significance pursuant to Section 2790 of the Public Resources Code, and

lands under Williamson Act contracts; (5) areas designated for open-space or agricultural uses in adopted open-space elements or agricultural elements of the local general plan or by local ordinance; (6) areas containing biological resources as described in Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines that may be significantly affected by the sustainable communities strategy or the alternative planning strategy; and (7) an area subject to flooding where a development project would not, at the time of development in the judgment of the agency, meet the requirements of the National Flood Insurance Program or where the area is subject to more protective provisions of state law or local ordinance.

(b) "Farmland" means farmland that is outside all existing city spheres of influence or city limits as of January 1, 2008, and is one of the following:

(1) Classified as prime or unique farmland or farmland of statewide importance.

(2) Farmland classified by a local agency in its general plan that meets or exceeds the standards for prime or unique farmland or farmland of statewide importance.

(c) "Feasible" means capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, legal, social, and technological factors.

(d) "Consistent" shall have the same meaning as that term is used in Section 134 of Title 23 of the United States Code.

(e) "Internally consistent" means that the contents of the elements of the regional transportation plan must be consistent with each other.

### **Redesignation of RTPAs**

65080.1. Once preparation of a regional transportation plan has been commenced by or on behalf of a designated transportation planning agency, the Secretary of the Business, Transportation and Housing Agency shall not designate a new transportation planning agency pursuant to Section 29532 for all or any part of the geographic area served by the originally designated agency unless he or she first determines that redesignation will not result in the loss to California of any substantial amounts of federal funds.

### **RTPs - California Coastal Trail**

65080.1. Each transportation planning agency designated under Section 29532 or 29532.1 whose jurisdiction includes a portion of the California Coastal Trail, or property designated for the trail, that is located within the coastal zone, as defined in Section 30103 of the Public Resources Code, shall coordinate with the State Coastal Conservancy, the California Coastal Commission, and the Department of Transportation regarding development of the California Coastal Trail, and each transportation planning agency shall include provisions for the California Coastal Trail in its regional plan, under Section 65080.

### **RTPs – Alternative Planning Scenario**

65080.3. (a) Each transportation planning agency with a population that exceeds 200,000 persons may prepare at least one "alternative planning scenario" for presentation to local officials, agency board members, and the public during the development of the triennial regional transportation plan and the hearing required under subdivision (c) of Section 65080.

(b) The alternative planning scenario shall accommodate the same amount of population growth as projected in the plan but shall be based on an alternative that



attempts to reduce the growth in traffic congestion, make more efficient use of existing transportation infrastructure, and reduce the need for costly future public infrastructure.

(c) The alternative planning scenario shall be developed in collaboration with a broad range of public and private stakeholders, including local elected officials, city and county employees, relevant interest groups, and the general public. In developing the scenario, the agency shall consider all of the following:

(1) Increasing housing and commercial development around transit facilities and in close proximity to jobs and commercial activity centers.

(2) Encouraging public transit usage, ridesharing, walking, bicycling, and transportation demand management practices.

(3) Promoting a more efficient mix of current and future job sites, commercial activity centers, and housing opportunities.

(4) Promoting use of urban vacant land and "brownfield" redevelopment.

(5) An economic incentive program that may include measures such as transit vouchers and variable pricing for transportation.

(d) The planning scenario shall be included in a report evaluating all of the following:

(1) The amounts and locations of traffic congestion.

(2) Vehicle miles traveled and the resulting reduction in vehicle emissions.

(3) Estimated percentage share of trips made by each means of travel specified in subparagraph (C) of paragraph (1) of subdivision (b) of Section 65080.

(4) The costs of transportation improvements required to accommodate the population growth in accordance with the alternative scenario.

(5) The economic, social, environmental, regulatory, and institutional barriers to the scenario being achieved.

(e) If the adopted regional transportation plan already achieves one or more of the objectives set forth in subdivision (c), those objectives need not be discussed or evaluated in the alternative planning scenario.

(f) The alternative planning scenario and accompanying report shall not be adopted as part of the regional transportation plan, but it shall be distributed to cities and counties within the region and to other interested parties, and may be a basis for revisions to the transportation projects that will be included in the regional transportation plan.

(g) Nothing in this section grants transportation planning agencies any direct or indirect authority over local land use decisions.

(h) This section does not apply to a transportation plan adopted on or before September 1, 2001, proposed by a transportation planning agency with a population of less than 1,000,000 persons.

### **Caltrans May Prepare an RTP**

65080.5. (a) For each area for which a transportation planning agency is designated under subdivision (c) of Section 29532, or adopts a resolution pursuant to subdivision (c) of Section 65080, the Department of Transportation, in cooperation with the transportation planning agency, and subject to subdivision (e), shall prepare the regional transportation plan, and the updating thereto, for that area and submit it to the governing body or designated policy committee of the transportation planning agency for adoption. Prior to adoption, a public hearing shall be held, after the giving of notice of the hearing by publication in the affected county or counties pursuant to Section 6061. Prior to the

adoption of the regional transportation improvement program by the transportation planning agency if it prepared the program, the transportation planning agency shall consider the relationship between the program and the adopted plan. The adopted plan and program, and the updating thereto, shall be submitted to the California Transportation Commission and the department pursuant to subdivision (b) of Section 65080.

(b) In the case of a transportation planning agency designated under subdivision (c) of Section 29532, the transportation planning agency may prepare the regional transportation plan for the area under its jurisdiction pursuant to this chapter, if the transportation planning agency, prior to July 1, 1978, adopts by resolution a declaration of intention to do so.

(c) In those areas that have a county transportation commission created pursuant to Section 130050 of the Public Utilities Code, the multicounty designated transportation planning agency, as defined in Section 130004 of that code, shall prepare the regional transportation plan and the regional transportation improvement program in consultation with the county transportation commissions.

(d) Any transportation planning agency which did not elect to prepare the initial regional transportation plan for the area under its jurisdiction, may prepare the updated plan if it adopts a resolution of intention to do so at least one year prior to the date when the updated plan is to be submitted to the California Transportation Commission.

(e) If the department prepares or updates a regional transportation improvement program or regional transportation plan, or both, pursuant to this section, the state-local share of funding the preparation or updating of the plan and program shall be calculated on the same basis as though the preparation or updating were to be performed by the transportation planning agency and funded under Sections 99311, 99313, and 99314 of the Public Utilities Code.

## **Government Code Section 65081**

### **RTPs – Air Carrier Airports**

65081.1. (a) After consultation with other regional and local transportation agencies, each transportation planning agency whose planning area includes a primary air carrier airport shall, in conjunction with its preparation of an updated regional transportation plan, include an airport ground access improvement program.

(b) The program shall address the development and extension of mass transit systems, including passenger rail service, major arterial and highway widening and extension projects, and any other ground access improvement projects the planning agency deems appropriate.

(c) Highest consideration shall be given to mass transit for airport access improvement projects in the program.

(d) If federal funds are not available to a transportation planning agency for the costs of preparing or updating an airport ground access improvement program, the agency may charge the operators of primary air carrier airports within its planning area for the direct costs of preparing and updating the program. An airport operator against whom charges are imposed pursuant to this subdivision shall pay the amount of those charges to the transportation planning agency.

### **MTCs Special Corridors**

65081.3. (a) As a part of its adoption of the regional transportation plan, the designated county transportation commission, regional transportation planning agency, or the Metropolitan Transportation Commission may designate special corridors, which may include, but are not limited to, adopted state highway routes, which, in consultation with the Department of Transportation, cities, counties, and transit operators directly impacted by the corridor, are determined to be of statewide or regional priority for long-term right-of-way preservation.

(b) Prior to designating a corridor for priority acquisition, the regional transportation planning agency shall do all of the following:

(1) Establish geographic boundaries for the proposed corridor.

(2) Complete a traffic survey, including a preliminary recommendation for transportation modal split, which generally describes the traffic and air quality impacts of the proposed corridor.

(3) Consider the widest feasible range of possible transportation facilities that could be located in the corridor and the major environmental impacts they may cause to assist in making the corridor more environmentally sensitive and, in the long term, a more viable site for needed transportation improvements.

(c) A designated corridor of statewide or regional priority shall be specifically considered in the certified environmental impact report completed for the adopted regional transportation plan required by the California Environmental Quality Act, which shall include a review of the environmental impacts of the possible transportation facilities which may be located in the corridor. The environmental impact report shall include a survey within the corridor boundaries to determine if there exist any of the following:

(1) Rare or endangered plant or animal species.

(2) Historical or cultural sites of major significance.

(3) Wetlands, vernal pools, or other naturally occurring features.

### **RTPAs/MPOs Designation of Corridors for Priority Acquisition**

(d) The regional transportation planning agency shall designate a corridor for priority acquisition only if, after a public hearing, it finds that the range of potential transportation facilities to be located in the corridor can be constructed in a manner which will avoid or mitigate significant environmental impacts or values identified in subdivision (c), consistent with the California Environmental Quality Act and the state and federal Endangered Species Acts.

(e) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, a corridor of statewide or regional priority may be designated as part of the regional transportation plan only if it has previously been specifically defined in the plan required pursuant to Section 134 and is consistent with the plan required pursuant to Section 135 of Title 23 of the United States Code.

## Government Code Section 65588

### **RTP Updates and Housing Element Revisions**

65588. (a) Each local government shall review its housing element as frequently as appropriate to evaluate all of the following:

- (1) The appropriateness of the housing goals, objectives, and policies in contributing to the attainment of the state housing goal.
- (2) The effectiveness of the housing element in attainment of the community's housing goals and objectives.
- (3) The progress of the city, county, or city and county in implementation of the housing element.

(b) The housing element shall be revised as appropriate, but no less often than required by subdivision (e), to reflect the results of this periodic review. Nothing in this section shall be construed to excuse the obligations of the local government to adopt a revised housing element in accordance with the schedule specified in this section.

(c) The review and revision of housing elements required by this section shall take into account any low- or moderate-income housing provided or required pursuant to Section 65590.

(d) The review pursuant to subdivision (c) shall include, but need not be limited to, the following:

(1) The number of new housing units approved for construction within the coastal zone after January 1, 1982.

(2) The number of housing units for persons and families of low or moderate income, as defined in Section 50093 of the Health and Safety Code, required to be provided in new housing developments either within the coastal zone or within three miles of the coastal zone pursuant to Section 65590.

(3) The number of existing residential dwelling units occupied by persons and families of low or moderate income, as defined in Section 50093 of the Health and Safety Code, that have been authorized to be demolished or converted since January 1, 1982, in the coastal zone.

(4) The number of residential dwelling units for persons and families of low or moderate income, as defined in Section 50093 of the Health and Safety Code, that have been required for replacement or authorized to be converted or demolished as identified in paragraph (3). The location of the replacement units, either onsite, elsewhere within the locality's jurisdiction within the coastal zone, or within three miles of the coastal zone within the locality's jurisdiction, shall be designated in the review.

(e) Each city, county, and city and county shall revise its housing element according to the following schedule:

(1) (A) Local governments within the regional jurisdiction of the Southern California Association of Governments: June 30, 2006, for the fourth revision.

(B) Local governments within the regional jurisdiction of the Association of Bay Area Governments: June 30, 2007, for the fourth revision.

(C) Local governments within the regional jurisdiction of the Council of Fresno County Governments, the Kern County Council of Governments, and the Sacramento Area Council of Governments: June 30, 2002, for the third revision, and June 30, 2008, for the fourth revision.

(D) Local governments within the regional jurisdiction of the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments: December 31, 2002, for the third revision, and June 30, 2009, for the fourth revision.

(E) Local governments within the regional jurisdiction of the San Diego Association of Governments: June 30, 2005, for the fourth revision.

(F) All other local governments: December 31, 2003, for the third revision, and June 30, 2009, for the fourth revision.

(2) (A) All local governments within a metropolitan planning organization in a region classified as nonattainment for one or more pollutants regulated by the federal Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. Sec. 7506), except those within the regional jurisdiction of the San Diego Association of Governments, shall adopt the fifth revision of the housing element no later than 18 months after adoption of the first regional transportation plan to be adopted after September 30, 2010.

(B) (i) All local governments within the regional jurisdiction of the San Diego Association of Governments shall adopt the fifth revision of the housing element no later than 18 months after adoption of the first regional transportation plan update to be adopted after September 30, 2010.

(ii) Prior to or concurrent with the adoption of the fifth revision of the housing element, each local government within the regional jurisdiction of the San Diego Association of Governments shall identify adequate sites in its inventory pursuant to Section 65583.2 or rezone adequate sites to accommodate a prorated portion of its share of the regional housing need for the projection period representing the period from July 1, 2010, to the deadline for housing element adoption described in clause (i).

(I) For the fifth revision, a local government within the jurisdiction of the San Diego Association of Governments that has not adopted a housing element for the fourth revision by January 1, 2009, shall revise its housing element not less than every four years, beginning on the date described in clause (i), in accordance with paragraph (4), unless the local government does both of the following:

(ia) Adopts a housing element for the fourth revision no later than March 31, 2010, which is in substantial compliance with this article.

(ib) Completes any rezoning contained in the housing element program for the fourth revision by June 30, 2010.

(II) For the sixth and subsequent revisions, a local government within the jurisdiction of the San Diego Association of Governments shall be subject to the dates described in clause (i), in accordance with paragraph (4).

(C) All local governments within the regional jurisdiction of a metropolitan planning organization or a regional transportation planning agency that has made an election pursuant to subparagraph (L) of paragraph (2) of subdivision (b) of Section 65080 by June 1, 2009, shall adopt the fifth revision of the housing element no later than 18 months after adoption of the first regional transportation plan update following the election.

(D) All other local governments shall adopt the fifth revision of the housing element five years after the date specified in paragraph (1).

(3) Subsequent revisions of the housing element shall be due as follows:

(A) For local governments described in subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) of paragraph (2), 18 months after adoption of every second regional transportation plan update,

provided that the deadline for adoption is no more than eight years later than the deadline for adoption of the previous eight-year housing element.

(B) For all other local governments, at five-year intervals after the date specified in subparagraph (D) of paragraph (2).

(C) If a metropolitan planning organization or a regional transportation planning agency subject to the five-year revision interval in subparagraph (B) makes an election pursuant to subparagraph (L) of paragraph (2) of subdivision (b) of Section 65080 after June 1, 2009, all local governments within the regional jurisdiction of that entity shall adopt the next housing element revision no later than 18 months after adoption of the first regional transportation plan update following the election. Subsequent revisions shall be due 18 months after adoption of every second regional transportation plan update, provided that the deadline for adoption is no more than eight years later than the deadline for adoption of the previous eight-year housing element.

(4) (A) A local government that does not adopt a housing element within 120 days of the applicable deadline described in subparagraph (A), (B), or (C) of paragraph (2) or subparagraph (A) or (C) of paragraph (3) shall revise its housing element not less than every four years until the local government has adopted at least two consecutive revisions by the statutory deadline.

(B) If necessary, the local government shall adopt three consecutive four-year revisions by the statutory deadline to ensure that when the local government adopts its next housing element covering an eight-year planning period, it does so at the deadline for adoption for other local governments within the region also covering an eight-year planning period.

(C) The deadline for adoption of every second four-year revision shall be the same as the deadline for adoption for other local governments within the region.

(5) The metropolitan planning organization or a regional transportation planning agency for a region that has an eight-year revision interval pursuant to paragraph (3) shall notify the department and the Department of Transportation in writing of the estimated adoption date for its next regional transportation plan update at least 12 months prior to the estimated adoption date. The Department of Transportation shall maintain and publish on its Internet Web site a current schedule of the estimated regional transportation plan adoption dates. The department shall maintain and publish on its Internet Web site a current schedule of the estimated and actual housing element due dates. Each council of governments shall publish on its Internet Web site the estimated and actual housing element due dates, as published by the department, for the jurisdictions within its region and shall send notice of these dates to interested parties. For purposes of determining the existing and projected need for housing within a region pursuant to Sections 65584 to 65584.08, inclusive, the date of the next scheduled revision of the housing element shall be deemed to be the estimated adoption date of the regional transportation plan update described in the notice provided to the Department of Transportation plus 18 months.

(6) The new projection period shall begin on the date of December 31 or June 30 that most closely precedes the end of the previous projection period.

## **Definitions**

(f) For purposes of this article, the following terms have the following meanings:

(1) “Planning period” shall be the time period between the due date for one housing element and the due date for the next housing element.

(2) “Projection period” shall be the time period for which the regional housing need is calculated.

(g) For purposes of this section, “regional transportation plan update” shall mean a regional transportation plan adopted to satisfy the requirements of subdivision (d) of Section 65080.

**Sustainable Communities and Climate Protection Act**

Chapter 728 of the Statutes of 2008 shall be known and may be cited as the Sustainable Communities and Climate Protection Act.

## **Appendix H**

# **ALTERNATIVE PLANNING STRATEGY (APS)**



Page Left Intentionally Blank

## **Appendix H**

### **Alternative Planning Strategy**

#### **Background**

California Government Code Section 65080(H) states MPOs shall prepare an APS if the MPO determines the region will not be able to achieve ARB's regional GHG emission reduction targets through the sustainable communities strategy (SCS). It should be noted that an SCS must be prepared as part of the RTP - regardless if the MPO can achieve the regional GHG emission reduction target or not. The APS however is not a part of an RTP.

#### **APS Statutory Language**

Below is the specific statutory language from California Government Code Section 65080(H) relating to the preparation of an APS:

Calif. Government Code Section 65080(H)

(H) If the sustainable communities strategy, prepared in compliance with subparagraph (B) or (C), is unable to reduce greenhouse gas emissions to achieve the greenhouse gas emission reduction targets established by the state board, the metropolitan planning organization shall prepare an alternative planning strategy to the sustainable communities strategy showing how those greenhouse gas emission targets would be achieved through alternative development patterns, infrastructure, or additional transportation measures or policies. The alternative planning strategy shall be a separate document from the regional transportation plan, but it may be adopted concurrently with the regional transportation plan. In preparing the alternative planning strategy, the metropolitan planning organization:

(i) Shall identify the principal impediments to achieving the targets within the sustainable communities strategy.

(ii) May include an alternative development pattern for the region pursuant to subparagraphs (B) to (F), inclusive.

(iii) Shall describe how the greenhouse gas emission reduction targets would be achieved by the alternative planning strategy, and why the development pattern, measures, and policies in the alternative planning strategy are the most practicable choices for achievement of the greenhouse gas emission reduction targets.

(iv) An alternative development pattern set forth in the alternative planning strategy shall comply with Part 450 of Title 23 of, and Part 93 of Title 40 of, the Code of Federal Regulations, except to the extent that compliance will prevent achievement of the greenhouse gas emission reduction targets approved by the state board.

(v) For purposes of the California Environmental Quality Act (Division 13 (commencing with Section 21000) of the Public Resources Code), an alternative planning strategy shall not constitute a land use plan, policy, or regulation, and the inconsistency of a project with an alternative planning strategy shall not be a consideration in determining whether a project may have an environmental effect.

Page Left Intentionally Blank

## **Appendix I**

### **RHNA AND RTP DEVELOPMENT INFORMATION**

The following table was prepared by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD). Questions regarding the RHNA process should be directed to HCD using the contact information located at:

<http://hcd.ca.gov/contact.html>

Page Left Intentionally Blank

## RHNA/Housing Element & RTP Statutory Process Timelines

<b>Regional Housing Need Allocation (RHNA)</b> <i>Government Code (GC) Sections 65584-65589</i>	<b>Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)</b> <b>(Sustainable Communities Strategy -SCS)</b>
<p><b>A. REGIONAL CONSULTATION &amp; DETERMINATION</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. COG/MPO provides HCD written notice of estimated RTP adoption date: at least 12 months prior to estimated adoption date. GC 65588(e)(5). <i>NOTE: RTP adoption later than estimated date can cause (1) misalignment between RHNA projection period (based on “estimated” adoption date) &amp; HE planning period &amp; due date (18 months from “actual” adoption date) &amp; (2) shortage of required housing unit allocation over period past “estimated” adoption date. GC 65588(e)(2)</i></li> <li>2. HCD &amp; COG/MPO begin RHNA consultation: at least 26 months before due date of local government Housing Element (HE). GC 65584.01(c)(1). <i>(COG Subregion optional formation and notification: at least 28 months before HE due date. GC 65584.03.)</i></li> <li>3. HCD issues final RHNA: at least 24 months before HE due date. GC 65584(b).</li> </ol> <p><b>B. COG/MPO RHNA DISTRIBUTION METHODOLOGY &amp; PLAN</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. COG/MPO begins developing distribution methodology: at least 24 months before HE due date <i>(allowing 60-day public comment period &amp; public hearing)</i>. GC 65584.04(a).</li> <li>5. COG/MPO adopts final distribution methodology for all income category RHNA consistent with development pattern of Regional Transportation Plan Sustainable Communities Strategy. GC 65584.04(h).</li> </ol> <p><b>C. COG/MPO ISSUES DRAFT RHNA DISTRIBUTIONS</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>6. COG/MPO distributes Draft RHNA: at least 18 months before HE due date. GC 65584.05(a).</li> <li>7. Jurisdictions may request draft RHNA revision: within 60 days from receipt of draft RHNA. GC 65585.05(b)-(c)</li> </ol> <p><b>D. JURISDICTION APPEAL PROCESS &amp; COG/MPO ACTION</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>8. Jurisdictions may appeal draft RHNA: within 60 days from date COG/MPO establishes to hear appeals at public hearing. GC 65585.05(d)-(e)</li> <li>9. COG/MPO reviews and responds to appeal requests and issues proposed Final RHNA (at least equal to HCD income category RHNA): within 45 days after appeal hearing. GC 65584.05(f)-(g).</li> <li>10. COG/MPO holds Public Hearing and adopts and submits Final RHNA Plan: Adopt Plan within 45 days from issuing proposed Final RHNA distribution Plan. Submit Plan within 3 days from adoption to HCD to review/approve within 60 days from receipt. GC 65584.05(h).</li> </ol> <p><b>E. HCD REVIEW &amp; APPROVAL OF COG/MPO RHNA PLAN</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>11. Review of Final RHNA by HCD: within 60 days of receipt of COG's Final RHNA Plan <i>(HCD may revise COG's RHNA Plan if not consistent with initial regional determination)</i> GC 65584.05(h)</li> </ol>	<p><i>(Regional variations exist for some MPOs in San Joaquin Valley, Bay Area, and Southern California and for congestion management agency-subregion processes)</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. MPO gathers data, develops models, begins update of regional growth forecast</li> <li>2. MPO adopts public participation plan for SCS and possibly an APS</li> <li>3. Prior to public participation process, MPO submits proposed methodology for estimating GHG reduction from its SCS (and APS, if desired) to ARB for review and comment</li> <li>4. MPO conducts outreach &amp; public workshops, at least 1-3 workshops per county</li> <li>5. MPO conducts inter-agency consultation pursuant to federal conformity requirements</li> <li>6. MPO prepares draft SCS which must accommodate HCD's RHNA determination</li> <li>7. Draft EIR/RTP is prepared &amp; reviewed by public and agencies for comment</li> </ol> <p><i>MPO must issue Draft SCS not less than 55 days before RTP adoption; must hold SCS public hearing (for single-county at least 2 public hearings&amp; for multi-county at least 3 hearings)</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>8. MPO makes any revisions to Draft SCS/responds to DEIR comments</li> <li>9. MPO Certifies EIR &amp; Adopts RTP within either 4 years of its prior conformity date, or 5 years. of its prior adoption date, if attainment MPO</li> <li>10. MPO submits RTP to FHWA/FTA for conformity</li> <li>11. After adoption, MPO submits SCS for review to ARB. ARB has 60 days to accept or reject the MPO's determination that strategy, if implemented, will achieve region's GHG target</li> </ol> <p>*****</p> <p><i>For non-attainment regions, subsequent SCS (4 yrs. hence) must integrate with prior RHNA as RHNA determinations are made for 8-yr intervals (every other 4-yr RTP update).</i></p>
<p><b>JURISDICTION 8-YEAR HOUSING ELEMENT DUE DATE:</b> within 18 months from <i>actual</i> RTP adoption date. <i>NOTE: consequence for late adoption past 120 days from due date is interruption of 8-year HE cycle and 4-yr update by due date for at least two consecutive 4-year intervals. GC 65588(e)(4)</i></p>	<p><i>If approved by FHWA, FTA &amp; EPA, federal approval starts RTP update timetable for non-attainment MPOs: RTP must be updated within 4 years</i></p>

Page Left Intentionally Blank

## **Appendix J**

### **Glossary of Transportation Terms**



Page Left Intentionally Blank

<b>APCD</b>	<u>Air Pollution Control District</u> , a county agency that adopts regulations to meet State and Federal air quality standards.
<b>AQMD</b>	<u>Air Quality Management District</u> , a regional agency formed by 2 or more counties, which adopts regulations to meet State and Federal air quality standards.
<b>ATTAINMENT AREA</b>	<u>Attainment Area</u> , is any geographic area in which levels of a given criteria air pollutant (e.g., ozone, carbon monoxide, PM10, PM2.5, and nitrogen dioxide) meet the health-based National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) for that pollutant. An area may be an attainment area for one pollutant and a nonattainment area for others. A “maintenance area” (see definition below) is not considered an attainment area for transportation planning purposes.
<b>BLUEPRINT PLANNING</b>	<u>Blueprint Planning</u> , is a Caltrans sponsored voluntary discretionary competitive grant program designed to assist MPOs in developing a regional vision that considers transportation, land use, housing, environmental protection, economic development and equity.
<b>CAPACITY</b>	<u>Capacity</u> , is a transportation facility's ability to accommodate a moving stream of people or vehicles in a given time period.
<b>CARB</b>	<u>California Air Resources Board</u> , the State agency responsible for implementation of the Federal and State Clean Air Acts. Provides technical assistance to air districts preparing attainment plans; reviews local attainment plans and combines portions of them with State measures for submittal of the State Implementation Plan (SIP) to U.S. EPA.
<b>CASP</b>	<u>California Aviation System Plan</u> , prepared by Caltrans Division of Aeronautics every five years as required by PUC Section 21701. The CASP integrates regional aviation system planning on a Statewide basis.
<b>CEQA</b>	<u>California Environmental Quality Act</u> , State law that requires the environmental effects associated with proposed plans, programs and projects to be fully disclosed.
<b>CMA</b>	<u>Congestion Management Agency</u> , the county agency responsible for developing, coordinating and monitoring the Congestion Management Program.
<b>CMP</b>	<u>Congestion Management Program</u> is a countywide integrated program that addresses congestion in a coordinated and

cooperative manner. The program contains 5 elements: a Level of Service element, a transit standards element, a TDM and trip reduction element, a land use analysis element, and a capitol improvement program element. To effectively address this goal, the appropriate land use, transportation and air quality agencies need to integrate their planning processes, share information and respond to congestion using a coordinated approach. In 1996 AB 2419 amended government code section 65088.3 to allow counties to opt out of this previously mandatory program.

**CTC**

California Transportation Commission, a decision making body established by AB 402(Alquist / Ingalls) of 1977 to advise and assist the Secretary of Transportation and the legislature in formulating and evaluating State policies and plans for transportation programs.

**CTP**

California Transportation Plan, The CTP is a long-range transportation policy plan that is submitted to the Governor. The CTP is developed in collaboration with partners, presents a vision for California's future transportation system, and defines goals, policies, and strategies to reach the vision. It is developed in consultation with the State's regional transportation planning agencies, is influenced by the regional planning process, and provides guidance for developing future RTPs. RTPs should be consistent with and implement the vision and goals of the CTP. As defined by State statute, the CTP is not project specific.

**DSMP**

District System Management Plan, a District's long-range plan for management of the State highway transportation system in its jurisdiction.

**FAA**

Federal Aviation Administration, the agency of the U.S. Department of Transportation charged with regulating air commerce to promote its safety and development, encouraging and developing civil aviation, air traffic control and air navigation, and promoting the development of the national airport system.

**EMISSIONS  
BUDGET**

Emissions Budget, is the part of the State Implementation Plan (SIP) that identifies the allowable emissions levels, mandated by the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS), for certain pollutants from mobile, stationary, and area sources. The emissions levels are used for meeting emission reduction milestones.

**FHWA**

Federal Highway Administration, a component of the U.S. Department of Transportation, established to ensure development of an effective national road and highway transportation system. FHWA and FTA, in consultation with US EPA, make Federal Clean Air Act Conformity findings for

Regional Transportation Plans, Transportation Improvement Programs, and Federally funded projects.

**FISCAL  
CONSTRAINT**

Fiscal constraint, the metropolitan transportation plan, TIP, and STIP includes sufficient financial information for demonstrating that projects in the metropolitan transportation plan, TIP, and STIP can be implemented using committed, available, or reasonably available revenue sources, with reasonable assurance that the Federally supported transportation system is being adequately operated and maintained. For the TIP and the STIP, financial constraint/fiscal constraint applies to each program year. Additionally, projects in air quality nonattainment and maintenance areas can be included in the first two years of the TIP and STIP only if funds are “available” or “committed.”

**FTA**

Federal Transit Administration, a component of the U.S. Department of Transportation, responsible for administering the Federal transit program under the Federal Transit Act, as amended, and SAFETEA-LU.

**FSTIP**

Federal State Transportation Improvement Program is a multi-year Statewide, financially constrained, intermodal program of projects that is consistent with the Statewide transportation plan (CTP) and regional transportation plans (RTPs). The FSTIP is developed by the California Department of Transportation and incorporates all of the MPOs *and* RTPAs FTIPs by reference. Caltrans then submits the FSTIP to FHWA.

**FTIP**

Federal Transportation Improvement Program is a constrained 4-year prioritized list of all transportation projects that are proposed for *Federal and local* funding. The FTIP is developed and adopted by the MPO/RTPA and is updated every 4 years. It is consistent with the RTP and it is required as a prerequisite for Federal funding.

**IIP**

Interregional Improvement Program is one of two component funding source programs that ultimately make up the State Transportation Improvement program. The IIP receives 25% of the funds from the State Highway account. The IIP is the source of funding for the ITIP.

**ILLUSTRATIVE  
PROJECT**

An illustrative project means an additional transportation project that may (but is not required to) be included in a financial plan for the RTP or FTIP if reasonable additional resources were to become available.

**INTERMODAL**

Intermodal refers to the connections between modes of transportation.

<b>ITIP</b>	<u>Interregional Transportation Improvement Program</u> is a Statewide program of projects, developed by Caltrans for interregional projects that are primarily located outside of urbanized areas. The ITIP has a 4-year planning horizon and is updated every two years. It is submitted to the CTC along with the FTIP and taken together they are known as the STIP.
<b>ITS</b>	<u>Intelligent Transportation Systems</u> are electronics, photonics, communications, or information processing used singly or in combination to improve the efficiency or safety of a surface transportation system.
<b>ITSP</b>	<u>Interregional Transportation Strategic Plan</u> describes the framework in which the State will carry out its responsibilities for the Interregional Transportation Improvement Program (ITIP).
<b>MIS</b>	<u>Major Investment Study</u> was a Federally mandated study required for major transportation improvements under ISTEA. An MIS was a planning analysis done on a corridor or sub-regional area that included social, economic and environmental considerations early in the planning process and integrated these considerations into the project development stage. Although SAFETEA-LU has deleted this requirement, Section 450.318(a) and Appendix A retains the option to link early environmental considerations in the RTP to the subsequent project specific environmental review that takes place during the project delivery process.
<b>MODE</b>	<u>Mode</u> is a specific form of transportation, such as automobiles, buses, trains or planes.
<b>MPO</b>	<u>Metropolitan Planning Organization</u> , a planning organization created by Federal legislation charged with conducting regional transportation planning to meet Federal mandates.
<b>NATIONAL AMBIENT AIR QUALITY STANDARDS</b>	<u>NAAQS</u> are the acceptable limits that are set for various pollutants by the US EPA. Air quality standards have been established for the following six criteria pollutants: ozone, carbon monoxide, particulate matter, nitrogen dioxide, lead and sulfur dioxide.
<b>NEPA</b>	<u>National Environmental Policy Act</u> is Federal legislation that created a national policy and procedures that require Federal agencies to consider the environmental effects of their actions and to inform the public that their decisions reflect this environmental consideration. NEPA applies to most

transportation projects because they are jointly funded with a combination of Federal, State and sometimes local money.

**NONATTAINMENT**

Nonattainment, any geographic region of the United States that has been designated by the EPA as a nonattainment area under section 107 of the Clean Air Act for any pollutants for which an NAAQS exists.

**PERFORMANCE  
MEASURES**

Performance measures are used to model travel demand and allow the long-range forecasting of transportation network and system-level performance (e.g. Walk, bike, transit, and carpool mode share, corridor travel times by mode, percentage of population within 0.5 mile of a high frequency transit stop).

**PERFORMANCE  
MONITORING  
INDICATORS/METRICS**

Performance monitoring indicators or metrics include field data such as vehicle miles traveled, mode share, fatalities/injuries, transit access, change in agricultural land, and CO2 emissions.

**PERFORMANCE  
TARGETS**

Performance targets are numeric goals established to enable the quantifiable assessment of performance measures.

**RIP**

Regional Improvement Program is one of two component funding source programs that ultimately make up the State Transportation Improvement program. The RIP receives 75% of the funds from the State Highway account. This 75% is then distributed to the MPOs and RTPAs by a formula. The RIP is the source of funding for the FTIP.

**RTIP**

Regional Transportation Improvement Program, is a program proposal of projects prepared by the regions in coordination with Caltrans for inclusion in the STIP.

**RTP**

Regional Transportation Plan, a Federal and State mandated planning document prepared by MPOs and RTPAs. The plan describes existing and projected transportation needs, conditions and financing affecting all modes within a 20-year horizon.

**RTPA**

Regional Transportation Planning Agency, a State designated single or multi-county agency responsible for regional transportation planning. RTPAs are also known as Local Transportation Commissions or Councils of Governments and are usually located in rural or exurban areas.

**SHA**

State Highway Account, the SHA account is the State's primary source of funding for transportation improvements. The SHA account is composed of revenues from the State's gasoline and diesel fuel tax, truck weight fees and Federal highway funds. The

SHA is primarily used for STIP, SHOPP and local assistance projects as well as non-capitol projects such as maintenance, operations, and support.

**SHOPP**

State Highway Operations and Protection Program is a legislatively created program to maintain the integrity of the State highway system. It is tapped for safety and rehabilitation projects. SHOPP is a multi-year program of projects approved by the Legislature and Governor. It is separate from the STIP.

**SIP**

State Implementation Plan, as defined in section 302(q) of the Clean Air Act (CAA), the portion (or portions) of the implementation plan, or most recent revision thereof, which has been approved under section 110 of the CAA, or promulgated under section 110(c) of the CAA, or promulgated or approved pursuant to regulations promulgated under section 301(d) of the CAA and which implements the relevant requirements of the CAA.

**SMART GROWTH**

Smart Growth, is a set of policies designed by local governments to protect, preserve and economically develop established communities as well as natural and cultural resources. Smart growth encompasses a holistic view of development.

**SPRAWL**

Sprawl is an urban form based on the movement of people from the central city to the suburbs. Concerns associated with sprawl include loss of farmland and open space due to low-density land development, increased public service costs including transportation, and environmental degradation.

**STIP**

State Transportation Improvement Program, a Statewide or bundled prioritized list of transportation projects covering a period of four years that is consistent with the long-range Statewide transportation plan, metropolitan transportation plans and FTIPs, and required for projects to be eligible for funding under Title 23 U.S.C. and title 49 U.S.C. Chapter 53.

**TCM**

Transportation Control Measures, any measure that is specifically identified and committed to in the applicable SIP that is either one of the types listed in section 108 of the Clean Air Act or any other measure for the purpose of reducing emissions or concentrations of air pollutants from transportation sources by reducing vehicle use or changing traffic flow or congestion conditions. Notwithstanding the above, vehicle technology-based, fuel-based, and maintenance-based measures that control the emissions from vehicles under fixed traffic conditions are not TCMs.

**TIERING**

Section 15385 of the CEQA guidelines defines tiering as the coverage of general matters in broader EIRs with subsequent narrower EIRs incorporating by reference the general

discussions and concentrating solely on the issue specific to the EIR that is being subsequently prepared. Tiering allows agencies to deal with broad environmental issues in EIRs at the planning stage and then to provide a more detailed examination of specific effects in EIRs for later development projects that are consistent with or that implement the plan.

**TITLE VI**

Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, prohibits discrimination in any program or project receiving Federal financial assistance.

**TDM**

Transportation Demand Management refers to policies, programs and actions that encourage the use of transportation alternatives to driving alone and reduce vehicle miles traveled.

**TSM**

Transportation System Management refers to the use of relatively inexpensive transportation improvements that are used to increase the efficiency of transportation facilities. TSM can include carpool and vanpool programs, parking management, traffic flow improvements, high occupancy vehicle lanes, and park-and-ride lots.

**US EPA**

United States Environmental Protection Agency is the Federal agency that approves the SIP and the emissions budgets that are the basis of the RTP conformity assessments.



Page Left Intentionally Blank

## **Appendix K**

### **AB 441 - Promoting Health and Health Equity in MPO RTPs**

Page Left Intentionally Blank

## Appendix K Contents

<b>Introduction: Public Health and Transportation Planning</b> .....	276
<b>Direct Effects</b> .....	277
<b>Indirect Effects</b> .....	278
<b>Policies, Programs, and Projects that Promote Health and Health Equity in RTPs</b> .....	280
<b>Goals and Policies</b> .....	280
<i>Health in All Policies</i> .....	280
<i>Regional and Local Active Transportation Planning</i> .....	281
<i>Local Government General Plans and Policies</i> .....	283
<b>Programs</b> .....	284
<i>Collaboration with Non-Transportation Agencies</i> .....	284
<i>Affordable Housing</i> .....	286
<i>Interagency Consultation Process: Near-Road Air Quality Considerations for MPOs</i> .....	287
<i>Near-Road Air Quality Analysis and Mitigation</i> .....	288
<i>Bicycle and Pedestrian Non-Infrastructure Programs</i> .....	288
<i>Complete Streets Programs</i> .....	290
<i>Strengthening Stakeholder Engagement in Communities Affected by Health Inequities</i> .....	292
<i>Programs that Serve Rural Transportation Needs</i> .....	294
<i>Promoting Public Transit Connectivity to Essential Destinations and Low Income Communities</i> .....	294
<b>Public Health Planning Activities and Projects</b> .....	295
<i>Using a Health and Health Equity Lens in Decision-Making</i> .....	295
<i>Health Impact Assessment</i> .....	295
<b>Data, Tools, and Metrics that Promote Health and Health Equity in RTPs</b> .....	297
<b>Performance Measures/Metrics/Indicators for Health and Health Equity</b> .....	297
<b>Modeling Tools to Capture Health and Health Equity Impacts</b> .....	298
<b>Health Economic Assessment Tool (HEAT)</b> .....	299
<b>Integrated Transport and Health Impact Model (ITHIM)</b> .....	300
<b>California Statewide Public Health Assessment Model (C-PHAM)</b> .....	302
<b>Key Terms</b> .....	303
<b>Resources and Citations</b> .....	305

## Purpose of Appendix K

Assembly Bill 441 (2012, Monning) requires the RTP Guidelines to identify innovative planning practices that can serve as models for MPOs and their partner agencies in undertaking a regional transportation planning process that promotes the health and well-being of all Californians. Appendix K has been prepared to serve as voluntary guidance to highlight cutting-edge examples of policies, programs, projects, and tools that MPOs are employing to address public health and health equity in the regional transportation planning process. It is important to note that this appendix is not intended to provide a “one size fits all” approach. In light of the diversity of California MPOs, and the varying level of financial resources and technical capabilities to undertake the long range regional transportation planning process, this appendix offers examples from both rural and urban regions, and recognizes the importance of a regionally-appropriate approach to addressing health and health equity in the RTP. It is also important to acknowledge that improving the built environment is one of many factors in improving public health. This Appendix is meant to provide examples of how the RTP can contribute to improved public health and is not meant to imply that by implementing these recommendations, all public health needs will be addressed.


## Introduction: Public Health and Transportation Planning

Many factors combine to affect the health of individuals and communities. Within the public health field the circumstances and conditions in which people are born, grow up, live, work, play and age are called the social determinants of health (SDoH) and are recognized to have a significant impact on health outcomes and health equity.<sup>1</sup> These social determinants of health include socioeconomic status, education, employment, social support networks, and the built environment and have been shown to have a greater impact on health than health care or genetics.<sup>2</sup> Transportation is a key social determinant of health and the Regional Transportation Plans determine long-term investments in the built environment over extensive geographies. These plans can impact public health through multiple pathways, including economic opportunity, access to essential destinations, and the safety of communities and transportation options, as illustrated in the graphic below.

---

<sup>1</sup> Mark R. Cullen, Clint Cummins, and Victor R. Fuchs, “Geographic and Racial Variation in Premature Mortality in the U.S.: Analyzing the Disparities,” *PLoS ONE* 7, no. 4 (April 17, 2012): e32930, doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0032930.

<sup>2</sup> Schroeder, SA (2007). We can Do Better---Improving the Health of American People. *NEJM*. 357:12221-8.



*Credit: Southern California Association of Governments 2016-2040 RTP/ SCS Public Health Appendix*

A 2012 report, “*Creating Healthy Regional Transportation Plans: A Primer for California’s Public Health Community on Regional Transportation Plans and Sustainable Communities Strategies*,”<sup>1</sup> (2012, TransForm & CA Dept. of Public Health) identified direct and indirect effects of transportation projects and policies that are developed at both the regional and local level:

### **Direct Effects**

- Physical Activity and Active Transportation.** Active transportation (walking, biking, and wheeling to destinations) has a direct health benefit, and can reduce the risk of heart disease, improve mental health, lower blood pressure, and reduce the risk of overweight and obesity-related chronic disease such as Type 2 Diabetes. Public transit is considered active transportation because it generally involves an active mode at the beginning or the end of the trip.
- Collision Injuries and Fatalities.** Motor vehicle collisions are a major cause of death and injury, and are the leading cause of death among those ages 5-34. In 2009, traffic injuries caused 3,063 deaths, 25,328 hospitalizations, and 221,454 emergency department treatments in California. 18 percent of deaths, 19 percent of the hospitalizations, and 9 percent of the emergency department treatments were pedestrians and bicyclists. Road design, “Complete Streets,” speed reduction, and other strategies can all reduce the toll of motor vehicle collisions.
- Air Pollution.** Auto emissions impact air quality and contribute to impaired lung development, lung cancer, asthma and other chronic respiratory problems, and

heart disease. Cleaner fuels and more efficient vehicles can reduce emissions, but strategies that reduce driving are also important for air quality because some pollutants, like particulate matter from re-entrained road dust, are directly related to how much people drive.

- **Climate Change.** The transportation sector causes 38 percent of California's total gross greenhouse gas emissions. Minimizing transportation's contribution to climate change will limit the health effects of climate change, such as heat illness, effects of higher ozone levels, impacts of extreme weather events, and changes in vector-borne diseases.
- **Stress and Mental Health.** Commuting during rush-hour traffic can be highly stressful for drivers. Unreliable and infrequent transit service can also cause stress, especially for low-income employees who depend solely on transit to get to their jobs on time. Reducing commute times and increasing public transportation reliability through effective transportation planning can reduce stress and improve mental health.

## Indirect Effects

- **Access to Jobs.** For low-income families who cannot afford a car, public transit can be a lifeline to jobs. Social service agencies have found that inadequate transportation is one of the top three barriers to the transition from welfare to work. Transportation planning can help residents reach jobs, education, social services, and medical care by walking, biking or public transportation in a timely manner.
- **Access to Services and Medical care.** When getting to health care or other essential services is difficult—and this is especially true for lower-income residents, seniors, and people with disabilities, who don't have access to a car or effective public transportation—patients often miss appointments or delay care until a condition deteriorates and requires emergency attention.
- **Household Expenses.** The Average American Family spends an astounding 32 percent of household income on housing and 19 percent on getting from place A to place B<sup>3</sup>. Low-income families are hit the hardest because housing and transportation expenses account for a larger proportion of their income. This leaves much less for savings or investing in education, healthful food, etc. Regions can support increased economic stability and access to community necessities by assuring that all populations, and especially vulnerable populations such as youth, older adults, and low-income residents, have access to affordable and accessible transportation options. Affordable transportation

---

<sup>3</sup> [http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/livability/fact\\_sheets/transandhousing.cfm](http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/livability/fact_sheets/transandhousing.cfm)

options enable low income households to invest in savings, education, and healthier food options—all factors that contribute to greater individual and community health.

- **Displacement/Gentrification.** Transportation improvements, especially new rail lines and stations to low-income communities, can increase access to opportunities. But they can also result in much higher property values and an increase in the cost of owning and renting property, inadvertently displacing existing residents and businesses. Being forced to leave a home is a stressful, costly and traumatic life event, especially when affordable housing is so limited. There is a growing recognition of tools and strategies that can be implemented alongside community investments to reduce displacement.
- **Social Cohesion and Social Networks.** Transportation planning and community design that facilitates active transportation, including public transportation, tends to increase social interaction and community cohesion. Increased neighborly interactions can help reduce crime, depression, and poverty, provide support and safety, and increase property values. Community cohesion and supportive transportation services are particularly important for vulnerable populations, including the elderly and disabled.

Health-focused transportation plans can help reduce the number of injuries and fatalities from collisions. When streets are designed to safely accommodate walking and biking, more people may do so, and as more people walk and bike the rate of collisions actually goes down as pedestrians and bicyclists become more visible to motorists. In addition, more people out walking and biking in a neighborhood has an important public safety benefit, as it means there are more “eyes on the street” to deter criminal activity. Taking this a step further, studies have shown that people who live in neighborhoods with less traffic and higher rates of walking, bicycling, and transit use know more of their neighbors, visit their neighbor’s homes more often, and are less fearful of their neighbors.<sup>4</sup> When streets are inhospitable to pedestrians and bicyclists, residents don’t feel safe walking or biking to nearby transit and their ability to access regional educational and employment opportunities is hampered. In short, improving traffic safety results in better public health beyond simply reduced injuries and fatalities.

While local governments have primary control over streets and roads in their jurisdictions, and county transportation agencies can generate funding by placing transportation sales taxes before voters, the interaction of transportation and land use happens most profoundly at a regional scale. Many health, equity and environmental benefits of smarter planning and investment – from creating access to jobs for low-income communities, to protecting open space, to reducing air pollution – can be

---

<sup>4</sup> “At the Intersection of Active Transportation and Equity.” Safe Routes to School National Partnership. 2015. <[http://saferoutespartnership.org/sites/default/files/resource\\_files/at-the-intersection-of-active-transportation-and-equity.pdf](http://saferoutespartnership.org/sites/default/files/resource_files/at-the-intersection-of-active-transportation-and-equity.pdf)>.



realized at a regional scale through the collaborative planning process between regional and local governments. MPOs play a significant role in engaging residents and stakeholders in the regional transportation planning process to ensure the improvement of health outcomes for all segments of the population. A timely opportunity to address public health outcomes is early during the RTP development process and MPOs are encouraged to consider health priorities in selection of projects for the RTP.

## **Policies, Programs, and Projects that Promote Health and Health Equity in RTPs**

This section serves to identify examples of innovative policies, programs, and projects that California MPOs of varying size have employed to consider health and health equity in the RTP. This section encourages a regionally-appropriate approach to addressing health and health equity in the planning process. For example, regions with limited resources, especially rural regions, may be best served by selecting a few high-priority strategies where there is greatest opportunity to affect regional outcomes.

### **Goals and Policies**

#### ***Health in All Policies***

The identification of regional goals and policies is an important part of the RTP development process. The Health in All Policies (HiAP) approach is one mechanism that facilitates the consideration of health in the RTP. HiAP is a collaborative strategy that aims to improve public health outcomes by including health considerations in the planning process across sectors and policy areas. The five key tenets of HiAP as defined by the California Department of Public Health include:

- Promote Health Equity and Sustainability
- Support Inter-Agency Collaboration
- Benefit Multiple Partners
- Engage Stakeholders
- Create Structural or Procedural Change

#### **Urban MPO Example:**

The regional planning process serves as a valuable forum for inter-agency collaboration and is uniquely suited for a HiAP approach. The Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) incorporated the use of the HiAP policy framework in its 2016-2040 RTP/SCS. SCAG identified seven focus areas for further analysis and implementation related to the built environment's impact on health outcomes:

1. Access to Essential Destinations
2. Affordable Housing
3. Air Quality

4. Climate Adaptation
5. Economic Opportunities
6. Physical Activity
7. Transportation Safety

SCAG developed a comprehensive Public Health Appendix which features an in-depth discussion of the focus areas, a simple and clear graphic connecting the RTP goals to each of these focus areas, identification of the challenges and opportunities in these areas, adoption of guiding principles for the integration of public health considerations in the plan, a detailed report of plan performance in the public health focus areas, and examples of regional and local initiatives. For more information:

[http://scagrtpscscs.net/Documents/2016/final/f2016RTPSCS\\_PublicHealth.pdf](http://scagrtpscscs.net/Documents/2016/final/f2016RTPSCS_PublicHealth.pdf)

### ***Regional and Local Active Transportation Planning***

Active Transportation planning promotes bicycling and walking as a means to decrease auto dependency, reduce traffic congestion, facilitate development of new sidewalks and trails, and improve connectivity. Infrastructure that welcomes walking and biking as modes of transportation provides opportunity for increased physical activity and associated health benefits and contributes to an environment that is ultimately safer for those traveling by bicycle or on foot. Local and regional governments have expanded the level of planning and investment in active transportation. Some examples of regional and local active transportation planning throughout California are highlighted below:

#### Large/Urban MPO Examples:

##### *SCAG 2016 RTP/SCS*

Chapter 5 and the Active Transportation Appendix to the 2016 RTP/SCS, represents how the region plans to use active transportation to help meet these challenges over the next 25 years, including longer-trip strategies for commuters and active recreation, integrating active transportation with transit, short-trip strategies for utilitarian trips (shopping, school, local retail), and safety/encouragement. It presents the background, existing conditions, progress since the 2012 RTP/SCS, new strategies, and actions making it easier and safer to walk and bike in Southern California.

For more information see: <http://scagrtpscscs.net/Pages/FINAL2016RTPSCS.aspx>

##### *SANDAG's Active Transportation Grant Program (ATGP)*

The *TransNet* sales tax measure Extension Ordinance provides funding for two competitive grant programs that support local efforts to increase walking, biking, and transit usage throughout the region: the Smart Growth Incentive Program (SGIP) and the Active Transportation Grant Program (ATGP). The ATGP also is funded with Transit Development Act (TDA) funds.

The goal of the ATGP is to encourage local jurisdictions to plan and build facilities that promote multiple travel choices for residents and connectivity to transit, schools, retail centers, parks, work, and other community gathering places. The grant program also encourages local jurisdictions to provide bicycle parking, education, encouragement, and awareness programs that support pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure.

It is important to note that not all MPO's have local discretionary funding resources to develop and administer a program such as SANDAG's ATGP. More information on the ATGP is available at:

<http://www.sandag.org/index.asp?classid=12&projectid=491&fuseaction=projects.detail>

#### Small/Medium/Rural MPO Examples:

##### *Linking Tahoe Active Transportation Plan*

The Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization (TMPO) and Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) prepared the "Linking Tahoe Active Transportation Plan" (ATP). The ATP is a toolbox for planning, designing, constructing and maintaining a safe, comfortable and efficient roadway for users of all ages and abilities such as pedestrians, bicyclists, transit riders, motorists, commercial and emergency vehicles. The ATP helps plan a network that provides connectivity, improves safety, supports consistent project implementation and increases awareness. For more information visit: <http://www.trpa.org/transportation/plans-projects-and-programs/> and <http://www.trpa.org/ActiveTransportationPlan/>

##### *StanCOG Bicycle/Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC)*

The BPAC is one of the StanCOG Standing Committees. This committee, created in 2009, advises the Policy Board on bicycle and pedestrian-related issues. It reviews transportation projects and recommends planning efforts that enhance non-motorized transportation opportunities in the Stanislaus region. For more information visit: <http://www.stancoq.org/bpac-committee.shtm>

##### *Walk 'n' Bike Tulare County Active Transportation Plan*

The Tulare County Association of Governments (TCAG) has begun to develop the first Regional Active Transportation Plan (RATP) for the county, called "Walk 'n Bike Tulare County." The plan seeks to make walking and biking in Tulare County safer and more convenient. Most importantly, it will identify the highest priority pedestrian and bicycle improvements for the County and its eight cities for the next ten years, and will aim to position those projects to compete well for grant funds. Also, the plan will make up the pedestrian and bicycle component of the Tulare County Regional Transportation Plan. For more information visit: <http://www.tularecounty.ca.gov/rma/index.cfm/whats-going-on/walk-n-bike-tulare-county-regional-active-transportation-plan/>

## ***Local Government General Plans and Policies***

Local jurisdictions are instrumental partners in the preparation of the RTP/SCS and are vital to its successful implementation. Local governments have exclusive land use authority and general plans are the mechanism by which long range planning is conducted to provide for the public health and welfare of cities and counties within MPO regions. Local general plans serve as critical sources of information in the development of the RTP/SCS. The 2016 Draft General Plan Guidelines (GPG) prepared by the Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR) acknowledge this relationship and provides guidance on the relationship between the General Plan and regional plans.

The general plan development process has evolved to include elements beyond the seven mandated areas of land use, circulation, and housing, open space, air quality, safety, and noise – for example, elements dedicated to health and equity. Chapter 5 of the 2016 Draft General Plan Guidelines (GPG) prepared by the Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR) identifies the following health considerations for the General Plan development process:

1. Health and Economic Opportunity
2. A Changing Climate and Resiliency
3. Active Living and Recreation
4. Social Connection and Safety
5. Housing
6. Nutrition and Food Systems
7. Environmental Health; and
8. Health and Human Services

The GPG also provide guidance, strategies and approaches for:

1. Incorporating Health Considerations into General Plans
2. Innovative Partnerships and Collaboration
3. Sources of Support and Information for Health Considerations
4. Health Data and Mapping; and
5. OPR Recommended Policies

Chapter 6 of the GPG addresses Social Equity, Environmental Justice, and Community Resilience in the General Plan including relevant statutory requirements and definitions, examples of incorporating a social equity “lens” for the plan, government funding perspectives, data, mapping, and tools, examples of community engagement, incorporation of supportive policies and strategies for addressing community resilience.

Given the recent passage of [SB 1000](#) (Leyva, 2016), the GPG will be updated to provide guidance for local jurisdictions, who will be required to include an environmental justice element or environmental justice goals, policies, and objectives in other elements of the general plan. The General Plan process is distinct and separate from the RTP/SCS and is carried out by local agencies, however it serves as an important opportunity for engagement to address regional goals and the plans themselves are foundational documents for the RTP/SCS. MPOs are encouraged to collaborate closely with local jurisdiction long-range planning staff, and share data and resources where appropriate to facilitate local and regional policy considerations and investments that promote health, health equity, and environmental justice in the RTP/SCS.

General Plan Guidelines information is available at:

[https://www.opr.ca.gov/s\\_generalplanguidelines.php](https://www.opr.ca.gov/s_generalplanguidelines.php)

Additional resources and information regarding local government policies and programs that promote health are available through the “Healthy Eating Active Living” (HEAL) campaign:

<http://www.healcitiescampaign.org/http://www.healcitiescampaign.org/toolkit.html>

## **Programs**

### ***Collaboration with Non-Transportation Agencies***

Data development and technical analyses to consider public health and health equity in the RTP are very resource intensive and are often beyond the fiscal reach of small and rural agencies. One practical and non-resource intensive approach MPOs can use to understand regional public health and health equity issues is to engage in focused consultation with the local public health community and county public health departments, representatives from local school districts, community based organizations, and other non-transportation agencies. This type of outreach can yield valuable insight regarding identifying regional needs, opportunities for greatest impact, areas of existing community and decision-maker support as well as alignment with current and emerging policy direction and funding programs. This consultation should happen early in the development of the RTP/SCS to ensure that feedback from public health practitioners can be meaningfully integrated into the RTP/SCS, especially any data analysis, identification of performance measures, scenario modeling and selection of transportation projects for funding.

#### **Urban MPO Example:**

##### ***Public Health in Southern California:***

To address public health more broadly in its planning process, SCAG has established a Public Health Subcommittee, a Public Health Workgroup, and developed a Public Health Work Plan:

- The Public Health Subcommittee, outlined recommendations addressing the promotion of active transportation, enhancement of public health data, and engagement in collaborations.
- In accordance with the recommendations of the Public Health Subcommittee, SCAG formed a Public Health Workgroup to collaborate with regional stakeholders to develop a Work Plan of policy recommendations that further define SCAG's role in public health.
- For more information please visit the SCAG Public Health Program webpage: <http://www.scag.ca.gov/programs/Pages/Programs/PublicHealth.aspx>

The *Alliance for a Healthy Orange County* is an example of a successful partnership among various stakeholders to leverage resources and funding to promote positive public health outcomes. For more information visit:

<http://www.ochealthalliance.org/>

#### Small/Medium/Rural MPO Example:

The Shasta Regional Transportation Agency (SRTA) partners with public health organizations and agencies such as *Healthy Shasta* and the Shasta County Health and Human Services Agency in the development of the RTP, see the SRTA Public Participation Plan available at: <http://www.srta.ca.gov/166/Public-Participation>

#### National Examples:

##### *Health & Well Being in Regional Planning – Nashville, Tennessee:*

Developed in 2015, the Nashville MPO [Regional Transportation Plan \(RTP\)](#) increased its commitment to prioritizing transportation projects that improve health. Through the endorsed goals and objectives for the RTP, the MPO is committed to helping local communities grow in a healthy and sustainable way by:

- Aligning transportation decisions with economic development initiatives, land use planning, and open space conservation efforts.
- Integrating healthy community design strategies and promote active transportation to improve the public health outcomes of the built environment.
- Encouraging the deployment of context-sensitive solutions to ensure that community values are not sacrificed for a mobility improvement.
- Incorporating the arts and creative place-making into planning and public works projects to foster innovative solutions and to enhance the sense of place and belonging.
- Pursuing solutions that promote social equity and contain costs for transportation and housing.
- Minimizing the vulnerability of transportation assets to extreme weather events.

The three major strategies to achieve these outcomes are:

- Fund and implement the Regional Vision for Mass Transit
- Develop active transportation options for walkable communities

- Reinvest in strategic roadway corridors

The MPO also updated the scoring criteria used to evaluate projects. 80 of the 100 points help to ensure that projects are prioritized around improving health by increasing physical activity, improving air quality and reducing crashes for all modes. In addition, projects were evaluated for location within Health Priority Areas, which are defined by areas with high rates of at least three of the following: low income, unemployed, carless and populations over age.

By prioritizing active transportation facilities such as transit, sidewalks and bikeway, and placing these facilities in areas where they are most needed, the MPO is working to using transportation as a prevention strategy to improve health and prevent disease. For more information, see the Plan's website:

[http://www.nashvillempo.org/regional\\_plan/health/](http://www.nashvillempo.org/regional_plan/health/)

#### *Health in Transportation Planning - Puget Sound, Washington Regional Council*

[VISION 2040](#), the region's long-range growth management, economic and transportation strategy, calls for a transportation system that creates more travel choices while preserving environmental quality and open space. Health is featured prominently in VISION 2040's multicounty planning policies. PSRC works with regional partners to discover how health outcomes in VISION 2040 can better be achieved.

VISION 2040's triple bottom line (people, prosperity, and planet) is viewed by the public health partners as recognizing the link between a healthy environment, healthy economy, and healthy people. In addition to continuing PSRC's interest in safety, VISION 2040 calls out other health-related topics, including the built environment and health, air and water pollution from vehicles, and chronic diseases related to exposure to pollutants, physical inactivity and lack of access to healthy foods. In addition, the plan calls for ensuring mobility choices and minimizing negative impacts for disadvantaged populations and people with special needs.

For more information, see the Plan's website:

<http://www.psrc.org/transportation/bikeped/health-in-transportation-planning/>

#### ***Affordable Housing***

The California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) reviews and certifies the General Plan Housing Elements of local jurisdictions that are responsible for the siting and permitting of affordable housing. MPOs can serve as a forum for regional discussion regarding housing affordability to identify data, tools, and services that could be provided to local partners.

### Large/Urban MPO Example:

#### *SCAG Regional Housing Summit and 2016 RTP/SCS*

In October 2016 SCAG, in partnership with numerous stakeholders, held a Regional Housing Summit. The Summit provided a forum to discuss critical housing issues facing Southern California and the entire state including: the chronic shortage of housing and a lack of housing affordability throughout California; the fact that major institutions, employers, and startups cite lack of housing options as a serious impediment to recruiting and retaining talent; the impact of housing affordability as a critical challenge to local, regional, and Statewide economies, particularly as people from all income groups are increasingly frustrated with the lack of affordable options to rent or buy and instead opt to develop their careers in more affordable areas.

The Summit discussed solutions and strategies for decision-makers to build housing in their local communities. For more information please visit:

<http://www.scag.ca.gov/SiteAssets/HousingSummit/index.html>

Additionally, SCAG discussed Housing Affordability and Economic Impacts in the 2016 RTP SCS Public Health Appendix:

[http://scagrtpscscs.net/Documents/2016/final/f2016RTPSCS\\_PublicHealth.pdf](http://scagrtpscscs.net/Documents/2016/final/f2016RTPSCS_PublicHealth.pdf)

#### *Calling the Bay Area Home: Tackling the Affordable Housing and Displacement Challenge*

This forum was jointly held in February 2016 by the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) to facilitate a timely and important dialogue among a diverse array of stakeholders on the role that Bay Area local governments and regional agencies — as well as the state and federal governments — can play in addressing skyrocketing housing costs and the accompanying displacement of long-time residents. Held in Oakland, the forum brought together Bay Area housing and transportation policymakers, city planners, community and business leaders, housing developers and advocates. For more information please see: <http://mtc.ca.gov/whats-happening/news/recap-calling-bay-area-home-tackling-affordable-housing-and-displacement>

#### ***Interagency Consultation Process: Near-Road Air Quality Considerations for MPOs***

The association between respiratory and other health effects and proximity to high traffic roadways is addressed in ARB's Air Quality and Land Use Handbook. Diesel exhaust and other vehicle emissions, known as mobile source air toxics (MSATs), are associated with many diseases. "Sensitive land uses," including residences, schools, daycare centers, playgrounds, and medical facilities, deserve special attention because children, pregnant women, the elderly, and those with existing health problems are especially vulnerable to the effects of air pollution. Agencies participating in the interagency consultation process are encouraged to work closely with transportation project sponsors to ensure that siting and design decisions consider MSAT health risk and



exposure reduction near sensitive land uses. Pollutant exposure reduction strategies for projects can be an important preventative action.

ARB's Air Quality and Land Use Handbook is available at:

<https://www.arb.ca.gov/ch/landuse.htm>

Examples of near-road pollutant reduction strategies are included in the General Plan Guidelines update, at [https://www.opr.ca.gov/s\\_generalplanguidelines.php](https://www.opr.ca.gov/s_generalplanguidelines.php).

### ***Near-Road Air Quality Analysis and Mitigation***

While transportation agencies must conduct analysis of the air quality impacts of their proposed projects through the NEPA or CEQA processes, the RTP planning process also offers an opportunity for MPOs to consider the cumulative near-roadway air quality impacts of the existing transportation system as well as potential impacts of new transportation projects on sensitive lands uses. An example of this type of analysis is the “Emissions Impacts Along Freeways and Highly Traveled Corridors” that SCAG included in the Environmental Justice Appendix of its 2016/2040 RTP. This analysis looked at the emissions exposure in areas within 500 feet of freeways and high volume roads in the SCAG region, and cross-referenced this information with demographic information about people residing in those areas to determine potential environmental justice impacts. SCAG also included in this Appendix an “Environmental Justice Toolbox” that included examples of potential mitigation for air quality impacts along freeways and heavily traveled corridors, and potential mitigation for public health impacts that transportation agencies could use as mitigation options for project impacts.

### ***Bicycle and Pedestrian Non-Infrastructure Programs***

Non-infrastructure programs that promote public health, especially safe walking and biking, are just as essential as infrastructure projects that improve the built environment. Many people are uncomfortable or unfamiliar with how to navigate their communities on foot or bike, or feel unsafe doing so. Non-infrastructure programs are also essential to reducing greenhouse gas emissions because they make users more comfortable and familiar with how to walk and bike, thereby taking more cars and school buses off the road. Programs such as Safe Routes to School, bike safety education programs and Vision Zero are some examples of non-infrastructure programs that can advance public health in the RTP.

#### ***Safe Routes to School***

The Safe Routes to School movement is focused around six “E”s: engineering, education, encouragement, enforcement, evaluation and equity. The first E, engineering, is focused on infrastructure projects that improve the built environment around schools. This is of particular importance in the RTP process given its focus on identifying transportation projects for funding. The second and third Es are the heart of the non-

infrastructure work with Safe Routes to School, and focus on getting more children to understand how to walk and bike safely to school and in their communities, and have fun doing it. Enforcement focuses on making sure existing traffic safety laws are enforced, and partnering with law enforcement and regulatory agencies to create safer environments for walking and bicycling. Evaluation looks at how effective the overall Safe Routes to School efforts are at increasing walking and bicycling. Finally, equity focuses on ensuring that students of all backgrounds and abilities can walk and bike safely, with a particular focus on disadvantaged communities, where there are often higher rates of students walking and biking, as well as higher rates of injuries and fatalities.

Safe Routes to School non-infrastructure efforts can be integrated into RTPs in several ways. First, MPOs can create Regional Safe Routes to School Plans that identify strategies for increasing walking and bicycling to school across the region. These plans would identify routes that are safe and convenient for walking and bicycling, as well as infrastructure improvements that could improve the commute for students making these trips. The plans would then be a resource when MPOs make decisions about where to prioritize transportation funding. Second, MPOs can integrate Safe Routes to School into the active transportation and complete streets sections of their RTPs, identifying strategies to increase walking and bicycling and improve safety as part of the overall active transportation goals. Third, Safe Routes to School can be a primary strategy to improve public health and health equity, because they focus on children and future generations living within the region.

Safe Routes to School is a mechanism to promote physical activity and thereby reduce obesity. It can also be a land use consideration in the SCS process, since the location of schools is a primary driver of how many students can walk or bike instead of being driven in a car or school bus. Safe Routes to School can also be a part of VMT reduction strategies, since around 10-14% of morning congestion is attributable to cars and buses driving children to school. Finally, MPOs can create distinct Safe Routes to School funding programs to allocate resources to communities and schools to run Safe Routes to School education and encouragement activities, as well as infrastructure improvements. It is important to note that many regions do not have the financial resources to undertake such a program; however, MPOs are encouraged to strategically partner and pursue discretionary funding from the Active Transportation Program or other sources to develop non-infrastructure plans and programs to address regional health and health equity issues. Many more strategies can be found in the Safe Routes to School National Partnership's Primer for Regional Governments.

#### *Safety Education Programs.*

*Vision Zero.* "Vision Zero" is a campaign to reduce the number of pedestrian deaths to zero. It involves a culture change to reclaim streets for people rather than cars, and relies on significant collaboration across agencies, organizations, and community residents to work towards improving street safety. Vision Zero campaigns are an emerging non-infrastructure strategy; as of this writing, no Vision Zero initiatives have been adopted by an MPO. SCAG is working in partnership to support the City of Los Angeles' Vision Zero campaign by sharing data, tracking efforts, assisting in the pursuit of funding, and including supportive language in the RTP. This is an example of one way

in which an MPO could support local jurisdictions efforts in this area.  
<http://visionzero.lacity.org/>

### Urban MPO Examples

#### *SCAG “Go Human”*

“Go Human” is a community outreach and advertising campaign with the goals of reducing traffic collisions in Southern California and encouraging people to walk and bike more. The program seeks to create safer and healthier cities through education, advocacy, information sharing and events that help residents re-envision their neighborhoods. Go Human is a collaboration between SCAG and the health departments and transportation commissions from the counties of Imperial, Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino, and Ventura. Go Human was launched with a \$2.3 million grant from the 2014 Active Transportation Program.

#### *MTC One Bay Area Grant Program*

The MTC One Bay Area Grant (OBAG2) Program provides specific funding opportunities for jurisdictions in the nine-county Bay Area region to invest in Safe Routes to School projects. Under OBAG2, MTC provides \$5 million per year, distributed to each of the nine counties based on school enrollment for Safe Routes to School infrastructure projects and Non-Infrastructure programs. Each County CMA determines the details on how the SRTS funds are spent. It should be noted that this example is unique to a large urbanized MPO with substantial discretionary funding sources. Not all regions have the fiscal resources to undertake this type of program

### Rural MPO Example:

#### *Healthy Shasta*

Shasta Regional Transportation Agency collaborates with the “Healthy Shasta” partnership to promote healthy and active living among north state residents through increased biking and walking. For more information please visit: <http://healthyshasta.org/>

### ***Complete Streets Programs***

The term “Complete Streets” refers to a transportation network that is planned, designed, constructed, operated and maintained to provide safe mobility for all users, including bicyclists, pedestrians, transit and rail riders, commercial vehicles and motorists appropriate to the function and context of the facility.

MPOs should encourage all jurisdictions and agencies within the region to ensure that their circulation elements and street and road standards, including planning, design, construction, operations, and maintenance procedures address the needs of all users. Streets, roads and highways should also be safe for convenient travel in a manner that is suitable within the context of Complete Streets. To the maximum extent feasible, MPO funded transportation system projects, corresponding Complete Street facilities, and improvements should meet the needs in project areas to maximize connectivity, convenience and safety for all users.

### Large/Urban MPO Examples:

#### *SANDAG Complete Streets Policies*

The SANDAG Board of Directors adopted a [Regional Complete Streets Policy](http://www.sandag.org/index.asp?classid=12&projectid=521&fuseaction=projects.detail) in December 2014. The policy defines complete streets as it will be used to guide SANDAG in its role as an implementer of regional transportation projects. The policy includes implementation action items to provide the tools, training and procedures necessary to ensure all projects implemented by SANDAG consider local complete streets initiatives and accommodate the needs of all travel modes: <http://www.sandag.org/index.asp?classid=12&projectid=521&fuseaction=projects.detail>

#### *MTC Complete Streets Policies*

MTC's Complete Streets policy requires jurisdictions that wish to be eligible for One Bay Area Grant funding to update its general plan circulation element to include Complete Street elements, or pass a policy resolution with nine specified elements. Essentially all of the Bay Area's 101 jurisdictions have done so over the last few years.

#### *Taking Back the Streets and Sidewalks Report*

Many aspects of Complete Streets policies also contribute to achieving the tenets of community violence prevention through infrastructure design. Taking Back the Streets and Sidewalks Report can serve as a reference for those in the planning community working on violence prevention. The report examines ways in which Safe Routes to School and community safety efforts overlap and complement each other. The report primarily focuses on approaches to support personal safety for children and teens during the trip to and from school, but broader community strategies are also discussed in the course of providing background and exploring more comprehensive solutions to violence in communities. The report's overall goal is to increase the safety and health of children and youth, and ensure that communities become more equitable places. The report is available at: <http://saferoutespartnership.org/resources/report/taking-back-streets-and-sidewalks>

### Small/Medium/Rural MPO Examples

#### *Linking Tahoe: Active Transportation Plan – Complete Streets Resource Guide*

This appendix presents an overview of bicycle and pedestrian facility designs, based on appropriate Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices and Highway Design Manuals, and is supplemented by national best practices developed by FHWA and the National Association of City Transportation Officials, as well as state standards and Tahoe-specific design guidelines. The appendix is intended to provide readers and project designers with an understanding of the facility types that are proposed in the Plan, and with specific treatments that are recommended or required region-wide. This appendix also acts as a stand-alone document for implementing agencies to use as a reference guide for designing projects that provide for all roadway user mobility and safety. For more information see: [http://tahoempower.org/activetransportationplan/docs/appendices/Appendix%20A Complete e%20Street%20Resource%20Guide.pdf](http://tahoempower.org/activetransportationplan/docs/appendices/Appendix%20A%20Complete%20Street%20Resource%20Guide.pdf)

## ***Strengthening Stakeholder Engagement in Communities Affected by Health Inequities***

MPOs can strengthen stakeholder engagement in communities most affected by health inequities by identifying and proactively seeking the input of these households and by making meetings as accessible as possible. Engagement strategies may include:

- Proactively working with and/or providing financial support (if feasible) to community-based and membership organizations across the region to help engage low-income residents and residents of color in the public process and to jointly plan public workshops or other engagement opportunities.
- Forming an advisory group on environmental justice, social equity and/or disadvantaged communities that includes policy and community-based organizations that are focused on social equity in the region to provide feedback throughout the RTP process.
- Creating resident advisory committees or roles within existing committees with decision-making authority and identify opportunities for disadvantaged communities to serve as representatives on decision-making bodies.
- Ensuring that community residents have the opportunity to deliberate together to achieve consensus on their most pressing needs and recommendations.
- Creating a feedback loop to provide community members information about how their input was included in any drafts and reasons for including/excluding the input;
- Ensuring that there is agreement between residents and the local planning authority about what community engagement includes.
- Educating and building capacity of community members on issues such as data, evaluation, storytelling, and mentoring community members new to the process.
- Ensuring Meetings are Convenient and Accessible:
  - ✓ Hold multiple public meetings at times and locations that allow a diverse range of individuals and organizations, including communities with various family and work schedules, to attend such as meetings in the evening and on the weekends.
  - ✓ Consider holding meetings at public facilities such as libraries, community centers, or neighborhood organizations that people are already familiar with and which are convenient to other destinations they may have to go before or after the meeting.
  - ✓ Avoid holding public meetings during the day if feedback from the community is sought.
  - ✓ Avoid government office buildings that require photo ID and security to enter.
  - ✓ Ensure that interpreters are available when holding meetings in communities with a large population of people with English as a second language or who do not speak English at all.
  - ✓ Translate materials, including electronic communications and invitations, to Spanish and other languages where appropriate.
  - ✓ Provide childcare, food, and other amenities, or resource local community groups to do so.

- Adding to the meeting agendas of neighborhood/community based organizations to facilitate a meeting where residents will be available, providing resources to the organization to assist.
- Using meeting locations within access to public transportation, walking and biking routes in addition to parking when selecting a facility. Many times agencies choose locations based on access to parking and busy routes like freeways, which are not as convenient for people who depend on public transportation or other modes. Neighborhood and community based organizations and schools may let you use their meeting space.
- Considering neutral professional facilitation of public meetings to manage conflict and keep the meetings running on time.
- As part of public process, providing materials ahead of time and sharing draft work product.
- Public participation should also include ability to access underlying data on populations (household and person files) and travel patterns (trip lists with time and distances of trip segments) to statistically describe the baseline and alternative scenarios by mode and other characteristics. This approach may better address specific questions of the public and complement limited analytic resources of MPOs.
- Expanding the list of potential partners to include: schools, the faith community, agriculture and food hubs, local business or chambers of commerce, health providers and public health sectors, funders/philanthropy, academia, and environmental health/justice advocates, libraries, law enforcement, parks and recreation, and the technology industry.
- Using a community health worker or promotoras model to identify resident leaders.
- Using facilitators with experience in race and power inequities at community meetings.
- Working with community-based and membership organizations across the region to jointly plan public workshops on the RTP, especially the Title VI and Environmental Justice analyses. They know the communities impacted by the RTP transportation projects and can assist with recruiting residents, businesses and other affected stakeholders. Be proactive in asking for their participation instead of waiting for them to come to you.
- Ensuring meetings are attended by MPO decision makers in addition to MPO staff.

#### MPO Example:

##### *FresnoCOG Community-Based Outreach Program*

To help ensure diverse and direct input from all populations especially those with the most potential to be affected by health inequities, Fresno Council of Governments (FresnoCOG) administers a “Community-Based Mini-Grant Outreach Program<sup>5</sup>,” which

---

<sup>5</sup> Administered as a contractual arrangement with community based consultants for outreach services that is subject to the federal procurement process. See:

[http://www.fresnocog.org/sites/default/files/publications/RTP/RTP\\_Mini\\_grant\\_app\\_Fresno\\_COG.pdf](http://www.fresnocog.org/sites/default/files/publications/RTP/RTP_Mini_grant_app_Fresno_COG.pdf)

competitively awards mini-grants (\$1,000 - \$3,000) to community-based organizations, schools, and other groups to conduct outreach to individuals not typically involved in the regional transportation planning process. The selected organizations conduct outreach activities such as organizing and tailoring meetings, customizing presentations materials, building trust and removing barriers to participation to secure public involvement from stakeholders in their communities and the populations they currently serve, engaging them in the planning process and generating feedback on the development of the RTP and SCS.

Additional statewide examples of stakeholder engagement strategies are also compiled in the following report developed by ClimatePlan:

[Leading the Way: Policies and Practices for Sustainable Communities](#)

### ***Programs that Serve Rural Transportation Needs***

The California Vanpool Authority (CalVans) is the lead agency in the Agricultural Industry Transportation Services (AITS) project which seeks to provide safe, reliable transportation for agricultural industry workers and to serve low-density rural areas and inter-county commuters. This multi-county partnership has grown to include 18 counties. The project is managed out of the Hanford office in Kings County with satellite offices in Ventura and Monterey. Approximately 450 vanpools provide transportation to farm workers traveling to one of many agricultural worksites within California and to Yuma and Imperial Valley in Arizona. For more information see: <http://www.calvans.org/>

Fresno COG Measure C Farmworker Vanpool Program provides vouchers to help farm laborers pay for their transportation to various job sites when they ride in an approved Farmworker Vanpool. For more information see: <http://www.fresnocog.org/measure-c-farmworker-vanpools-0>

### ***Promoting Public Transit Connectivity to Essential Destinations and Low Income Communities***

First-mile and last-mile connections to public transit are fundamentally important to providing access to essential destinations and increasing transit mode share which can contribute to improving public health outcomes through improved access to health care and services and enhancing active transportation opportunities.

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority developed a First and Last Mile Strategic Plan which identified strategies and potential funding sources for improving the areas surrounding transit stations to make it easier and safer for people to access them. More information regarding the plan is available at:

<https://www.metro.net/projects/countywide-planning/>

[http://media.metro.net/docs/First\\_Last\\_Mile\\_Strategic\\_Plan.pdf](http://media.metro.net/docs/First_Last_Mile_Strategic_Plan.pdf)

[http://media.metro.net/docs/sustainability\\_path\\_design\\_guidelines.pdf](http://media.metro.net/docs/sustainability_path_design_guidelines.pdf)



MPOs are encouraged to work with transit operators and local jurisdictions to address first mile-last mile connections. For example, SCAG served as a funding partner and provided technical assistance to LA Metro in the development of the First and Last Mile Strategic Plan referenced above.

Another mechanism by which MPOs can promote public transit connectivity is through RTP policies that promote Safe Routes to Transit. For example, SANDAG provided the following guiding language in Chapter 2 of the 2015 San Diego Forward RTP: Safe Routes to Transit projects can include bike and pedestrian access improvements at transit stations and within station areas, including improved access to nearby schools, jobs and commercial and residential areas. These projects can make walking or riding a bike between transit stops or stations safer and more comfortable. The projects can be built into future transit capital project or retrofitted into existing ones.

## **Public Health Planning Activities and Projects**

### ***Using a Health and Health Equity Lens in Decision-Making<sup>6</sup>***

Using a “health lens” is a systematic way of finding opportunities to improve health and equity and embed these principles in decision-making. The utilization of a health lens simply means providing evidence that allows people to consider the positive and negative health and equity consequences of their decisions during the decision-making process. It can be carried out at a high level to identify broad connections with health, or can address the potential adverse or beneficial health consequences of a policy or program at a more detailed level.

Analysis using a health lens can take many forms and the approach will vary depending on the circumstances. The choice between more or less structured analyses rests in many cases on resources, including availability of staff with appropriate skills, or funding to obtain such staff. One example of a more structured analysis is a Health Impact Assessment.

### ***Health Impact Assessment***

A Health Impact Assessment (HIA) is “a process that helps evaluate the potential health effects of a plan, project, or policy before it is built or implemented. HIA brings potential positive and negative public health impacts and considerations to the decision-making process for plans, projects, and policies that fall outside traditional public health arenas, such as transportation and land use. An HIA provides practical recommendations to increase positive health effects and minimize negative health effects.”<sup>7</sup>

The major steps in conducting an HIA include:

- Screening (identifying plan, project, or policy decisions for which an HIA would be useful).

---

<sup>6</sup> Rudolph, L., Caplan, J., Ben-Moshe, K., & Dillon, L. (2013). Health in All Policies: A Guide for State and Local Governments. Washington, DC and Oakland, CA: American Public Health Association and Public Health Institute.

<sup>7</sup> Centers for Disease Control & Prevention, <https://www.cdc.gov/healthyplaces/hia.htm>.



- Scoping (planning the HIA and identifying what health risks and benefits to consider).
- Assessment (identifying affected populations and quantifying health impacts of the decision).
- Recommendations (suggesting practical actions to promote positive health effects and minimize negative health effects).
- Reporting (presenting results to decision makers, affected communities, and other stakeholders).
- Monitoring and evaluation (determining the HIA's impact on the decision and health status).

Nationally, there are local and state laws that support the examination of health impacts in decision making and a few explicitly require the use of HIA. HIA is different from a public health assessment, a health risk assessment, and an environmental impact assessment. Learn more about the [different types of health assessments](#).

Resources on HIAs include:

Human Impact Partners, who have conducted many HIAs in California:

<http://www.humanimpact.org/>

U.S. Centers for Disease Control & Prevention:

<https://www.cdc.gov/healthyplaces/hia.htm>

World Health Organization: <http://www.who.int/hia/en/>

Pew Charitable Trusts, Health Impact Project:

<http://www.pewtrusts.org/en/projects/health-impact-project/health-impact-assessment>

American Planning Association, 2016. *The State of Health Impact Assessment in Planning*: <https://planning-org-uploaded-media.s3.amazonaws.com/document/State-of-Health-Impact-Assessment-in-Planning.pdf>

Examples:

Atlanta Regional Plan 2040 HIA (2012): This was the first-ever MPO to include a health impact assessment as part of its RTP development process:

<http://www.pewtrusts.org/en/multimedia/data-visualizations/2015/hia-map/state/georgia/atlanta-plan-2040>

Other case studies are available here:

<http://www.pewtrusts.org/en/projects/health-impact-project/health-impact-assessment/case-studies>

## **Data, Tools, and Metrics that Promote Health and Health Equity in RTPs**

While this is a dynamic and evolving policy area, research has demonstrated a clear connection between public health and transportation. Accordingly, the tools and strategies to promote health in transportation continue to be improved, and it is recommended that state, regional and local agencies all integrate the consideration of public health into their transportation and planning policies, programs, and projects as appropriate.

MPOs are encouraged to include strategies and policies in the RTP to obtain data and develop tools which would facilitate health and equity analysis and measurements. Agencies are also encouraged to build partnerships to leverage financial and technical resources as appropriate. Regions with limited resources, especially rural regions, may be best served by selecting a few high-priority strategies where there is greatest opportunity to affect performance metrics/outcomes over a larger geographic region, or taking a more comprehensive approach over a smaller, more focused geographical area. Appropriate scale is important for the effective application of resources to quantitatively address public health and health equity in the planning process.

### **Performance Measures/Metrics/Indicators for Health and Health Equity**

One critical opportunity through which health and equity considerations into an RTP is development of health related performance measures that can be used in comparing alternative scenarios. Extensive research and early applications have demonstrated that physical activity as measured through active transportation (i.e. minutes of walking and biking) can reap substantial public health benefits, in addition to other co-benefits such as reducing greenhouse gas emissions. Further, physical activity as measured by minutes of active transportation is also one of the easiest health impacts to measure using existing tools and methods. Activity Based Models can provide outputs of bicycle and pedestrian trips that serve as key inputs into health models (such as those listed above in the “Modeling Tools to Capture Health and Health Equity Impacts” section). Additionally, if and when MPOs evaluate specific projects and scenarios based on cost effectiveness, including increased active transportation per dollar invested, those projects that increase active transportation are found to have substantial, and sometime larger, monetary benefits compared with traditional transportation performance measure such as vehicles hours of delay.

The significant monetary benefit of increased physical activity is based on extensive evidence from the public health research that increasing active transportation and therefore physical activity reduces rates of colon cancer, breast cancer, lung cancer, respiratory disease, diabetes and dementia. These diseases are among the top causes of death in the United States.

Resources: Projects with health and transportation indicators:

- ✓ [USDOT Transportation and Health Tool](#)
- ✓ [CDPH Healthy Communities Data and Indicators Project \(HCI\)](#)
- ✓ [CDC: Community Health Status Indicators \(CHSI 2015\)](#)
- ✓ [California Health Disadvantage Index](#)
- ✓ [CalBRACE Climate Change and Health Vulnerability Indicators](#)  
(Anticipated release January 2017)

Resource: Report on how to incorporate health and equity performance measures:

- ✓ [Transportation 4 America: Planning for a Healthier Future](#)

Additionally, health departments, both at the local and state level, have access to a variety of other public health data sets (e.g. chronic disease rates, behavior risk factors), survey results (e.g. California Household Travel Survey), and peer reviewed literature. Health departments can also provide guidance on health data and in some cases may be able to assist with data analysis.

Examples of how large/urban MPO's have included public health and equity performance measurement in their RTPs:

SCAG 2016 RTP/SCS Performance Measures and Public Health Appendices:

[http://scagrtpscscs.net/Documents/2016/final/f2016RTPSCS\\_PerformanceMeasures.pdf](http://scagrtpscscs.net/Documents/2016/final/f2016RTPSCS_PerformanceMeasures.pdf)  
[http://scagrtpscscs.net/Documents/2016/final/f2016RTPSCS\\_PublicHealth.pdf](http://scagrtpscscs.net/Documents/2016/final/f2016RTPSCS_PublicHealth.pdf)

MTC adopted thirteen performance targets for Plan Bay Area 2040, the nine-county Bay Area's RTP/SCS. This plan is currently under development and is anticipated to be adopted by fall 2017. MTC conducted a project level cost/benefit analysis, as well as a qualitative assessment for each of the thirteen targets. Both scores, for cost/benefit and target results, informed the selection of projects to include in the scenario analysis process. For more information see: <http://planbayarea.org/the-plan/plan-details.html>

Appendix N of SANDAG's Regional Transportation Plan describes Performance Measures which include various public health indicators (benefits [7E and 7F] and a burden measure [9]). The appendix is located here:

[http://www.sdforward.com/pdfs/RP\\_final/AppendixN-EvaluatingthePerformanceoftheTransportationNetwork.pdf](http://www.sdforward.com/pdfs/RP_final/AppendixN-EvaluatingthePerformanceoftheTransportationNetwork.pdf)

## **Modeling Tools to Capture Health and Health Equity Impacts**

This section provides background information on some modeling tools currently being used to capture health and equity impacts in the regional transportation planning process. It is important to note that these tools are dynamic and continually evolving. The tools below are described for informational purposes only and MPO's are encouraged to use the most regionally appropriate tools and approach, taking into

consideration regional demographics, as well as the technical and fiscal capacity of their agency. It is also important to note that models capturing the impacts of public health are oftentimes only as good as the inputs provided by regional travel demand models. **Chapter 3** of the RTP Guidelines provides technical detail and additional planning practice examples regarding travel models used in RTP development.

### Health Economic Assessment Tool (HEAT)

The Health Economic Assessment Tool (HEAT) was developed by the World Health Organization (WHO) to assist in economic assessment of the health benefits of walking or bicycling. The tool estimates the value of reduced mortality that results from specified amounts of walking or bicycling. HEAT is best used for planning new bicycle or walking infrastructure, evaluating the reduced mortality from past and/or current levels of bicycling or walking, and providing input for health impact assessments (HIA). The data needed to run HEAT are: an estimate of how many people are walking or bicycling, an estimate of the average time spent walking or bicycling, mortality rate, and a value of statistical life number. The tool is designed for adult populations between the ages of 20-65 years old due to the fact that the model is designed to be used for activities such as commuting. The segment of the population age 65 and older is considered to be retirement age and not participating in a regular commuting and walking/bicycling routine.

Uses	<p>HEAT estimates the economic value of reduced mortality rates from increased walking and bicycling for a given population. The model is not calibrated to any country or region so the results should be used appropriately.</p> <p>The online tool models the effects of cycling or walking on the levels of physical activity in a population group. Based on these estimates, the tool estimates the mortality benefits from current levels of cycling or walking for a neighborhood or city.</p> <p>Results from the tool can provide input into more comprehensive cost-benefit analyses, or prospective health impact assessments: for instance, to estimate the mortality benefits from achieving national targets to increase cycling or walking, or to illustrate potential cost consequences of a decline in current levels of cycling or walking.</p>
Data Inputs Needed	Average duration of trip by walking or biking (in minutes) per day/week/month; and number of adults below the age of 65 years in the population.
Lowest Applicable Level of Geography	Population size across any geography
Resources/Contact	<a href="http://www.euro.who.int/en/health-topics/environment-and-health/Transport-and-health/activities/guidance-and-tools/health-economic-assessment-tool-heat-for-cycling-and-walking">http://www.euro.who.int/en/health-topics/environment-and-health/Transport-and-health/activities/guidance-and-tools/health-economic-assessment-tool-heat-for-cycling-and-walking</a>

## Examples/Case Studies of HEAT

MTC adopted thirteen performance targets for Plan Bay Area 2040, the nine-county Bay Area's RTP/SCS. This plan is currently under development and is anticipated to be adopted by fall 2017. MTC conducted a project level cost/benefit analysis, as well as a qualitative assessment for each of the thirteen targets. Both scores, for cost/benefit and target results, informed the selection of projects to include in the scenario analysis process.

For the health target (reduce adverse health impacts by 10%), MTC used the HEAT tool to estimate the relative health benefits or impacts of each project on the region's population. Given that MTC evaluated around 80 different projects, this simple tool allowed for a quantitative assessment of potential health outcomes in the region.

Small MPOs and rural agencies with minimal financial and technical resources may find this tool helpful for modeling health outcomes.

Here is a link to the World Health Organization's examples of the use of HEAT for cycling:

<http://www.euro.who.int/en/health-topics/environment-and-health/Transport-and-health/activities/guidance-and-tools/health-economic-assessment-tool-heat-for-cycling-and-walking/examples-of-applications-of-heat>.

## Integrated Transport and Health Impact Model (ITHIM)

The Integrated Transport and Health Impact Model (ITHIM) was developed at the University of Cambridge, England, in 2009. ITHIM is a scenario-based health risk analysis tool that models three health pathways related to travel behavior: physical activity from active transportation, road traffic injuries, and Particulate Matter (PM) 2.5 concentrations. Health outcomes are expressed in terms of change in deaths and years of life-shortening and of living with disability from major chronic diseases and road traffic injuries. ITHIM has 15 inputs aggregated from travel and health surveys, travel demand and air pollution models, mortality and disease data, and road traffic injuries. ITHIM is a free, open-source, spreadsheet tool (Excel) with detailed technical documentation for use, calibration, and integration with travel demand models. Extensions are available for cost-benefit, equity, and downscaling. Analysis can be conducted at the county or regional scale.

The California version of ITHIM was co-developed in 2011 by the California Department of Public Health and the University of Cambridge with assistance from the University of California, Davis. ITHIM has been calibrated for the major MPO regions of California (MTC, SACOG, SCAG, SANDAG, San Joaquin Valley), incorporating the latest data from the California Household Transportation Survey 2012.

ITHIM has been field-tested on behalf or in collaboration with several California MPOs. These include SANDAG, MTC, and FresnoCOG. In carrying out this work, interfaces between MPO travel demand models and ITHIM have been created. The use-cases of ITHIM include quantifying MPO preferred and alternative scenarios during SCS

development. At MTC, where a specific health goal was set for project performance, ITHIM was used to quantify the health benefits of achieving that goal. MTC has also used ITHIM to assess health and equity impacts of scenarios on high and low income groups. ITHIM has examined the health impacts of scenarios using backcasted goals for physical activity based on the U.S. Surgeon General's recommendation for daily physical activity for adults and for specific carbon reductions. UC Davis has participated in local implementations of ITHIM in Fresno and Sacramento counties with community-based organizations.

Outside of California, ITHIM has been in routine use since 2012 in Oregon by the Oregon state health department and the Oregon Department of Transportation (GreenStep model). In collaboration with the Centers for Disease Control, the Nashville, TN MPO implemented ITHIM as part of their 2013 regional transportation plan update. Different types of technical and development support are being provided by the California Department of Public Health, other state health departments, MPOs that have implemented ITHIM, and an international ITHIM developer's group, which include academic and independent researchers.

The following table provides general information and resources for ITHIM:

Uses	Estimates how changes in active and motorized travel across a population will impact premature mortality, chronic disease, and road traffic injuries, due to changes in physical activity, traffic-related fine particulate pollution, and traffic collisions. The model monetizes prevented deaths and disability using two different methods: cost of illness and value of a statistical life
Data Inputs Needed	ITHIM uses regional data from health surveys, traffic collision databases, vital statistics, and the results of regional models for travel demand, vehicle emissions, and air pollution.
Lowest Applicable Level of Geography	The model has been calibrated for the major regions in California that correspond to the counties served by MTC, SCAG, SANDAG, and SACOG. There is a Fresno County and San Joaquin Valley versions. Regional results can be geographically downscaled to counties and city level. The model is not yet suitable for project level assessments, but has used output of travel demand models to assess equity of health outcomes in economically disadvantaged subpopulations within regions.
Resources/Contact	<a href="#">CA Dept. of Public Health - Office of Health Equity</a> cchep@cdph.ca.gov

### California Statewide Public Health Assessment Model (C-PHAM)

The California Statewide Public Health Assessment Model (C-PHAM) was developed by Urban Design 4 Health (UD4H). It is a neighborhood/city scale public health scenario modeling tool for California's five major urban centers: San Francisco Bay Area, Los Angeles, San Diego, Sacramento, and Fresno. C-PHAM can be run from the land-use matrix developed using the Urban Footprint Scenario Planning tool, allowing quick approximations of public health co-benefit from land use changes suggested through local or MPO planning processes. C-PHAM is an evolving tool and currently the model does not include potential health risks from air pollution exposure and potential bicycle/pedestrian injury. At present, the model uses adult data but expansion to include the demographic cohorts of children and seniors is being pursued.

Uses	Provides rough, small area estimates of health benefits from land use and transportation changes.
Data Inputs Needed	-Urban Footprint Scenario Planning model forecasted land use changes OR -Minutes of Transportation-related physical activity in baseline and plan/project scenario.
Lowest Applicable Level of Geography	-ballpark estimates can be provided at a very small (neighborhood level) geography. Results are more reliable at larger (zip code) geographies.
Resources/Contacts	<a href="mailto:info@ud4h.com">Urban Design 4 Health info@ud4h.com</a>

## Key Terms

- a. **Community Resilience:** A measure of the sustained ability of a community to utilize available resources to respond to, withstand, and recover from adverse situations<sup>8</sup>.
- b. **Disadvantaged Community:** See Vulnerable Populations definition. Disadvantaged Community refers to communities that are currently experiencing or have experienced historic disadvantage due to income, race, ethnicity, language, residency status, environment, education, or other indicators of social status. Today in California, the term Disadvantaged Community is being used by state, regional, and some local agencies to allocate funding.
- c. **SB 535 Disadvantaged Community:** Senate Bill 535 (De Leon, Chapter 830, Statutes of 2012) added Section 39711 of the Health and Safety Code which specifies that Disadvantaged Communities are identified based on geographic, socioeconomic, public health, and environmental hazard criteria, and may include, but are not limited to, either of the following:
  - (a) Areas disproportionately affected by environmental pollution and other hazards that can lead to negative public health effects, exposure, or environmental degradation.
  - (b) Areas with concentrations of people that are of low income, high unemployment, low levels of homeownership, high rent burden, sensitive populations, or low levels of educational attainment.
- d. **Displacement:** Displacement manifests itself in many forms from physical (i.e. demolition, evictions or service disruption) to economic (i.e. rent increases). Displacement can result from gentrification when neighborhoods become out of reach for people or can occur at earlier stages through disinvestment, increasing vacancies and facilitating demographic turnover<sup>9</sup>. The detrimental effects of displacement include relocation costs, longer commutes, disruptions to health care, loss of community support networks, and homelessness. All of this impacts mental and psychological well-being<sup>10</sup>.
- e. **Environmental Justice:** Efforts to identify and address, as appropriate, disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of programs, policies, and activities on low-income and minority populations. Environmental justice at FHWA means *“identifying and addressing disproportionately high and adverse effects of the agency's programs, policies, and activities on minority and low-income populations to achieve an equitable distribution of benefits and burdens. This includes the full and fair participation by all potentially affected communities in the transportation decision-making process.”*
- f. **Gentrification:** Gentrification is generally described as that which happens in neighborhoods that are seeing decreases in the number of low-income people and

---

<sup>8</sup> Community Resilience. RAND Corporation. <http://www.rand.org/topics/community-resilience.html>

<sup>9</sup> <http://www.urbandisplacement.org/resources>

<sup>10</sup> “Development without Displacement: Resisting Gentrification in the Bay Area.” Causa Justa :: Just Cause and Alameda County Public Health Department, Place Matters Team. August 2014.



people of color due to an influx of high-income individuals and families who are willing and able to pay higher rents.<sup>11</sup>

- g. **Health:** Refers to physical, mental, and oral health.<sup>12</sup>
- h. **Health Equity:** Efforts to ensure that all people have full and equal access to opportunities that enable them to lead healthy lives.<sup>13</sup>
- i. **Health Inequity:** Disparities in health that are not only unnecessary and avoidable but, in addition, are considered unfair and unjust.<sup>14</sup> Health inequities are rooted in social and environmental injustices that make some population groups more vulnerable to poor health than other groups.<sup>15</sup>
- j. **Healthy Communities:** A healthy community as described by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Healthy People 2010 report is one that continuously creates and improves both its physical and social environments, helping people to support one another in aspects of daily life and to develop to their fullest potential. Healthy places are those designed and built to improve the quality of life for all people who live, work, worship, learn, and play within their borders -- where every person is free to make choices amid a variety of healthy, available, accessible, and affordable options.<sup>16</sup>
- k. **Social Equity:** The just and fair inclusion into a society in which all can participate, prosper, and reach their full potential<sup>17</sup>.
- l. **Vulnerable Population:** Includes the economically disadvantaged, racial and ethnic minorities, the uninsured, low-income children, the elderly, the homeless, those with human immunodeficiency virus (HIV), and those with other chronic health conditions, including severe mental illness<sup>18</sup>.

---

<sup>11</sup> "Development without Displacement: Resisting Gentrification in the Bay Area." Causa Justa :: Just Cause and Alameda County Public Health Department, Place Matters Team. August 2014.

<sup>12</sup> "The Landscape of Opportunity: Cultivating Health Equity in California." California Pan-Ethnic Health Network. October 2016.

<sup>13</sup> <http://www.cdph.ca.gov/programs/Documents/CDPHOHEDisparityReportAug2015.pdf>

<sup>14</sup> "The Concepts and Principles of Equity and Health." World Health Organization Regional Office for Europe. 2000.

<sup>15</sup> "The Concepts and Principles of Equity and Health." World Health Organization Regional Office for Europe. 2000.

<sup>16</sup> "Health and Healthy Places." U.S. Centers for Disease Control & Prevention.  
<https://www.cdc.gov/healthyplaces/about.htm>

<sup>17</sup> PolicyLink, Equity Definition: <http://www.policylink.org/about>

<sup>18</sup> "Vulnerable Populations: Who Are They?" American Journal of Managed Care, 2006.  
<http://www.ajmc.com/journals/supplement/2006/2006-11-vol12-n13suppl/nov06-2390ps348-s352>

## Resources and Citations

[http://sgc.ca.gov/pdf/HiAP\\_Task\\_Force\\_Report- Dec 2010.pdf](http://sgc.ca.gov/pdf/HiAP_Task_Force_Report-Dec_2010.pdf)

[https://www.cdph.ca.gov/programs/Documents/Healthy\\_Community\\_Indicators\\_Core\\_list10-17-14Table1-5.pdf](https://www.cdph.ca.gov/programs/Documents/Healthy_Community_Indicators_Core_list10-17-14Table1-5.pdf)

[https://www.cdph.ca.gov/Documents/CDPH\\_Healthy\\_Community\\_Indicators1pager5-16-12.pdf](https://www.cdph.ca.gov/Documents/CDPH_Healthy_Community_Indicators1pager5-16-12.pdf)

<https://www.cdph.ca.gov/programs/Pages/HealthyCommunityIndicators.aspx#TechInfo>

<https://planning-org-uploaded-media.s3.amazonaws.com/document/State-of-Health-Impact-Assessment-in-Planning.pdf>

<https://www.transportation.gov/transportation-health-tool>

<https://www.transportation.gov/mission/health/strategies-interventions-policies>

<http://phasocal.org/ca-hdi/>

[http://scagrtpscs.net/Documents/2016/proposed/pf2016RTPSCS\\_PublicHealth032816.pdf](http://scagrtpscs.net/Documents/2016/proposed/pf2016RTPSCS_PublicHealth032816.pdf)

<http://t4america.org/docs/planning-for-a-healthier-future-0616.pdf>

<http://www.transformca.org/sites/default/files/Healthy%20RTP%20-%20FULL%20-%202013-02-19%20Color.pdf>

<http://narc.org/wp-content/uploads/Public-Health-and-Transportation-Info-0606121.pdf>

[http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/planning/health\\_in\\_transportation/resources/healthy\\_communities/mpohealth12122012.pdf](http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/planning/health_in_transportation/resources/healthy_communities/mpohealth12122012.pdf)

[http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/planning/health\\_in\\_transportation/resources/movinghealthy.pdf](http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/planning/health_in_transportation/resources/movinghealthy.pdf)

<http://www.trbhealth.org/>

[http://sgc.ca.gov/pdf/HiAP\\_Task\\_Force\\_Report- Dec 2010.pdf](http://sgc.ca.gov/pdf/HiAP_Task_Force_Report- Dec 2010.pdf)

[https://www.cdph.ca.gov/programs/Documents/Healthy\\_Community\\_Indicators\\_Core\\_list10-17-14Table1-5.pdf](https://www.cdph.ca.gov/programs/Documents/Healthy_Community_Indicators_Core_list10-17-14Table1-5.pdf)

[https://www.cdph.ca.gov/Documents/CDPH\\_Healthy\\_Community\\_Indicators1pager5-16-12.pdf](https://www.cdph.ca.gov/Documents/CDPH_Healthy_Community_Indicators1pager5-16-12.pdf)

<https://www.cdph.ca.gov/programs/Pages/HealthyCommunityIndicators.aspx#TechInfo>

<https://planning-org-uploaded-media.s3.amazonaws.com/document/State-of-Health-Impact-Assessment-in-Planning.pdf>

<https://www.transportation.gov/transportation-health-tool>

<https://www.transportation.gov/mission/health/strategies-interventions-policies>

<http://phasocal.org/ca-hdi/>

[http://scagrtpscscs.net/Documents/2016/proposed/pf2016RTPSCS\\_PublicHealth032816.pdf](http://scagrtpscscs.net/Documents/2016/proposed/pf2016RTPSCS_PublicHealth032816.pdf)

[http://www.sdforward.com/pdfs/RP\\_final/AppendixQ-WhitePapers.pdf](http://www.sdforward.com/pdfs/RP_final/AppendixQ-WhitePapers.pdf)

<http://t4america.org/docs/planning-for-a-healthier-future-0616.pdf>

<http://www.transformca.org/sites/default/files/Healthy%20RTP%20-%20FULL%20-%202013-02-19%20Color.pdf>

<http://narc.org/wp-content/uploads/Public-Health-and-Transportation-Info-0606121.pdf>

[http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/planning/health\\_in\\_transportation/resources/healthy\\_communities/mpohealth12122012.pdf](http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/planning/health_in_transportation/resources/healthy_communities/mpohealth12122012.pdf)

[http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/planning/health\\_in\\_transportation/resources/movinghealthy.pdf](http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/planning/health_in_transportation/resources/movinghealthy.pdf)

<http://www.trbhealth.org/>

[http://www.saferoutespartnership.org/sites/default/files/pdf/CaseStudy\\_ActiveTransportationPlanningattheRegionalLevel.pdf](http://www.saferoutespartnership.org/sites/default/files/pdf/CaseStudy_ActiveTransportationPlanningattheRegionalLevel.pdf)

[http://www.saferoutespartnership.org/sites/default/files/pdf/The\\_Final\\_Active\\_Primer.pdf](http://www.saferoutespartnership.org/sites/default/files/pdf/The_Final_Active_Primer.pdf)

<http://saferoutespartnership.org/sites/default/files/pdf/RegionalGovernmentPrimer-v5.pdf>

[http://www.saferoutespartnership.org/sites/default/files/pdf/Local\\_Policy\\_Guide\\_2011.pdf](http://www.saferoutespartnership.org/sites/default/files/pdf/Local_Policy_Guide_2011.pdf)

<http://saferoutespartnership.org/resources/report/intersection-active-transportation-equity>

<http://www.apha.org/topics-and-issues/transportation/public-health-and-equity-principles-for-transportation>

[https://saferoutescalifornia.files.wordpress.com/2012/11/hip\\_healthequitymetrics\\_impacts\\_table\\_11\\_16\\_12.pdf](https://saferoutescalifornia.files.wordpress.com/2012/11/hip_healthequitymetrics_impacts_table_11_16_12.pdf)

<http://www.psrc.org/transportation/bikeped/health-in-transportation-planning/>

[http://www.nashvillempo.org/regional\\_plan/health/](http://www.nashvillempo.org/regional_plan/health/)

<http://www.mapc.org/public-health>

[http://www.changelabsolutions.org/sites/default/files/Health\\_Transport\\_Factsheet\\_FINAL\\_20110713\\_%28rebrand\\_20130409%29.pdf](http://www.changelabsolutions.org/sites/default/files/Health_Transport_Factsheet_FINAL_20110713_%28rebrand_20130409%29.pdf)

[http://portal.hud.gov/hudportal/HUD?src=/program\\_offices/economic\\_resilience/sustainable\\_communities\\_regional\\_planning\\_grants](http://portal.hud.gov/hudportal/HUD?src=/program_offices/economic_resilience/sustainable_communities_regional_planning_grants)

<https://www.sustainablecommunities.gov/>

Page Left Intentionally Blank

## **Appendix L**

### Planning Practice Examples

Page Left Intentionally Blank

## Appendix L Contents

<b>Introduction .....</b>	<b>313</b>
<b>Coordination with Other Planning Processes .....</b>	<b>313</b>
<b>Smart Mobility Framework.....</b>	<b>313</b>
<b>Planning for Public Health and Health Equity .....</b>	<b>313</b>
<b>Complete Streets.....</b>	<b>313</b>
<b>Regional Travel Demand Modeling &amp; Analysis .....</b>	<b>315</b>
<b>RTP Consultation and Coordination .....</b>	<b>315</b>
<b>Public Participation Plan .....</b>	<b>315</b>
<b>Title VI, Environmental Justice, and Social Equity Considerations in the RTP ...</b>	<b>318</b>
<b>Private Sector Involvement .....</b>	<b>324</b>
<b>Native American Tribal Government Consultation and Coordination .....</b>	<b>325</b>
<b>Consultation with Resource Agencies .....</b>	<b>325</b>
<b>Integrating Ecological Considerations into Transportation Planning and Project Delivery .....</b>	<b>327</b>
<b>Addressing Resource Areas and Farmland in the RTP .....</b>	<b>327</b>
<b>Regional Conservation Planning Strategies to Address Potential Impacts ...</b>	<b>328</b>
<b>Aquatic and Terrestrial Habitat Connectivity .....</b>	<b>331</b>
<b>RTP Financial Overview .....</b>	<b>333</b>
<b>Fiscal Constraint .....</b>	<b>333</b>
<b>Listing of Constrained and Un-constrained Projects .....</b>	<b>334</b>
<b>Revenue Identification and Forecasting .....</b>	<b>334</b>
<b>Estimating Future Transportation Costs .....</b>	<b>334</b>
<b>Asset Management.....</b>	<b>334</b>
<b>RTP Modal Discussion .....</b>	<b>334</b>
<b>Transit.....</b>	<b>334</b>
<b>Bicycle &amp; Pedestrian .....</b>	<b>334</b>
<b>Goods Movement (Maritime/Rail/Trucking/Aviation) .....</b>	<b>335</b>
<b>Regional Aviation System .....</b>	<b>336</b>
<b>Military Airfields and Installations .....</b>	<b>337</b>
<b>Transportation System Management and Operations .....</b>	<b>338</b>



<b>Future of Transportation and New Technology .....</b>	<b>338</b>
<b>Connected Vehicle Program.....</b>	<b>338</b>
<b>Transportation Electrification .....</b>	<b>339</b>
<b>Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) Contents and Development .....</b>	<b>340</b>
<b>Addressing Resource Areas and Farmland in the SCS.....</b>	<b>342</b>
<b>Land Use and Transportation Strategies to Address Regional Greenhouse Gas Emissions in the RTP .....</b>	<b>344</b>
<b>Pricing Strategies.....</b>	<b>344</b>
<b>Transportation Planning and Investment Strategies .....</b>	<b>345</b>
<b>Land Use Strategies that Can Help Reduce Rates of VMT and Per Person Household Greenhouse Gas Emissions.....</b>	<b>346</b>
<b>Transportation Demand Management (TDM) .....</b>	<b>346</b>
<b>RTP policies that support Smart Growth Land Use principles .....</b>	<b>347</b>
<b>Additional Planning Practice Examples.....</b>	<b>347</b>
<b>Adaptation of the Regional Transportation System to Climate Change.....</b>	<b>348</b>
<b>Performance Measures .....</b>	<b>349</b>

## **Introduction**

This appendix aggregates planning practice examples and resource information into a single location organized by topic area. The examples contained in this appendix are not intended to establish baseline standards but rather serve to highlight exemplary, state of the art planning practices that Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) can seek to emulate in their planning processes as financial and technical resources allow.

Efforts have been made to highlight planning practices that are being undertaken by large, medium, and small MPOs in both rural and urban areas throughout the state. It is important to note that this appendix represents a snapshot of available resources and planning practices representative of the time at which these guidelines were prepared.

## **Coordination with Other Planning Processes**

Regional Transportation Plans (RTPs) are prepared within the context of many other planning processes conducted by federal, state, and local agencies. This section provides resources associated with planning processes that are used by state, federal and local agencies such as Caltrans, the Federal Highway Administration, and local jurisdictions to further their respective goals and objectives associated with the California Transportation Plan, the federal Partnership for Sustainable Communities, and local General Plans. As the RTP is bound by fiscal constraint, the strategies, actions, and improvements described in this section are intended to inform the development of the RTP and should be considered to the maximum extent feasible.

Please see **Section 2.7** in the RTP Guidelines for additional information on these areas.

### **Smart Mobility Framework**

The Caltrans Smart Mobility Framework (SMF) is a key strategic tool for integrating transportation with land use, to develop healthy and livable communities through multi-modal travel options, reliable travel times, and safety for all users of the transportation system. Additional Smart Mobility Framework information and resources are available at the following links:

<http://www.dot.ca.gov/transplanning/ocp/sm-framework.html>

<http://smartmobilityca.org/>

### **Planning for Public Health and Health Equity**

Please see **Section 2.3** and **Appendix L** for resources and planning practice information regarding the consideration of public health and health equity in the regional transportation planning process.

### **Complete Streets**

The term “Complete Street” refers to a transportation network that is planned, designed, constructed, operated, and maintained to provide safe mobility for all users including: bicyclists, pedestrians, transit and rail riders, as well as commercial vehicles and

motorists appropriate to the function and context of the facility. Complete Streets policies and practices are best implemented with a comprehensive and integrated approach of all agencies involved, taking advantage of opportunities for synergies and cost savings such as restriping when repaving.

*General Complete Streets background, resources, and practice information at the state and national level:*

Smart Growth America offers an interactive resources data base which offers information and case studies on a variety of mobility topics including Complete Streets: <https://smartgrowthamerica.org/resources/>

The National Complete Streets Coalition provides success stories, frequently asked questions, examples, and resources including sample presentations here: <http://www.completestreets.org/>

The National Complete Streets Coalition provides a map with states and local jurisdictions that have adopted complete streets policies: <https://smartgrowthamerica.org/program/national-complete-streets-coalition/>

Safe Routes to Schools National Partnership Complete Streets resources are available here: <http://saferoutespartnership.org/state/bestpractices/completestreets>

The guide [Complete Streets: Making Roads Safe and Accessible for All Users](#) (Safe Routes to Schools National Partnership, 2013) provides information on Complete Streets policies in underserved communities.

A Complete Intersections Guide can be downloaded from the Caltrans Pedestrian Safety Resources website: [http://nacto.org/docs/usdg/complete\\_intersections\\_caltrans.pdf](http://nacto.org/docs/usdg/complete_intersections_caltrans.pdf)

Accommodating Bicycle and Pedestrian Travel: A Recommended Approach is a policy statement adopted by the United States Department of Transportation (USDOT). USDOT hopes that public agencies, professional associations, advocacy groups, and others will also adopt this approach as a way to promote the integration of bicycling and walking into the transportation main stream: [http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/bicycle\\_pedestrian/guidance/design.cfm](http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/bicycle_pedestrian/guidance/design.cfm)

The American Planning Association Knowledge Center offers Complete Streets applied research resources: <http://planning.org/research/streets/>

The [AARP Complete Streets Archive](#) provides reports, case studies, presentations and more.

*State-Level Plans addressing Complete Streets:*

<http://www.californiatransportationplan2040.org/>

<http://www.cabikepedplan.org/>

### Regional Planning Practice Examples of Complete Streets Policies:

#### *Large/Urban MPO Examples:*

The following link contains a case study in the SCAG region of how MPOs can integrate neighborhood electric vehicles into a complete streets policy:

<http://www.scag.ca.gov/sb375/pdfs/FS/cs-SouthBayStrategy.pdf>

The following links contains planning practice examples of integrating Complete Streets Policies in the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) bay-area region and the San Diego Region:

<http://mtc.ca.gov/our-work/plans-projects/bicycle-pedestrian-planning/complete-streets>

<http://www.sandag.org/index.asp?classid=12&projectid=521&fuseaction=projects.detail>

#### *Small/Medium and Rural MPO Examples:*

Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization and the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency developed the following Complete Street Resource Guide:

[http://tahoempo.org/activetransportationplan/docs/appendices/Appendix%20A\\_Complete%20Street%20Resource%20Guide.pdf](http://tahoempo.org/activetransportationplan/docs/appendices/Appendix%20A_Complete%20Street%20Resource%20Guide.pdf)

### Local Planning Guidance for Complete Streets

Governor's Office of Planning and Research General Plan Guidelines:

[https://www.opr.ca.gov/s\\_generalplanguidelines.php](https://www.opr.ca.gov/s_generalplanguidelines.php)

## **Regional Travel Demand Modeling & Analysis**

Please see **Section 3.5** for resources and planning practice information regarding travel demand modeling and analysis for the preparation of an RTP.

## **RTP Consultation and Coordination**

### **Public Participation Plan**

The purpose of the Public Participation Plan is to establish the process by which the public can participate in the development of regional transportation plans and programs. Please see **Section 4.1** in the RTP Guidelines for Statutory requirements associated with Public Participation Plan development and the public input process for preparing the RTP.

Exemplary planning practice examples of MPO Public Participation plans and processes include incorporating public participation strategies in the RTP that ensure members of

the public are engaged throughout the development of the RTP. Given the complex nature of transportation planning, MPOs can use public participation as a way to ensure local residents and community-based organizations are active participants at each step of the process. Open-invite roundtables and/or on-going advisory committees are one way that MPOs can seek public input throughout the process.

Various MPOs have developed on-going advisory committees that included a wide range of interests including representation from historically underserved communities and rural areas. These advisory committees met regularly throughout the development of the RTP to ensure the document reflected the goals of the community. Other MPOs used on-line educational survey tools and games in addition to workshops, roundtables, and phone surveys, to allow the public to balance their priorities for the region. Additional information and specific examples are provided below:

*Large/Urban MPO Examples:*

Metropolitan Transportation Commission Public Participation Plan

[http://www.mtc.ca.gov/get\\_involved/participation\\_plan.htm](http://www.mtc.ca.gov/get_involved/participation_plan.htm)

Sacramento Area Council of Governments Public Participation Plan

[http://www.sacog.org/sites/main/files/file-attachments/public\\_participation\\_plan\\_2013.pdf](http://www.sacog.org/sites/main/files/file-attachments/public_participation_plan_2013.pdf)

SANDAG Public Involvement Plan:

[http://www.sandag.org/uploads/projectid/projectid\\_428\\_15559.pdf](http://www.sandag.org/uploads/projectid/projectid_428_15559.pdf)

*Small/Medium/Rural MPO Example:*

Kern Council of Governments Online Educational Survey Game

<http://www.directionsto2050.com/>

To the extent that it is practicable and resources are available, the Draft RTP as well as any comments received to the draft could be posted on the MPO website in a way that is easily accessible to the public. The table below provides links to the websites of all eighteen California MPO's:

MPO Name	Website
Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments	<a href="http://www.ambag.org">www.ambag.org</a>
Butte County Association of Governments	<a href="http://www.bcag.org">www.bcag.org</a>
Fresno Council of Governments	<a href="http://www.fresnocog.org">www.fresnocog.org</a>
Kings County Association of Governments	<a href="http://www.kingscog.org">www.kingscog.org</a>
Kern Council of Governments	<a href="http://www.kerncog.org">www.kerncog.org</a>
Merced County Association of Governments	<a href="http://www.mcagov.org">www.mcagov.org</a>
Madera County Transportation Commission	<a href="http://www.maderactc.org">www.maderactc.org</a>
Metropolitan Transportation Commission	<a href="http://www.mtc.ca.gov">www.mtc.ca.gov</a>
Sacramento Area Council of Governments	<a href="http://www.sacog.org">www.sacog.org</a>
San Diego Association of Governments	<a href="http://www.sandag.org">www.sandag.org</a>
San Joaquin Council of Governments	<a href="http://www.sjcog.org">www.sjcog.org</a>
San Luis Obispo Council of Governments	<a href="http://www.slocog.org">www.slocog.org</a>
Santa Barbara County Association of Governments	<a href="http://www.sbcag.org">www.sbcag.org</a>
Shasta Regional Transportation Agency	<a href="http://www.srta.ca.gov">www.srta.ca.gov</a>
Southern California Association of Governments	<a href="http://www.scag.ca.gov">www.scag.ca.gov</a>
Stanislaus Council of Governments	<a href="http://www.stancog.org">www.stancog.org</a>
Tulare County Association of Governments	<a href="http://www.tularecog.org">www.tularecog.org</a>
Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization	<a href="http://www.trpa.org/transportation/">http://www.trpa.org/transportation/</a>

## **Title VI, Environmental Justice, and Social Equity Considerations in the RTP**

This section includes planning practices relevant to the requirements described in Chapter 4, especially sections 4.2, 4.3 and 4.4. These requirements include conducting a social equity analysis to ensure that any planned regional transportation improvements do not have a disproportionately high and adverse impact on low income or minority populations, and to ensure that the plan will not result in the denial of, reduction in, or significant delay in the receipt of benefits by minority or low-income populations.

In order to identify and address (if further mitigation measures or alternatives are feasible that would reduce the disproportionately high and adverse effects) disproportionately high and adverse effects of programs, policies, and activities on minority and low-income populations to achieve an equitable distribution of benefits and burdens in the RTP, MPOs are called upon to (1) *identify which populations and communities are low income or minority*, and to (2) *determine what metrics they will use to measure the benefits and burdens to those populations and communities*. They are then called up to (3) *conduct an appropriate social equity analysis*, as discussed in section 4.2. Finally, (4) *a public participation* is required to ensure that the RTP planning process succeeds in “seeking out and considering the needs of low-income and minority households.”

Planning practices relevant to each of these requirements are collected here:

### **1.) Identifying protected communities:**

FTA Circular 4703.1 emphasizes the importance of understanding a community when addressing environmental justice, both in identifying low income and minority communities through the use of Census data and in engaging with potentially impacted residents and community-based organizations. In defining a unit of geographic analysis, a study area “must be appropriate to the scope of the plan, program, or project to determine disproportionate burdens on EJ versus non-EJ populations.” As such, MPOs ought to “make reasonable efforts to identify the presence of distinct minority and/or low-income communities residing both within, and in close proximity to, the proposed project or activity and to identify those minority and/or low income groups who use or are dependent upon natural resources that could be potentially affected by the proposed action.” This may involve analysis that summarizes impacts for areas with the highest concentration of EJ populations or potential burdens within an MPO’s service area.

One particular approach, pioneered by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), for identifying especially impacted communities, is known as “Racially Concentrated Areas of Poverty.” HUD’s definition is “a geographic area with significant concentrations of poverty and minority populations.” The concept is flexible and can be readily adapted to local conditions. For instance, in Minnesota’s Twin City region, the Metropolitan Council provides a two-step definition for Areas of Concentrated Poverty. The first, contiguous census tracts where at least 40% of residents live in households with incomes below 185% of the federal poverty line. The second, a refinement of HUD’s concept which further identifies, as particularly vulnerable, Areas of Concentrated Poverty where at least 50% of the residents are people of color.

## **2.) Defining “benefits” and “burdens” to those protected communities:**

While there is some federal guidance on candidate social equity performance measures, the measures can vary according to regional goals. Examples of performance measures that have been used by California MPOs are:

- Share of population within 1/4 or 1/2 mile of transit
- Travel Time
- Active Transportation' infrastructure
- Share of transportation system usage by population type
- Physical activity (time or distance) walking/biking
- Distribution of investments
- Combined housing / transportation affordability
- Gentrification / displacement
- Access to employment
- Access to parks or open space
- Access to medical or health care facilities
- Access to primary or secondary schools
- Access to higher education
- Access to grocery stores
- Air quality - localized (near roads, ports, rail yards, etc.)
- Traffic safety - active modes
- Air quality - regional distribution
- Roadway noise

Some of these performance measures are intended to help evaluate whether a particular population will be more heavily burdened than others if the RTP is implemented, while others are intended to indicate whether some groups will glean more benefits than others if the RTP is implemented. Based on factors such as community input, availability of the necessary data, technical capabilities of the MPO, and likely accuracy of the results of the analysis, each MPO through outreach to and consultation with residents of affected communities can choose these or other measures best suited to its region.

In addition, non-governmental organizations have identified planning examples from other contexts. One example is guidance the California Air Resources Board (ARB) has provided on the implementation of SB 535 (De León).<sup>19</sup> ARB's GGRF Funding Guidelines require implementing agencies to “give priority to those [investments] that maximize benefits to disadvantaged communities” by “favor[ing the] projects which provide ... the most significant benefits” to them. More specifically, the Guidelines require that every investment intended to benefit a disadvantaged community “provide[] direct, meaningful, and assured benefits to one or more disadvantaged communities.”

---

<sup>19</sup> That statute requires that “a minimum of 25 percent” of moneys in the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund go “to projects that provide benefits to” disadvantaged communities and “a minimum of 10 percent ... to projects located within” those communities. Health & Saf. Code § 39713.



ARB's Funding Guidelines<sup>20</sup> define the benefit a GGRF investment must provide under SB 535 as "a benefit that *meaningfully addresses an important community need*" in a disadvantaged community.<sup>21</sup> ARB's definition of "benefit" is also directly relevant to the crafting of an equity and EJ analysis of the RTP, as discussed in the next section. In addition, ARB's Funding Guidelines require that "projects be designed to *avoid substantial burdens*, such as physical or economic displacement of low-income disadvantaged community residents and businesses or increased exposure to toxics or other health risks."<sup>22</sup>

### 3.) Conducting the social equity analysis:

Many California MPOs have conducted environmental justice and social equity analyses in their respective RTP/SCS reports. Federal and state agencies have also compiled best practices in environmental justice and equity analysis in various topic areas from RTPs across the nation<sup>23</sup>. Efforts are underway by SANDAG<sup>24</sup>, in partnership with other regional transportation planning agencies and Caltrans, to develop a Social Equity Analysis Method (SEAM) and a Social Equity Analysis Tool (SEAT) to assist with RTP development. This project, which is partly funded by a Caltrans Partnership Planning grant, will produce a tool that MPOs and RTPAs could use when assessing benefits and burdens on various 'social equity focus' (SEF) populations (e.g. low income and minority groups) that are expected to occur if the programs and projects in an RTP are implemented. The final version of the SEAT is expected to be complete in the first quarter of 2018 and will include up to eight performance measures – some of which will measure relative benefits and others that will measure relative burdens. The goal is to provide an analysis tool with functionality in a GIS-based application that can be used by agencies throughout the state.

MPOs also can work with environmental justice and social equity stakeholders through the RTP/SCS outreach process to develop additional measures and analyses to illustrate and identify the historical and current conditions of transportation and land use for low income and minority communities to ensure future transportation investments will not further cause disproportional impacts to those communities.

As MPOs seek to respond to the needs and concerns of low-income and minority communities, a planning practice from another (non-RTP) context that MPOs may incorporate comes from the U.S. Department of Housing and Community Development (HUD) rule on "affirmatively furthering fair housing" (or AFFH). AFFH looks at

---

<sup>20</sup> Air Resources Board, Cap-and-Trade Auction Proceeds Funding Guidelines for Agencies that Administer California Climate Investments (Dec. 2015), p. 2.A-6, available at <http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/capandtrade/auctionproceeds/fundingguidelines.htm>

<sup>21</sup> *Id.*, p. 2-6. See *id.*, p. 1.A-12 (requiring reporting on "disadvantaged community benefits and ... strategies the agency will use to maximize benefits" to them).

<sup>22</sup> *Id.* p. 2-12.

<sup>23</sup> Examples include:

<http://dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/saferoutes/EnvironmentalJusticeDeskGuideJan2003.pdf>,

[http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/environmental\\_justice/resources/](http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/environmental_justice/resources/),

[http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/environmental\\_justice/case\\_studies/](http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/environmental_justice/case_studies/)

<sup>24</sup> SANDAG Statewide Social Equity project description:

<http://sdforward.com/ContinuingActions/SocialEquityEnvJustice.aspx>.

neighborhood-level transportation and transit access, educational and economic opportunity, and environmental health factors.<sup>25</sup>

The AFFH begins with assessing “the elements and factors that cause, increase, contribute to, maintain, or perpetuate segregation, racially or ethnically concentrated areas of poverty, significant disparities in access to opportunity, and disproportionate housing needs.”<sup>26</sup> The basic methodology for HUD’s AFFH rule includes the following steps:

1. Identify, with robust community engagement, current patterns and conditions of segregation, racially concentrated poverty, disparities in access to opportunity, and disproportionate housing needs, utilizing data HUD provides and other relevant regional data;
2. Identify key contributing factors of the patterns and conditions identified;
3. Prioritize the most significant contributing factors and set goals that will meaningfully address the high priority factors, with “metrics and milestones” for each goal;
4. Tailor near-term actions and investments consistent with those goals; and
5. Measure progress over the near term. (24 C.F.R. § 5.154(d) (2), (3), (4), (5) and (7).)

The HUD rule is discussed in a recent letter that the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Transportation issued with the Secretaries of HUD and the U.S. Department of Education.<sup>27</sup> That letter emphasized the relevance of transportation to the issues of segregation, access to opportunity, and racially-concentrated poverty, and encouraged transportation agencies (including MPOs) nationally to integrate the principles and goals of AFFH into their decision-making. In particular, the letter called on transportation agencies to “identify impediments to accessing opportunity” and to “coordinate efforts to address” issues of segregation and opportunity.<sup>28</sup> In considering whether to align its equity analysis with the Assessment its local jurisdictions are called up to conduct, an MPO will have the opportunity to ensure coordination regionally of local actions to identify and address current conditions of inequity.

---

<sup>25</sup> HUD, Assessment Tool (Public Dec. 31, 2015) at 8, available online at <https://www.huduser.gov/portal/sites/default/files/pdf/Assessment-of-Fair-Housing-Tool.pdf> (last accessed July 12, 2016).

<sup>26</sup> 24 C.F.R. § 5.154 (a).

<sup>27</sup> The Tri-Agency letter, issued on June 3, 2016, is available at <https://www2.ed.gov/documents/press-releases/06032016-dear-colleagues-letter.pdf>.

<sup>28</sup> The letter states: “Today, our agencies are calling on local education, transportation, and housing leaders to work together on issues at the intersection of our respective missions in helping to guarantee full access of opportunity across the country. Our goals are to identify impediments to accessing opportunity; to coordinate efforts to address these issues and to provide broad-reaching benefits; and to ensure that every child and family is provided with transportation, housing, and education tools that promote economic mobility. The new process in which communities are engaging under the Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing rule (AFFH rule) from HUD provides an opportunity for cross-agency collaboration and strong community involvement. We urge you to take full advantage of the community participation process of the AFFH rule, so that regional planning promotes economic mobility and equal access to the many benefits provided by affordable housing, great schools, and reliable transportation.”

## **Public Engagement Practices for “Seeking Out and Considering the Needs of Low-income and Minority Households”:**

Building on the emphasis of public engagement outlined in FTA Circular 4703.1, it is recommended that MPOs “ensure the full and fair participation by all potentially affected communities in the transportation decision-making process....Understanding the needs and priorities of environmental justice populations will also help...to balance the benefits of the proposed project against its adverse effects.” If an adverse effect is “predominantly borne by an EJ population, or will be suffered by the EJ population and is appreciably more severe or greater in magnitude than the adverse effect that will be suffered by the non-EJ population”, engagement with an affected community can help to identify an appropriate strategy to mitigate, reduce, avoid, and/or offset adverse effects. Public outreach is, therefore, an essential component of an MPO’s environmental justice efforts and should employ strategies to increase engagement in the transportation decision-making process from low income and minority populations. Specific strategies covering location, timing, content, format, noticing, and accessibility requirements of public outreach meetings are detailed in Chapter III of FTA Circular 4703.1.

MPOs can encourage the involvement of low-income communities and communities of color by proactively seeking the input of these households and by making public meetings as accessible as possible. Public engagement strategies to promote inclusion of these communities may include:

- Conduct education and outreach before beginning the formal input process;
- Provide all materials related to the update with adequate time for public review and input.
- Provide early and ongoing drafts for public review to ensure transparency.
- Proactively work with and/or provide financial support, as resources allow, to community-based and membership organizations across the region to help engage low-income residents and residents of color in the public process and to jointly plan public workshops or other engagement opportunities.
- Form an advisory group on Environmental Justice, Social Equity and/or Disadvantaged Communities that includes policy and community-based organizations that are focused on social equity in the region to provide feedback throughout the RTP process.
- Ensure that community residents have the opportunity to deliberate together to achieve consensus on their most pressing needs and recommendations.
- Hold meetings at accessible locations and outside of traditional working hours (e.g. evenings and weekends);
- Locate meetings in low-income communities and communities of color;
- Locate meetings at sites accessible via affordable transit;
- Translate meeting materials for non-English speakers;
- Consider the needs to low-income and individuals with limited English proficiency when translating outreach materials and ensuring that documents are easy to understand (i.e. evaluate the reading level of the materials and quality of translations);
- Technology and the Internet can reach many people, but recognize that not everyone has access to the Internet and an email address and that efforts should be made to reach individuals in other ways;
- Provide interpretation at meetings for non-English speakers;

- Create resident advisory committees or roles within existing committees with decision-making authority and identify opportunities for disadvantaged communities to serve as representatives on decision-making bodies;
- Expand the list of potential partners to include: schools, the faith community, agriculture and food hubs, local business or chambers of commerce, health providers and public health sectors, funders/philanthropy, academia, and environmental health/justice advocates, libraries, law enforcement, parks and recreation, and the technology industry;
- Create a feedback loop to provide community members information about how their input was included in any drafts and reasons for including/excluding the input;
- Make sure that there is agreement between residents and the local planning authority about what community engagement includes;
- Educate and build capacity of community members on issues such as data, evaluation, storytelling, and mentoring community members new to the process;
- Use a community health worker or promotora model to identify resident leaders;
- Use facilitators with experience in race and power inequities at community meetings;
- Work with community-based and membership organizations across the region to jointly plan public workshops on the RTP, especially the Title VI and Environmental Justice analyses. They know the communities impacted by the RTP transportation projects and can assist with recruiting residents, businesses and other affected stakeholders. Be proactive in asking for their participation instead of waiting for them to come to you; and,
- Ensure meetings are attended by MPO decision makers in addition to MPO staff.

*Exemplary planning practice examples of MPO efforts to address Title VI, Environmental Justice, and Social Equity Considerations in the RTP are provided below:*

*Large/Urban MPO Examples:*

<http://planbayarea.org/the-plan/plan-details/equity-analysis.html>

<http://www.scag.ca.gov/programs/Pages/EnvironmentJustice.aspx>

[http://www.sdfoward.com/pdfs/RP\\_final/AppendixH-SocialEquityEngagementandAnalysis.pdf](http://www.sdfoward.com/pdfs/RP_final/AppendixH-SocialEquityEngagementandAnalysis.pdf)

*Statewide Social Equity Analysis Tool:*

SANDAG, through a Caltrans Strategic Partnership Grant, is collaborating with large and small MPOs and RTPAs in the state to develop a tool that can be used for conducting Social Equity Analyses for regional plans throughout the state of California.

Currently agencies use varied approaches when conducting a social equity analyses of regional plans such as RTPs and the SCSs required by SB 375. There is not a widely accepted tool used by regional and local agencies to model the burdens and benefits of regional plans and the projects they encompass to consistently evaluate environmental justice outcomes expected to result from a plan or project. This project calls for identification of best practices being used by regional agencies to analyze proposed plans and covered projects and development of a Social Equity Analysis Methodology

(SEAM) and Social Equity Analysis Tool (SEAT) for statewide use. For more information visit: <http://sdfoward.com/ContinuingActions/SocialEquityEnvJustice.aspx>

#### *Small/Medium and Rural MPO Examples:*

To help ensure diverse and direct input from all populations especially those with the most potential to be affected by health inequities, Fresno Council of Governments (FresnoCOG) administers a “Community-Based Mini-Grant Outreach Program<sup>29</sup>,” which competitively awards mini-grants (\$1,000 - \$3,000) to community-based organizations, schools, and other groups to conduct outreach to individuals not typically involved in the regional transportation planning process. The selected organizations conduct outreach activities such as organizing and tailoring meetings, customizing presentations materials, building trust and removing barriers to participation to secure public involvement from stakeholders in their communities and the populations they currently serve, engaging them in the planning process and generating feedback on the development of the RTP and SCS.

*Additional statewide examples* of stakeholder engagement strategies are also compiled in the following report developed by ClimatePlan:

[Leading the Way: Policies and Practices for Sustainable Communities](#)

#### **Private Sector Involvement**

Private sector involvement refers to engaging the goods movement industry and other business or commercial interests in the development of the RTP. Trucks, freight trains, taxis, limousines, and shared mobility companies all use the transportation network and are an integral part of the regional transportation system. Other examples of private sector entities to engage in the development of the RTP include Transportation Management Associations, private transit operators, developers, and Chambers of Commerce. Private sector involvement informs the regional transportation planning process can contribute to greater efficiency of the planned transportation network.

*Exemplary planning practice examples of MPO efforts to engage the private sector in RTP development are provided below:*

#### *Large/Urban MPO Examples:*

<http://www.sacog.org/regional-plans>

*The National Highway Institute offers training on engaging the Private Sector in Freight Planning:*

[http://www.nhi.fhwa.dot.gov/training/course\\_search.aspx?sf=0&course\\_no=139009](http://www.nhi.fhwa.dot.gov/training/course_search.aspx?sf=0&course_no=139009)

---

<sup>29</sup> Administered as a contractual arrangement with community based consultants for outreach services that is subject to the federal procurement process. See: [http://www.fresnocog.org/sites/default/files/publications/RTP/RTP\\_Mini\\_grant\\_app\\_Fresno\\_COG.pdf](http://www.fresnocog.org/sites/default/files/publications/RTP/RTP_Mini_grant_app_Fresno_COG.pdf)

## Consultation with Interested Parties

The US DOT defines consultation as when: “one or more parties confer with other identified parties in accordance with an established process and, prior to taking action(s), considers the views of the other parties and periodically informs them about action(s) taken.” Some areas of consultation could include transportation, land use, employment, economic development, housing, community development and environmental issues. Consultation requirements for the RTP are outlined in **Section 4.6**.

*Large/Urban MPO Examples:*

<http://rtpscs.scaq.ca.gov/Pages/default.aspx>

*Exemplary planning practice examples of MPO consultation efforts are provided below:*

*Small/Medium and Rural MPO Example:*

<http://www.sjcog.org/index.aspx?nid=181>

## Native American Tribal Government Consultation and Coordination

California is home to many non-federally recognized tribes as well as Native Americans living in urban areas. MPOs should involve the Native American communities in the public participation processes. Establishing and maintaining government-to-government relations with federally recognized Tribal Governments through consultation is separate from, and precedes the public participation process. Tribal Consultation requirements for the RTP are outlined in **Section 4.9**.

US DOT Order 5301.1 ensures that programs, policies and procedures administered by the US DOT are responsive to the needs and concerns of Native Americans. This Order provides a very thorough overview of the various Federal regulations and Executive Orders on this subject. This Order is available at:

<http://environment.fhwa.dot.gov/guidebook/vol2/5301.1.pdf>

It is recommended that federally and non-federally recognized Tribal Governments be consulted when historic, sacred sites, subsistence resources or traditional collecting properties are present in the MPOs jurisdiction.

*An exemplary planning practice example of MPO Tribal Consultation efforts is provided below:*

[http://www.sdforward.com/pdfs/RP\\_final/AppendixG-TribalConsultationProcessforSanDiegoForward-CommunicationCooperationandCoordination.pdf](http://www.sdforward.com/pdfs/RP_final/AppendixG-TribalConsultationProcessforSanDiegoForward-CommunicationCooperationandCoordination.pdf)

## Consultation with Resource Agencies

Current federal regulations require MPOs to consult with resource agencies, State and local agencies responsible for land use management, environmental protection,



conservation, and historic preservation concerning the development of the RTP. As part of SCS development, MPOs must gather and consider the best available scientific information on resource areas and farmlands within the region. State and federal resource agencies may be able to assist MPOs by providing data, maps, or other information. Detailed information regarding Resource Agency Consultation during RTP development is available in **Section 4.10**.

Transportation agencies and resource agencies have developed methods to better incorporate resource issues into transportation planning processes to benefit both transportation planning and project delivery as well as ecological outcomes. Two examples of processes are:

- 1) [FHWA's Eco-logical Approach](#) organizes current methods for addressing natural resource identification, avoidance, minimization and mitigation into a systematic, step-wise process that starts at the beginning of the transportation planning process and concludes with establishing programmatic approaches to recurring natural resource issues that are implemented at the project level. FHWA has developed an implementation approach called Integrated Eco-logical Framework (IEF), a nine-step, voluntary framework for partners to collaborate, share data, and prioritize areas of ecological significance. Implementing IEF at a regional scale during RTP development would allow for early coordination with resource agencies and other key stakeholders to establish a Regional Ecosystem Framework. This approach is also consistent with Regional Advance Mitigation Planning (RAMP) models developed by the RAMP Statewide Working Group.

<https://www.environment.fhwa.dot.gov/ecological/ImplementingEcoLogicalApproach/default.asp>

<https://rampcalifornia.water.ca.gov/>

- 2) [AB 2087](#) (Levine, 2016) establishes a pilot study program for a conservation planning tool called a Regional Conservation Investment Strategy (RCIS). The purpose of the RCIS is to promote the conservation of species, habitats and other natural resources and enable advance mitigation for public infrastructure projects, including transportation. An RCIS provides a voluntary, non-regulatory assessment and analysis of conservation needs in a region including habitat connectivity and climate resilience. Transportation agencies can use an approved RCIS to secure mitigation credit for conservation investments consistent with the RCIS through a Mitigation Credit Agreement (MCA). Pursuant to AB 2087, an RCIS pilot study program is presently under development and all RCISs and MCAs must be approved prior to January 1, 2020.

*Exemplary planning practice examples of Resource Agency consultation efforts and resulting planning products are provided below:*

#### *Large/Urban MPO Examples:*

The San Diego Association of Governments' *TransNet* Environmental Mitigation Program (EMP), funded by local sales tax dollars, is unique in that it goes beyond traditional mitigation for transportation projects by including a funding allocation for habitat acquisition, management, and monitoring activities as needed to help implement

the Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP) and the Multiple Habitat Conservation Program (MHCP) which are developed through extensive consultation with resource agencies. Information regarding the *TransNet* EMP is available at:

<http://www.sandag.org/index.asp?projectid=263&fuseaction=projects.detail>

The Southern California Association of Governments' (SCAG) recently approved SCS Appendix on Natural and Farm Lands is a prime example of successful consultation with environmental agencies and stakeholders. SCAG established an Open Space Conservation Working Group (which included resource agencies), developed a comprehensive database with resources for county transportation commissions, local governments and other planning agencies to use in their conservation and mitigation planning processes, along with a report to provide context. The SCAG SCS Appendix is available at:

[www.scagrtpscscs.net/Documents/2016/final/f2016RTPSCS\\_NaturalFarmLands.pdf](http://www.scagrtpscscs.net/Documents/2016/final/f2016RTPSCS_NaturalFarmLands.pdf)

#### *Small/Medium and Rural MPO Examples:*

Butte County Association of Government's (BCAG) RTP/SCS and Regional Conservation Plan. BCAG adopted the Butte County Regional Conservation Plan (Plan), a regional [Natural Community Conservation Plan/Habitat Conservation Plan](#) (NCCP/HCP), to streamline the development and mitigation associated with public and private development in the planning area. BCAG's RTP/SCS is built around a set of general plans designed to be consistent with the Regional Conservation Plan. Preparation and adoption of the Regional Conservation Plan required extensive resource agency coordination with the planning signatories upon issuance of federal and state permits along with the Plan.

<http://www.buttehcp.com/>

### **Integrating Ecological Considerations into Transportation Planning and Project Delivery**

This section discusses regionally important natural resources such as farmlands and habitat corridors that should be identified during the development and update process of RTPs, in order to more effectively implement transportation projects during the environmental review and permitting processes. This should not be considered a comprehensive list of environmental resources to consider in planning and early project development nor is this intended to include a comprehensive list for regulatory review. For a list of environmental resources to consider during environmental review, please see **Chapter 5** of these Guidelines.

#### **Addressing Resource Areas and Farmland in the RTP**

As a planning practice to comply with the requirements of CA Government Code 65080 (b)(2)(B), MPOs, based on locally and regionally significant considerations, are



encouraged to develop a Regional Open Space and Conservation Area Framework that identifies and considers “resource areas” and “farmland” as defined in Government Code Section 65080.01(a) and (b). To demonstrate consideration of resource areas and farmland, the SCS could 1) identify regional priority areas for conservation and mitigation efforts, based upon existing publicly available information and developed in consultation with the appropriate resource agencies including cities and counties, 2) adopt a land use forecast structured around spatially explicit, complementary networks of priority conservation areas and priority development areas, and 3) commit discretionary funding for conservation and development incentives for such areas. For an example of this approach, see Plan Bay Area: <http://planbayarea.org/the-plan/adopted-plan-bay-area-2013.html>

Another way to demonstrate consideration of resource areas and farmland is to 1) incorporate layers representing all categories of “resource areas” listed in Government Code Section 65080.01(a) and (b), as well as other key resources identified in HCPs, NCCPs and input from leading conservation organizations, and 2) treat these layers as constraints to development in land use scenarios and the adopted land use forecast. This low-cost, straightforward approach was pioneered by the Santa Barbara County Association of Governments (using a “Regional Greenprint” of GIS layers representing habitat, agricultural resources and other open space areas), and the Tulare County Association of Governments (using layers from the San Joaquin Valley Greenprint).

### **Regional Conservation Planning Strategies to Address Potential Impacts**

Landscape conservation planning takes a proactive approach, identifying priority mitigation and conservation areas in advance of impacts, with the goal of preserving larger areas of higher habitat quality and connectivity. This type of advance planning also results in a more efficient and streamlined permitting approach for development projects. Advance mitigation, Natural Community Conservation Planning, mitigation banking, and in-lieu fee programs are all examples of landscape conservation planning in California. Generally speaking, all take a long-range, regional approach to mitigation and conservation planning. By working on a regional level, rather than project-by-project, state and federal agencies can work together and in cooperation with regional and local agencies to offset the environmental impacts of several planned infrastructure projects at once. <https://www.wildlife.ca.gov/Conservation/Planning>

#### *Policies and Regulations*

The following is a list of national and state policies that support and enable regional conservation planning efforts in California:

##### *National*

- Department of the Interior, Order No. 3330 “Improving Mitigation Policies and Practices of the Department of the Interior (Secretary Sally Jewell, 2013);” and
- Presidential Memorandum “Mitigating Impacts on Natural Resources from Development and Encouraging Related Private Investment” (Nov 2015).
- FHWA policies to encourage integration of natural resources in the planning process: <https://www.environment.fhwa.dot.gov/integ/index.asp>

##### *State*

- California Endangered Species Act and Natural Community Conservation Planning Act (NCCP Act)

### *Tools and Frameworks*

The following is a list of tools and frameworks available for regional conservation planning that can be integrated into planning processes at a regional scale:

- Regional Advance Mitigation Planning (RAMP) - Advance mitigation planning to identify areas for mitigation prior to project-by-project discussion is an exemplary planning practice. Regional Advance Mitigation Planning (RAMP) is an important example of such efforts. By coordinating early with agencies responsible for project-level permitting to evaluate the individual and cumulative impacts of one or several projects and focusing mitigation on regional priority conservation opportunities, ecosystem-scale conservation needs can be met, providing more effective conservation and mitigation. In addition, the time and cost inefficiency of project-by-project review, permitting, and mitigation can be avoided thereby making mitigation more efficient. MPOs may consider using RAMP in siting and mitigating for infrastructure projects, in order to maximize time efficiency, reduce mitigation costs, and protect regional natural resources;
- Regional Conservation Investment Strategies (RCIS) and Mitigation Credits Agreements (MCA) – Assembly Bill 2087 (Levine, 2016), established an RCIS pilot study program in California that is presently under development. An RCIS must be proposed by a public agency and would provide a voluntary process and framework to guide investments in natural resource conservation, infrastructure, and will identify priority locations for compensatory mitigation on a regional basis. Once an RCIS has been approved by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife as a pilot project, a Mitigation Credit Agreement can be established. Once established, RCISs and subsequent MCAs can provide a regional mitigation framework for RTPs and subsequent transportation projects. All RCISs and MCAs must be approved prior to January 1, 2020;
- For additional information regarding regional open space conservation please see the following EPA website - <http://www.epa.gov/dced/openspace.htm>.

The following is a list of regional Habitat Conservation Plan/NCCPs (HCP/NCCP) and other resources:

- CA Department of Fish and Game Natural Community Conservation Planning information - There are currently 13 approved NCCPs (includes 6 subarea plans) and 22 NCCPs in the active planning phase (includes 10 subarea plans), which together cover more than 7 million acres and will provide conservation for nearly 400 special status species and a wide diversity of natural community types throughout California - <https://www.wildlife.ca.gov/Conservation/Planning/NCCP/Plans>;
- USFWS Endangered Species Habitat Conservation Planning Information <https://www.fws.gov/endangered/what-we-do/hcp-overview.html>
- Pacific Southwest Region USFWS Offices for Ecological Information <http://www.fws.gov/cno/es/>
- Sacramento FWS Office list of Regional Habitat Conservation Plans - [https://www.fws.gov/sacramento/es/Habitat-Conservation-Plans/es\\_hcp.htm](https://www.fws.gov/sacramento/es/Habitat-Conservation-Plans/es_hcp.htm)

- Carlsbad FWS Office information regarding Regional Habitat Conservation Plans <http://www.fws.gov/carlsbad/HCPs/CarlsbadCFWOREgionalHCPs%20.html>
- Ventura FWS Office information regarding Regional Habitat Conservation Plans <https://www.fws.gov/ventura/endangered/habitatconservation/index.html>
- Information regarding City and County Zoning Ordinances - <https://www.opr.ca.gov/docs/PZD2012.pdf>
- Information regarding Farmland Mapping and Williamson Act [www.conservation.ca.gov/dlrp/fmmp](http://www.conservation.ca.gov/dlrp/fmmp);
- Information regarding adopted Open Space Elements is available through the Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR) California Planner's Book of Lists - [https://www.opr.ca.gov/s\\_publications.php](https://www.opr.ca.gov/s_publications.php)

### *Statewide Examples*

Aggregated planning practice examples of the consideration of environmental resources in transportation planning from throughout California can be found in the Sustainable Communities Strategies and Conservation report:

<http://www.nature.org/ourinitiatives/regions/northamerica/unitedstates/california/sustainable-communities-strategies-and-conservation.pdf>

The following represent additional planning practice examples of how regions have conducted regional conservation planning efforts focusing on resource areas and farmland as part of their RTP process:

### *Large/Urban MPO Examples:*

- SANDAG's Environmental Mitigation Program (EMP) - An excellent example of this approach is SANDAG's EMP, which is funded through the region's TransNet sales tax measure. The EMP directs mitigation resources to habitat identified in adopted conservation plans, leverages funding from conservation partners, and saves additional money by acquiring habitat "early, at lower prices, and in larger parcels" (<http://www.keepsandiegomoving.com/EMP/EMP-intro.aspx>). For more information, please see San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan <http://www.sdforward.com/>;
- Orange County Transportation Authority (OCTA) EMP [http://www.octa.net/Projects-and-Programs/Measure-M/Measure-M2-\(2011-2041\)/Freeway-Mitigation/Conservation-Plan/](http://www.octa.net/Projects-and-Programs/Measure-M/Measure-M2-(2011-2041)/Freeway-Mitigation/Conservation-Plan/);
- Rural-Urban Connections Strategy (RUCS) developed by SACOG: <http://www.sacog.org/rucs/>
- SCAG's preparation of a Conservation Framework and Assessment (Jan 2015)- [http://sustain.scag.ca.gov/Sustainability%20Portal%20Document%20Library/SCAG%20Final%20Conservation%20Framework%20%20Assessment\\_Feb.pdf](http://sustain.scag.ca.gov/Sustainability%20Portal%20Document%20Library/SCAG%20Final%20Conservation%20Framework%20%20Assessment_Feb.pdf);
- SCAG's 2016 RTP/SCS preparation of Natural and Farm Lands Appendix - [www.scagrtpscs.net/Documents/2016/final/f2016RTPSCS\\_NaturalFarmLands.pdf](http://www.scagrtpscs.net/Documents/2016/final/f2016RTPSCS_NaturalFarmLands.pdf)

### *Medium/Small/Rural MPO Examples:*

- Butte County Association of Government's (BCAG) RTP/SCS and Regional Conservation Plan - BCAG adopted the Butte County Regional Conservation Plan (Plan), a regional Natural Community Conservation Plan/Habitat Conservation Plan (NCCP/HCP), adopted recently to streamline the development and mitigation associated with public and private development in the planning area. BCAG's RTP/SCS has identified Regional Conservation Plan development and implementation strategies during transportation projects. Preparation and adoption of the Regional Conservation Plan required extensive resource agency coordination with the planning signatories upon issuance of federal and state permits along with the Plan. For more information, see Butte County Metropolitan Transportation Plan & Sustainable Communities Strategy: <http://www.bcag.org/Planning/RTP--SCS/index.html>;
- AMBAG incorporated a Regional Greenprint Analysis into its 2014 MTP/SCS: <http://www.ambag.org/programs-services/planning/metro-transport-plan>;
- San Joaquin Valley Greenprint, sponsored by Fresno COG: [www.fresnocog.org/san-joaquin-valley-greenprint-program](http://www.fresnocog.org/san-joaquin-valley-greenprint-program);
- Tulare County Association of Governments (using layers from the San Joaquin Valley Greenprint) - 2014-2040 Regional Transportation Plan & Sustainable Communities Strategy for Tulare County <http://www.tularecog.org/rtp2014/>.
- Santa Barbara County Conservation Blueprint – A process led by the Land Trust of Santa Barbara County is underway and leading an effort of data gathering and community engagement process leading to a Conservation Blueprint that will provide a science based decision-making platform for conservation, including restoration and other land management decisions. The process is led by Land Trust for Santa Barbara County, Cachuma Resource Conversation District, and the Santa Barbara Foundation's LEAF Initiative, and is guided by a 12-member Steering Committee; <http://www.aginnovations.org/project/santa-barbara-county-conservation-blueprint>. For more information, see Santa Barbara's 2040 Regional Transportation Plan and Sustainable Communities Strategy: <http://www.sbcag.org/rtp.html>;
- The Land Trust of Santa Cruz County developed a Conservation Blueprint (<http://www.landtrustsantacruz.org/blueprint/>) for the county which is being integrated with Santa Cruz County's RTP and regional planning processes. Specifically, Santa Cruz County's Conservation Blueprint is the basis for developing an advance mitigation planning framework via an EMP within the 2014 RTP development process - <http://sccrtc.org/funding-planning/long-range-plans/rtp/2014-plan>.
- The Elkhorn Slough Early Mitigation Partnership (ESEMP) is a Caltrans-sponsored interagency effort to provide early mitigation for a series of future transportation improvement projects within the Elkhorn Slough Watershed. This project seeks to help address regional scale conservation in a manner that also can help facilitate project delivery by developing a process for identifying funding strategies and implementing conservation agreements earlier than would be possible through existing traditional channels - <http://elkhornslough.ucdavis.edu/>.

### **Aquatic and Terrestrial Habitat Connectivity**

A functional network of connected wildlands is essential to the continued support of California's diverse natural communities in the face of human development and climate change. Natural and semi-natural components of the landscape must be large enough

and connected enough to meet the needs of all species that use them, including species' continued need for movement, migration, and shifts in distribution. The California Essential Habitat Connectivity Project developed guidance for mitigating the fragmenting effects of roads and transportation corridors and a framework for developing regional and local connectivity plans (California Essential Habitat Connectivity Project 2010).

### *Policies and Regulations*

The following is a list of national and state policies that support and enable habitat connectivity planning efforts in California:

#### *National*

- Federal Endangered Species Act and species recovery plans that identify habitat fragmentation and road mortality as risks to species recovery

#### *State*

- [AB 498](#) (Levine, 2015) regarding Wildlife Conservation and Wildlife Corridors which amends California Fish and Game Code Sections 1797.5, 1930, and 1930.5;
- CEQA Guidelines and Migratory Species – “Will the project interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites;”
- California State Wildlife Action Plan and Transportation Companion Plan - <https://www.wildlife.ca.gov/swap>; and
- [SB 857](#) (Kuehl, 2006) applies to State Highway System transportation projects and details requirements for assessing and remediating barriers to fish passage at stream crossings along the State Highway System. A coordinated and comprehensive fish passage improvement program is fundamental to restore unimpeded passage for aquatic organisms and for the success of habitat restoration activities.

### *Tools and Data*

There are GIS habitat modeling tools and datasets that are available to consider and integrate into the RTP update process. These can be integrated into the RTP update itself as well as with future transportation projects identified in RTPs. The following is a list of tools and datasets available for planning decisions:

#### *Statewide*

- California Essential Connectivity Project (2010) <https://www.wildlife.ca.gov/conservation/planning/connectivity/CEHC>;
- California Protected Areas Database [www.calands.org](http://www.calands.org); and
- California Fish Passage Assessment Database (PAD) <http://www.calfish.org/>

#### *Regional*

- Bay Area Critical Linkages - <http://www.scwildlands.org/>;
- South Coast Linkages - <http://www.scwildlands.org/>;
- California Desert Connectivity Project - <http://www.scwildlands.org/>; and
- CDFW's Northern Sierra Nevada Foothill connectivity mapping project <https://www.wildlife.ca.gov/Data/Analysis/Connectivity>.

## *Examples*

The following are examples of various RTPs and other long-range transportation plans that have integrated habitat connectivity resources and natural resource mapping into their planning processes:

- AMBAG's Monterey Bay Area Sensitive Resource Mapping Project with 2035 RTP/SCS Update. AMBAG received SHRP2 (C06) federal highway research funds to apply FHWA's Integrated Ecological Framework (IEF) to their Moving Forward Monterey Bay 2035 Plan and planning process. The goal was to identify sensitive resources in the AMBAG region to provide managers with a better understanding of potential conflicts and mitigation needs for transportation projects in the 2035 Plan. AMBAG created an on-line interactive GIS database with this project and developed 32 sensitive resource maps for the AMBAG region and used in the Environmental Mitigation section of the RTP/SCS 2035 Plan update;
- Caltrans District 5 Highway 17 Transportation Concept Report – [http://www.dot.ca.gov/dist05/planning/sys\\_plan\\_docs/factsheets\\_datasheets/SR17/17\\_tcr.pdf](http://www.dot.ca.gov/dist05/planning/sys_plan_docs/factsheets_datasheets/SR17/17_tcr.pdf);
- Caltrans District 5 Regional Wildlife and Habitat Connectivity Plan for the Central Coast Region of California – <http://www.dot.ca.gov/dist05/planning/AdvWildlifeConnectivity.htm>; and
- Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Plan - Conservation planning efforts, such as the Conservation Blueprint, developed by the Land Trust of Santa Cruz County, and the Wildlife Habitat Connectivity GIS database, developed by Caltrans and partner agencies, support regional mitigation and can serve as a resource for future mitigation plans in Santa Cruz County. This data is being integrated into the RTP 2014 of Santa Cruz County and AMBAG's RTP/SCS.

## **RTP Financial Overview**

Federal statute and regulations and California State statute requires RTPs to contain an estimate of funds available for the 20-year planning horizon. This discussion of financial information is fundamental to the development and implementation of the RTP. The financial portions of the RTP identify the current and anticipated revenue sources and financing techniques available to fund the planned transportation investments described in other portions of the RTP. The intent is to define realistic financing constraints and opportunities. All projects, except illustrative projects i.e. unconstrained projects, must be fully funded in order to be included in the RTP. With this financing information, alternatives are developed and used by the MPO, local agencies and State decision-makers in funding transportation projects. Detailed information regarding RTP financial requirements is available in **Sections 6.2 – 6.7**.

### **Fiscal Constraint**

<http://www.sandag.org/index.asp?projectid=292&fuseaction=projects.detail>

<http://www.scag.ca.gov/rtp2004/2004/FinalPlan.htm>



## **Listing of Constrained and Un-constrained Projects**

[http://www.mtc.ca.gov/planning/2035\\_plan/](http://www.mtc.ca.gov/planning/2035_plan/)

## **Revenue Identification and Forecasting**

<http://www.bcag.org/Planning/index.html>

## **Estimating Future Transportation Costs**

In keeping with the Federal and State efforts to streamline the project delivery and NEPA review process at the project level by providing environmental information at the earliest point in time, it is recommended that the RTP also include a preliminary cost estimate for the mitigation activities that are identified.

## **Asset Management**

To ensure a sustainable transportation system, MPOs are encouraged to address existing infrastructure condition and performance prior to considering expansion of the system. This general approach is considered a best practice that will ensure that the agencies funding for the transportation will be adequate to sustain the system into the future.

## **RTP Modal Discussion**

### **Transit**

Los Angeles Metro, First and Last Mile Strategic Plan, identified strategies and potential funding sources for improving the areas surrounding transit stations to make it easier and safer for people to access them. SCAG incorporated some of these strategies into its 2016 RTP/SCS as well as short trips strategies to increase the number of trips under three miles that people take by foot or bike. The plan is available at:

[http://media.metro.net/docs/sustainability\\_path\\_design\\_guidelines.pdf](http://media.metro.net/docs/sustainability_path_design_guidelines.pdf)

### **Bicycle & Pedestrian**

The use of bicycles and walking as a means of transportation has increased dramatically in California over the last 20 years. Both modes of transportation promote a healthy lifestyle and reduce environmental impacts.

Bicycle and Pedestrian planning practice information and resources are available at the following links:

“At the Intersection of Active Transportation & Equity” (Safe Routes to Schools National Partnership, 2015) <http://saferoutespartnership.org/resources/report/intersection-active-transportation-equity>

“Urban Bikeway Design Guide” (National Association of City Transportation Officials, 2014) <http://nacto.org/publication/urban-bikeway-design-guide/>

Local and Regional plans for bicycle and pedestrian trails and related facilities, including the California Coastal Trail should be supported by RTPs. Additional planning practice information regarding the California Coastal Trail is available at the following links:

Completing the California Coastal Trail Plan – California Coastal Conservancy  
<http://www.coastal.ca.gov/access/coastal-trail-report.pdf>

Information regarding California Coastal Trail Definition and Design and Siting Standards is available at:  
[http://www.scc.ca.gov/webmaster/pdfs/CCT\\_Siting\\_Design.pdf](http://www.scc.ca.gov/webmaster/pdfs/CCT_Siting_Design.pdf)

### **Goods Movement (Maritime/Rail/Trucking/Aviation)**

MPOs are encouraged to consider developing or updating freight plans for their region, as these plans can help MPOs improve the efficiency and sustainability of goods movement in their regions.

<http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tpp/offices/ogm/>

<http://rtpscs.scag.ca.gov/Pages/default.aspx>

<http://www.alamedactc.org/goodsmovement>

<http://www.ops.fhwa.dot.gov/Freight/infrastructure/nfn/index.htm>

<http://www.sandag.org/index.asp?classid=13&fuseaction=home.classhome>

### *California Sustainable Freight Action Plan*

In July 2015, Governor Brown issued Executive Order B-32-15 which prioritizes California’s transition to a more efficient and less polluting freight transportation system. This transition of California’s freight transportation system is essential to supporting the State’s economic competitiveness in the coming decades while reducing greenhouse gas emissions and air quality impacts. The Executive Order directed State agencies to develop an integrated action plan by July 2016 that established clear targets to improve freight efficiency, transition to zero-emission technologies, and increase the competitiveness of California’s freight system. It is suggested that regional transportation agencies consult the California Sustainable Freight Action Plan when developing the freight-related strategies in their respective RTPs. For more information see: <http://www.dot.ca.gov/casustainablefreight/>

### *California Freight Mobility Plan*

The state’s California Freight Mobility Plan (CFMP) is a policy and action agenda document that supports the improvement of California’s goods movement infrastructure while preserving the environment. MPOs are encouraged to review the CFMP for



guidance, and ensure consistency while addressing goods movement within their RTPs. The RTPs and the CFMP will ideally function in a feedback loop, as the goods movement strategies and projects identified in RTPs will be incorporated into the next update of the CFMP. For more information see:

<http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tpp/offices/ogm/cfmp.html>

## **Regional Aviation System**

MPOs should consider including the following aviation planning topics in the development of their RTPs:

1. An overview of the role that all public use airports including both commercial, and general aviation airports, heliports, and military airfields play in the region's multimodal transportation system.
2. Describe the functional relationship between the region's airports, and heliports, and explain specific RTP policies that support and preserve the long term viability of the region's airports.
3. Identify current airport conditions such as noise, safety, and future airport improvement projects that can be found in either an airport's layout plan, or master plans.
4. Provide a list of all public-use airports, including their State functional class developed by the Division of Aeronautics for all commercial and general aviation airports, and military installations in the region, and a description of their facilities and uses, and a map of their location.
5. Provide a discussion of any future airport(s) growth and improvement needs found in each airport's master plan or airport layout plan.
6. A discussion of multimodal ground access issues and any required ground access program or plan.
7. A separate list of short (5 year) and long-range (10 year) Airport Capital Improvement Plan (ACIP) projects within the region.
8. Identify which governing body serves as each county's ALUC for the region established pursuant to PUC 21670(a), as well as the title and date of the most current ALUCPs, Airport Master Plans or Airport Layout Plans; and military Air Installation Compatible Use Zone Plans.
9. Demonstrate consistency with the State of California Office of Planning and Research's document entitled *Community and Military Compatibility Planning; Supplement to the General Plan Guidelines* (December 2009) for military installations available at:

[https://www.opr.ca.gov/docs/Military\\_GPG\\_Supplement.pdf](https://www.opr.ca.gov/docs/Military_GPG_Supplement.pdf)

Additional aviation planning practice information and case studies can be found at:

<http://dot.ca.gov/hq/planning/aeronaut/publication.htm>

[http://www.faa.gov/airports/planning\\_capacity/ga\\_study](http://www.faa.gov/airports/planning_capacity/ga_study)

<http://www.gao.gov/products/GAO-10-120>

<http://www.gao.gov/products/GAO-13-261>

For questions and additional information regarding the state aviation program and its airport planning activities for a specific region, please visit the Caltrans Division of Aeronautics website: <http://www.dot.ca.gov/aeronaut/index.html>

For additional information regarding land use compatibility concerns affecting airports, please visit the Caltrans Division of Aeronautics website: <http://dot.ca.gov/hq/planning/aeronaut/documents/alucp/>

### **Military Airfields and Installations**

As a best practice, MPOs should include a discussion of military installations transportation and land use compatibility needs in their RTPs by addressing of the following:

1. A list and map of all military airfields and installations in the region.
2. An overview of the role that these military airfields and installations play in the region including a brief description of the installation's current and future mission(s).
3. Discuss multimodal ground access needs to installations for both people and freight, as well any needed ground access programs or plans that support its needs to complete its mission(s).
4. Demonstrate consistency with California's OPR document *Community and Military Compatibility Planning; Supplement to the General Plan Guidelines* (December 2009) available at: [https://www.opr.ca.gov/docs/Military\\_GPG\\_Supplement.pdf](https://www.opr.ca.gov/docs/Military_GPG_Supplement.pdf).

**Additional military installation planning practices can be found at:**

<http://www.napawash.org/2009/1378-strengthening-national-defense-counter-encroachment-through-military-community-collaboration.html>

[http://militarycouncil.ca.gov/s\\_economicdata.php](http://militarycouncil.ca.gov/s_economicdata.php)

<https://www.sdmac.org/ImpactStudy.htm>

<http://hrtpo.org/page/military-transportation-needs>

[http://www.nctcoq.org/trans/aviation/jlus/JLUS\\_bkg.asp](http://www.nctcoq.org/trans/aviation/jlus/JLUS_bkg.asp)

<http://hrtpo.org/page/military-transportation-needs>

<http://www.nceastmgf.org/studies-and-analyses>

For questions and additional information regarding the state aviation program and its airport planning activities for a specific region, please visit the Caltrans Division of Aeronautics website: <http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/planning/aeronaut/planners.htm>

## **Transportation System Management and Operations**

A US DOT document titled; “Management & Operations in the Metropolitan Transportation Plan: A Guidebook for Creating an Objectives-Driven, Performance-Based Approach” provides a very good overview on how to integrate transportation system management and operations into the planning process. See:

<http://www.ops.fhwa.dot.gov/publications/moguidebook/index.htm>

In addition, the US DOT document titled, “Traffic Signal Operations and Maintenance Staffing Guidelines,” provides guidelines to estimate the staffing and resource needs required to effectively operate and maintain traffic signal systems. Specifically, Chapter 1.3.1 provides a suggestion on the level of maintenance that is necessary. See: <http://ops.fhwa.dot.gov/publications/fhwahop09006/fhwahop09006.pdf>

## **Future of Transportation and New Technology**

While maintaining the current transportation network is often a priority for MPOs, MPOs need to be planning ahead for a future in which technology will transform the way that people move and live. This section provides a summary of federal and State legislation to prepare for new technologies and innovations for the future of transportation. MPOs are ideally positioned to anticipate and be responsive to the needs of future generations. In addition, RTPs can also identify how the transportation network has been designed to accommodate, and promote, new technology, alternative fuels, charging stations, zero-emission technology, and emerging technology such as automated vehicles; include a discussion about incentives and implementation of these measures; and, identify how the proposed transportation network is meeting the goals and objectives of the State’s Zero Emission Vehicle Action Plan.

### **Connected Vehicle Program**

There are several activities related to the national Connected Vehicle Program that will certainly impact regional and local transportation agencies, in addition to Caltrans. Since 90% of the roadways in California are owned and operated by local agencies, including the 58 counties and more than 500 incorporated cities, it is critically important for them to be aware of and to plan for the implementation of connected vehicles.

This document explains licensing requirements transparent and best practices accessible to any organization, public or private, seeking to deploy “Connected Vehicle” Dedicated Short Range Communications (DSRC) Roadside Units (RSU) and services that support vehicle-to-infrastructure (V2I) applications.

<http://ntl.bts.gov/lib/56000/56900/56950/FHWA-JPO-16-267.pdf>

This guidance is intended to assist system owner/operator staff to deploy V2I technology not only in terms Federal Aid Highway program requirements but also practices to help ensure interoperability and efficient and effective planning/procurement/operations.

[http://www.its.dot.gov/meetings/pdf/V2I\\_DeploymentGuidanceDraftv9.pdf](http://www.its.dot.gov/meetings/pdf/V2I_DeploymentGuidanceDraftv9.pdf)

SANDAG's "Off-Model GHG Reduction Methodology" provides calculations and planning practices for vehicle automation assumptions:

[http://www.sdfoward.com/pdfs/RP\\_final/AppendixA\\_B\\_C.pdf](http://www.sdfoward.com/pdfs/RP_final/AppendixA_B_C.pdf)

## **Transportation Electrification**

State law encourages MPOs to promote the development of transportation electrification and the deployment of electric vehicles in their RTPs. Section 740.12 of the Public Utilities Code describes the importance of transportation electrification for meeting greenhouse gas emission reduction targets and air quality standards.

### ***Guidance for Zero-Emission Vehicles Readiness Planning Statewide***

2016 Zero Emission Vehicle Action Plan

(Governor's Interagency Working Group on Zero-Emission Vehicles):

[https://www.gov.ca.gov/docs/2016\\_ZEV\\_Action\\_Plan.pdf](https://www.gov.ca.gov/docs/2016_ZEV_Action_Plan.pdf)

Zero-Emission Vehicles in CA: Community Readiness Guidebook and Other Resources  
(Governor's Office of Planning and Research, OPR):

[https://www.opr.ca.gov/docs/ZEV\\_Guidebook.pdf](https://www.opr.ca.gov/docs/ZEV_Guidebook.pdf)

[https://www.opr.ca.gov/s\\_zero-emissionvehicles.php](https://www.opr.ca.gov/s_zero-emissionvehicles.php)

A Toolkit for Community Plug-In Electric Vehicle Readiness and Additional Resources  
(California Plug-in Electric Vehicle Collaborative, PEV Collaborative):

[http://www.pevcollaborative.org/sites/all/themes/pev/files/docs/toolkit\\_final\\_website.pdf](http://www.pevcollaborative.org/sites/all/themes/pev/files/docs/toolkit_final_website.pdf)

<http://www.pevcollaborative.org/pev-readiness>

### ***Funding for Zero-Emission Vehicle Planning and Implementation***

Zero-Emission Vehicle Regional Readiness and Planning (California Energy Commission):

<http://www.energy.ca.gov/contracts/GFO-16-601/>

### ***Examples of Regional Readiness Plans (Zero-Emission Vehicles and Alternative Fuels)***

Upstate Plug-In Electric Vehicle Readiness Project (Shasta, Siskiyou & Tehama Counties)

<http://www.siskiyoucounty.org/pev/>

AMBAG Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Plan for the Monterey Bay Area

<http://www.ambag.org/programs-services/planning/electric-vehicle-planning>

San Joaquin Valley Plug-In Electric Vehicle Readiness Plan

[https://energycenter.org/sites/default/files/docs/nav/programs/pev-planning/san-joaquin/san\\_joaquin\\_valley\\_pev\\_readiness\\_plan-web.pdf](https://energycenter.org/sites/default/files/docs/nav/programs/pev-planning/san-joaquin/san_joaquin_valley_pev_readiness_plan-web.pdf)

Bay Area – Experience Electric Initiative

<http://mtc.ca.gov/whats-happening/news/experience-electric-initiative-brings-lastest-ev-models-people>

SCAG RTP/SCS Mobility Innovations Appendix:

[http://scagrtpscs.net/Documents/2016/draft/d2016RTPSCS\\_MobilityInnovations.pdf](http://scagrtpscs.net/Documents/2016/draft/d2016RTPSCS_MobilityInnovations.pdf)

SCAG Plug-In Electric Vehicle Readiness Plan

<https://www.scag.ca.gov/Documents/SCAG-Southern%20CA%20PEV%20Readiness%20Plan.pdf>

San Diego Regional Alternative Fuel Readiness Plan:

[http://www.sandag.org/uploads/projectid/projectid\\_487\\_20274.pdf](http://www.sandag.org/uploads/projectid/projectid_487_20274.pdf)

San Diego Plug-In Electric Vehicle Readiness Plan:

[http://www.sandag.org/uploads/publicationid/publicationid\\_1817\\_17061.pdf](http://www.sandag.org/uploads/publicationid/publicationid_1817_17061.pdf)

## **Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) Contents and Development**

Integrating transportation, land use, and housing, in the planning process is vital to reducing regional greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from cars and light trucks. The Sustainable Communities Strategy or SCS, was added as a new component of the RTP following the passage of SB 375 in September 2008, pursuant to Government Code Section 65080(b)(2). Detailed information on the requirements for SCS Content and Development is available in **Section 6.24 and Section 6.25**.

MPOs are required to develop a forecasted development pattern for the region that, when integrated with the regional transportation network and other transportation measures and policies, will reduce regional greenhouse gas emissions from cars and light trucks to achieve, if there is a feasible way to do so, the regional targets set by ARB.

The RTP/SCS is required to be developed in an inclusive and transparent manner pursuant to a public participation plan that meets state and federal requirements. Consistent with SB 375 and Title 23 CFR Part 450.316, the RTP/SCS development process includes involvement by all interested parties, such as walking and bicycling representatives, public health departments and public health non-governmental organizations, affordable housing advocates, transportation advocates, neighborhood and community groups, environmental advocates, home builder representatives, broad-based business organizations, landowners, commercial property interests and homeowner associations, the Native American community, neighboring MPOs and the general public through a proactive public participation process.

As part of the RTP/SCS development process, MPOs generally prepare scenarios that illustrate different long-range visions for transportation and land-use in the region. MPOs balance public input from a variety of stakeholders in the development of their RTP scenarios. Examples of how MPOs have incorporated public input into their RTP scenario development processes can be found below:

ABAG/MTC modeled the stakeholder-developed *Enhanced Network of Communities (ENC) Scenario* and the *Equity, Environment, and Jobs (EEJ) Scenario*. The ENC project list largely overlapped with the preferred scenario identified by MTC and ABAG. The EEJ list cut a number of road expansion projects in order to redirect funding to bus

service, while shifting some housing production to transit oriented suburban job centers that had not volunteered for significant growth.

Fresno COG modeled Scenario D, which was built around a more compact pattern of growth that would have conserved over 4,700 more acres of farmland, rangeland, and other open space than Fresno COG's preferred scenario, while directing more growth into existing communities, especially disadvantaged rural communities.

In response to community advocates' request for a "Balanced Growth Scenario," Kern COG developed the 33% Housing Mix Alternative, under which 33% of new residential development would have gone into existing communities, and the 100% Infill Alternative.

There are various approaches that MPOs can take to develop scenarios that reflect community input. Incorporating public feedback into scenario creation, as technical and financial resources allow, is considered an exemplary planning practice that MPOs should strive for.

As a planning practice to evaluate the implementation of the land use development plan in the SCS, an on-going monitoring program and periodic reporting program could be conducted. The monitoring program could be at a sufficient spatial and temporal level of detail to satisfy several objectives: a) identify regional or sub-regional growth patterns, b) provide jurisdiction level information needed to evaluate their role in the regional plan, and c) evaluate the consistency requirement for land use projects under SB 375 CEQA streamlining.

Another planning practice is for MPOs to provide financial incentives, as feasible, to those local governments that promote land-use and affordable housing production consistent with the SCS. Those incentives can make a portion of regional transportation funding available only to those local governments that (1) adopt an HCD-certified Housing Element and commit to implement its action programs and report annually on implementation progress, (2) produce a substantial portion of their lower-income RHNA need, and (3) adopt effective tenant protections and other anti-displacement policies to ensure that high-propensity transit riders are not displaced from transit-oriented locations.

MTC's OneBayArea Grant Program (OBAG) has implemented elements of this approach. While not all agencies have the financial resources necessary to fund a discretionary grant program such as OBAG, it is an exemplary practice for MPOs to learn from. As amended in July 2016, OBAG provides a policy framework for awarding federal funding to projects that reflect regional transportation priorities and that support the goals set forth in Plan Bay Area such as:

- Conservation planning and land protection in Priority Conservation Areas
- Incentives for focused, transit-oriented growth in Priority Development Areas
- Funding for active transportation projects designed to support complete streets and safe access to transit and schools
- Grants to reward cities for providing affordable housing and to protect affordable units in low-income communities

For visualization and mapping, Urban Footprint is a planning tool which can reveal outcomes ranging from household costs, water and energy use, to loss or retention of open space. SCAG employed Urban Footprint in the 2012 RTP/SCS, accessible at:

<http://www.scag.ca.gov/Documents/UrbanFootprintTechnicalSummary.pdf>

### **Addressing Resource Areas and Farmland in the SCS**

As a planning practice to comply with the requirements of CA Government Code 65080 (b)(2)(B), MPOs, based on locally and regionally significant considerations, are encouraged to develop a Regional Open Space and Conservation Area Framework that identifies and considers “resource areas” and “farmland” as defined in Government Code Section 65080.01(a) and (b). To demonstrate consideration of resource areas and farmland, the SCS could 1) identify regional priority areas for conservation and mitigation efforts, based upon existing publicly available information and developed in consultation with the appropriate resource agencies including cities and counties, 2) adopt a land use forecast structured around spatially explicit, complementary networks of priority conservation areas and priority development areas, and 3) commit discretionary funding for conservation and development incentives for such areas. For an example of this approach, see Plan Bay Area: <http://planbayarea.org/the-plan/adopted-plan-bay-area-2013.html>

Another way to demonstrate consideration of resource areas and farmland is to 1) incorporate layers representing all categories of “resource areas” listed in Government Code Section 65080.01(a) and (b), as well as other key resources identified in HCPs, NCCPs and input from leading conservation organizations, and 2) treat these layers as constraints to development in land use scenarios and the adopted land use forecast. This low-cost, straightforward approach was pioneered by the Santa Barbara County Association of Governments (using a “Regional Greenprint” of GIS layers representing habitat, agricultural resources and other open space areas), and the Tulare County Association of Governments (using layers from the San Joaquin Valley Greenprint).

For more information, see Santa Barbara’s 2040 Regional Transportation Plan and Sustainable Communities Strategy: <http://www.sbca.org/rtp.html> and the 2014-2040 Regional Transportation Plan & Sustainable Communities Strategy for Tulare County <http://www.tulareco.org/rtp2014/>.

To support and expand upon these practices, MPOs are strongly encouraged to help local jurisdictions integrate HCPs, NCCPs and other conservation plans into their general plans, and incorporate the results into future land use forecasts. Prior to preparing its 2012 MTP/SCS, for example, the Butte County Association of Governments (BCAG) helped four of six local jurisdictions update their general plans to be consistent with one another, and with the Butte Regional Conservation Plan (BRCP) then in development. Based in part on these plans, its 2012 land use forecast directs most new growth into a network of Urban Permit Areas designed to minimize conflict with the BRCP. Thus, by working on a voluntary basis with those who have land use planning authority, BCAG was able to lay the groundwork for a land use pattern that will help protect some of its region’s most important habitat and open space.

For more information, see Butte County Metropolitan Transportation Plan & Sustainable Communities Strategy: <http://www.bcag.org/Planning/RTP--SCS/index.html>.



The following represent additional planning practice examples of how MPOs have conducted regional conservation planning efforts focusing on resource areas and farmland:

North County Multiple Habitat Conservation Program (MHCP) coordinated by SANDAG:  
<http://www.sandag.org/index.asp?projectid=97&fuseaction=projects.detail>

Rural-Urban Connections Strategy (RUCS) developed by SACOG:  
<http://www.sacog.org/rucs/>

Natural and Farm Lands Appendix prepared by SCAG for its 2016 RTP/SCS:  
[www.scaqrtpscs.net/Documents/2016/final/f2016RTPSCS\\_NaturalFarmLands.pdf](http://www.scaqrtpscs.net/Documents/2016/final/f2016RTPSCS_NaturalFarmLands.pdf)

Regional Greenprint Analysis prepared by AMBAG for its 2014 MTP/SCS:  
<http://www.ambag.org/programs-services/planning/metro-transport-plan>

San Joaquin Valley Greenprint, sponsored by Fresno COG:  
<http://www.fresnocoq.org/san-joaquin-valley-greenprint-program>

To realize the benefits of natural resource assessments like these, it is essential that they be thoroughly incorporated into land use scenarios and transportation project selection. In addition to the approaches taken by the Bay Area, Santa Barbara County, Tulare County and Butte County, MPOs are encouraged to follow an approach set forth in SLOCOG's first RTP/SCS: "Give conservation plans as much weight as general plans when planning transportation investments." For more information, see <http://www.slocoq.org/programs/regional-planning/2014-rtpscs>.

The following sources of information can assist MPOs in gathering and considering the best practically available scientific information regarding resource areas and farmland:

Survey of conservation best practices in SCSs, with sample language, implementation steps and suggested performance measures for specific practices:

Sustainable Communities Strategies and Conservation: Results from the First Round and Policy Recommendations for the Future Round (Southern Sierra Partnership)  
<http://www.southernsierrapartnership.org/scs-policy-report.html>

Natural Community Conservation and Habitat Conservation Planning Information:

CA Department of Fish and Game Natural Community Conservation Planning information  
<http://www.dfg.ca.gov/habcon/nccp/>

USFWS Endangered Species Habitat Conservation Planning Information  
<https://www.fws.gov/endangered/what-we-do/hcp-overview.html>

Pacific Southwest Region USFWS Offices for Ecological Information  
<http://www.fws.gov/cno/es/>

Sacramento FWS Office list of Regional Habitat Conservation Plans



[https://www.fws.gov/sacramento/es/Habitat-Conservation-Plans/es\\_hcp.htm](https://www.fws.gov/sacramento/es/Habitat-Conservation-Plans/es_hcp.htm)

Carlsbad FWS Office information regarding Regional Habitat Conservation Plans  
<http://www.fws.gov/carlsbad/HCPs/CarlsbadCFWORegionalHCPs%20.html>

Ventura FWS Office information regarding Regional Habitat Conservation Plans  
<https://www.fws.gov/ventura/endangered/habitatconservation/index.html>

Information regarding City and County Zoning Ordinances:  
<https://www.opr.ca.gov/docs/PZD2012.pdf>

Information regarding Farmland Mapping and Williamson Act:  
[www.conservation.ca.gov/dlrp/fmmp](http://www.conservation.ca.gov/dlrp/fmmp)

[www.conservation.ca.gov/dlrp/pages/index.aspx](http://www.conservation.ca.gov/dlrp/pages/index.aspx)

Information regarding adopted Open Space Elements is available through the Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR) California Planner's Book of Lists:  
[https://www.opr.ca.gov/s\\_publications.php](https://www.opr.ca.gov/s_publications.php)

### **Land Use and Transportation Strategies to Address Regional Greenhouse Gas Emissions in the RTP**

MPOs are encouraged to consider and incorporate those strategies that are likely to provide the greatest level of greenhouse gas emissions reduction considering feasibility of implementation as well as the unique characteristics and needs within the region.

This section provides several, but not a complete list of many and varied resources currently available to promote reductions in greenhouse gas emissions. MPOs are encouraged to connect and consult these resources as appropriate for their region, additional information is also available in **Section 6.24**.

#### **Pricing Strategies**

(Local/State Legislation is required to implement various pricing strategies and should be researched prior to incorporating into the RTP development process)

Pricing strategies are suggested to encourage reduced driving to reduce GHG emissions, and include, but are not limited to:

1. Using alternative mode programs, congestion pricing, toll roads, and parking pricing strategies. Examples are:
  - i. Road pricing and High Occupancy Toll (HOT) lanes. To reduce VMT, MPOs should model adding pricing to existing lanes, not just as a means for additional expansion. Variable/congestion pricing should be considered.
  - ii. User fees such as fuel taxes and parking charges.
  - iii. Free or reduced fare transit fares.
  - iv. Expansion of Parking Cash-Out Programs.

- v. Strategies to reduce the impacts of pricing strategies on low-income individuals.
  - vi. Improve the cost-efficiency of transit investments and transit operations.
2. Consider utilizing revenues from these pricing strategies for projects, such as mass transit, that improve mobility without increasing VMT or GHG emissions.

Road pricing can be found at:

“Opportunities to Improve Air Quality through Transportation Pricing Programs”, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, September 1997.

<http://www.epa.gov/oms/market/pricing.pdf>

“Sacramento Transportation & Air Quality Collaborative Final Report, Volume III: Supplemental Text for Agreements”, December 2005.

<http://www.sacta.org/pdf/STAQC/FinalReportIII.pdf>

### **Transportation Planning and Investment Strategies**

1. Consider shifting transportation investments towards improving and expanding urban and suburban core transit, programs for walkability, bicycling and other alternative modes, transit access, housing near transit, and local blueprint plans that coincide with the regional blueprint and the SCS. Although not explicitly required by law, MPOs could identify a set of indicators that will be used to assess the performance of the RTP in reaching climate and other goals, and could identify the criteria that the MPO used to select the transportation projects on the constrained and unconstrained project lists. Some examples of MPOs that have undertaken this approach include efforts by MTC and SACOG, for more information see:

MTC Plan Bay Area and Transportation Project Performance Assessment

<http://planbayarea.org/the-plan/plan-details/transportation.html>

<http://planbayarea.org/file10305.html>

SACOG 2016 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy and Planning Process:

<http://www.sacog.org/general-information/2016-mtpscs>

[http://www.sacog.org/sites/main/files/file-attachments/chapter\\_2\\_planning\\_process.pdf](http://www.sacog.org/sites/main/files/file-attachments/chapter_2_planning_process.pdf)

- 2. Provide funds and technical assistance to local agencies to implement blueprint strategies and the SCS.
- 3. Implement operational efficiencies that reduce congestion in vehicle throughput on roadways or improve transit access or other alternative access without physical expansion of the roadways.
- 4. Consider consulting with school districts on the regional land use plan to facilitate coordination between school siting and other land uses. This coordination could effectively reduce driving in the region. Consider school districts’ facilities master plans and transportation policies in the coordination of regional planning efforts.

5. For purposes of allocating transportation investments, recognize the rural contribution towards GHG reduction for counties that have policies that support development within their cities, and protect agriculture and resource lands. Consideration should be given to jurisdictions that contribute towards these goals for projects that reduce GHG or are GHG neutral, such as safety, rehabilitation, connectivity and for alternative modes.
6. In setting priorities, consider transportation projects that increase efficiency, connectivity and/or accessibility or provide other means to reduce GHG.
7. In setting priorities, consider transportation projects that provide public health co-benefits.
8. Employ “Fix It First” policies to ensure that preventive maintenance and repair of existing transit and roads are the highest priority for spending, to reduce overall maintenance costs, and to support development in existing centers and corridors.

### **Land Use Strategies that Can Help Reduce Rates of VMT and Per Person Household Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Emissions**

(Strategies incorporating the “D factors” - Professor Robert Cervero research)

There have been various studies and research conducted on land use and transportation strategies regarding travel that reduces driving by walking, biking, and transit use. Some of this research is known as the “Ds factors” as the variables can be described as Density, land use; Diversity, pedestrian-scale; Design, access to regional Destinations, and Distance to transit.

Professor Robert Cervero’s research efforts found that certain neighborhood characteristics significantly affect the amounts and modes of travel by residents, customers and employees.

Land use strategies that typically incorporate some or all of these “D factors” include: urban and suburban infill, clustered development, mixed land uses, New Urbanist design, transit-oriented development, and other “smart-growth” strategies. When combined with good pedestrian and bicycle facilities and transit service, such strategies can contribute to a significant reduction in per household levels of GHG emissions (Reid Ewing, Keith Bartholomew, Steve Winkelman, Jerry Walters, and Don Chen, **Growing Cooler** – The Evidence on Urban Development and Climate Change, for the Urban Land Institute, 2008.)

The Ds are Destination (proximity), Density (or clustered development), Diversity (or mixture of land uses), Distance to transit, Design, and Development scale.

### **Transportation Demand Management (TDM)**

The Victoria Transport Policy Institute at <http://www.vtpi.org/tdm/index.php> contains an Encyclopedia that is a comprehensive source of information about innovative management solutions to transportation problems. It provides detailed information on various demand management strategies, plus general information on TDM planning and

evaluation techniques. It is produced by the Victoria Transport Policy Institute to increase understanding and implementation of TDM.

For example, TDM-related chapters include:

- Incentives to Use Alternative Modes and Reduce Driving
- Parking and Land Use Management
- TDM Programs and Program Support
- TDM Planning and Evaluation
- Innovative and Emerging Shared Mobility Services (i.e., bikeshare, carshare, and on-demand rideshare services)

### **RTP policies that support Smart Growth Land Use principles**

Metropolitan Transportation Commission's Best Practice Examples related to strategies 1. and 2. listed below:

MTC's T2035 Plan called for modifying our Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC) program to support Priority Development Areas which were identified as a part of FOCUS, the Bay Area's blueprint planning process. The TLC program offers capital grants to cities, counties, and transit agencies to construct projects that support compact development near transit. See:

<http://mtc.ca.gov/whats-happening/news/mtc-awards-44-million-new-grants-promote-livable-communities>

MTC's Resolution 3434 TOD Policy ties regional discretionary funds for new transit extension projects (funded via Resolution 3434) to supportive land uses. This policy establishes targets for new housing units in each transit corridor and calls for station area plans and corridor working groups to help achieve the housing targets. Station area plans to meet the housing targets must be adopted by local municipalities prior to receiving MTC discretionary funding for construction of Resolution 3434 funds. See:

<http://mtc.ca.gov/our-work/plans-projects/other-plans/regional-transit-expansion-program>

As MPOs and RTPAs work towards achieving better linkages between land use and transportation planning within their regions, both MPOs and RTPAs are highly encouraged to include within their Policy Element the following:

1. Develop investments and programs that support local jurisdictions that make land use decisions that implement as appropriate, the SCS, regional blueprints, and other strategies that will help reduce greenhouse gas emissions and improve the quality of mobility throughout the region.
2. Emphasize transportation investments in areas where forecasted development patterns indicated may result in regional greenhouse gas emissions reduction.

### **Additional Planning Practice Examples**

Attorney General list of mitigation measures:

[http://ag.ca.gov/globalwarming/pdf/GW\\_mitigation\\_measures.pdf](http://ag.ca.gov/globalwarming/pdf/GW_mitigation_measures.pdf)

CAPCOA CEQA and Climate Change paper:

<http://www.capcoa.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/03/CAPCOA-White-Paper.pdf>

US EPA highlighted case studies for Smart Growth illustrated through open space, mixed land use and transportation choices are available at:

<http://www.epa.gov/dced/case.htm>

SANDAG's Regional Parking Management Toolbox contains resources for parking and demand management. The Regional Parking Management Toolbox can be found here:

[http://www.sandag.org/uploads/publicationid/publicationid\\_1910\\_18614.pdf](http://www.sandag.org/uploads/publicationid/publicationid_1910_18614.pdf)

### **Adaptation of the Regional Transportation System to Climate Change**

MPOs should begin to address climate change in their long range transportation plans using Caltrans guidance, Cal-Adapt.org and other state resources (see Climate Adaptation Resources table). Design and planning standards should be re-evaluated to address future conditions. Where possible, MPOs and RTPAs should consult *Safeguarding California's* transportation chapter, local general plan safety elements, local hazard mitigation plans, and other relevant local, regional, and state resources and documents. See **Section 6.30** for additional information on Climate Change Adaptation planning.

In addition, MPOs should make use of models that predict climate impacts like sea level rise, and that estimate changes in carbon stocks from alternative project or land management activities. Recent research shows that changes in land use and management can generate GHG benefits by avoiding and reducing emissions, and by increasing carbon storage. MPOs are encouraged to refer to the Climate Action through Conservation (CATC): <http://scienceforconservation.org/downloads/>

The model, method and tool presented in this report is usable at the county or regional scale, and can help MPOs to provide a more comprehensive account of their progress toward meeting the state's GHG reduction goals.

#### *Large/Urban Planning Practice Example:*

Southern California Council of Government's (SCAG) has developed a section on Environmental Mitigation pursuant to 23 USC Section 134 into their RTP/SCS and planning process. SCAG has also developed a Sustainability Program focused on natural resources and climate change strategies.

<http://sustain.scaq.ca.gov/Pages/LinksResources.aspx>

<http://rtpscs.scaq.ca.gov/Pages/2012-2035-RTP-SCS.aspx>

MTC has been conducting climate resilience studies focused on impacts to specific communities, coastlines, and transportation assets:

<http://mtc.ca.gov/our-work/plans-projects/climate-change-clean-vehicles/adapting-rising-tides>

SANDAG prepared a Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation White Paper prior to adopting the 2015 RTP/SCS:

[http://www.sdforward.com/sites/sandag/files/Climate\\_Change\\_White%20Paper\\_fwe\\_07142014.pdf](http://www.sdforward.com/sites/sandag/files/Climate_Change_White%20Paper_fwe_07142014.pdf)

SACOG, prior to preparing the 2016 MTP/SCS, partnered with CivicSpark to develop the Sacramento Region Transportation Climate Adaptation Plan (SRTCAP). This plan outlines key strategies and actions the Sacramento region can take to ensure its transportation assets are adaptable to potential climate related events:

<http://www.sacog.org/sites/main/files/file-attachments/fullplanwithappendices.pdf>

## **Performance Measures**

Caltrans recommends using performance measures to measure the progress of regional projects. MPOs should take into account the benefits of using performance measures to establish a base of measurement and cross-reference the measurement with the performance measure outcome/results. These measurements can be used to justify the need for funding on specific projects. The scientific data may support regional needs and highlight the justification for funding a project that demonstrates the potential for improved performance on the Caltrans system or regional road network.

Although not explicitly required by law, MPOs could identify a set of indicators that will be used to assess the performance of the RTP. In addition, the RTP could identify the criteria that the MPO used to select the transportation projects on the constrained and unconstrained project lists. Caltrans has also developed a guidebook on how to implement performance measures in rural and small urban regions. This guidebook provides a toolbox from which to select appropriate methodologies for performance measures in rural or small urban area. The Guidebook on “Performance Measures for Rural Transportation Systems” can be accessed at:

<http://www.dot.ca.gov/perf>

In 2011, the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) received grant funding from the Strategic Growth Council to collaborate with other California MPOs and state agencies to identify common statewide performance monitoring indicators related to SB 375 implementation. While performance measures rely mostly on modeled or forecasted data, performance monitoring indicators rely directly on observed data. MPOs use travel demand models or Geographic Information Systems analyses to forecast performance measures. Ideally monitoring indicators would be considered together and be consistent with modeling performance measures.

The following table identifies nine indicators that can be monitored using statewide and regional data sources as reflected in the *Statewide Performance Monitoring Indicators for Transportation Planning Final Report* (SANDAG, 2013), available at:

[http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tpp/offices/ocp/ATLC/documents/august\\_15\\_2013/document\\_links/indicator.pdf](http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tpp/offices/ocp/ATLC/documents/august_15_2013/document_links/indicator.pdf).

Table 1: Proposed Performance Monitoring Indicators					
ID	Inventory Ref. (Appendix B)	MAP-21 Category	Statewide Performance Monitoring Observed Data	Performance Measure (Model Based)	Referenced In
<b>Congestion Reduction</b>					
1	A-8 / A-1	VMT	✓	✓	SB 375 & MAP-21
		a. VMT per capita* b. Percent of Congested Freeway/ Highway Vehicle Miles [PeMS]	✓	✓	SB 375 & MAP-21
2	A-16/A-18	Mode Share (Travel to work)*	✓	✓	SB 375 & MAP-21
<b>Infrastructure Condition</b>					
3	-	State of Good Repair a. Highways b. Local Streets c. Highway Bridges d. Transit Assets	✓		MAP-21
<b>System Reliability</b>					
4	A-65	Freeway/Highway Buffer Index [PeMS]	✓	✓	MAP-21
<b>Safety</b>					
5	A-39	Fatalities/Serious Injuries a. Fatalities/Serious Injuries per capita* b. Fatalities/Serious Injuries per VMT*	✓	✓	MAP-21
<b>Economic Vitality</b>					
6	C-33	Transit Accessibility (Housing and jobs within 0.5 miles of transit stops with frequent transit service)*	✓	✓	SB 375
7	A-84	Travel Time to Jobs	✓	✓	SB 375 & MAP-21
<b>Environmental Sustainability</b>					
8	B-1/B-5	Change in Agricultural Land*	✓	✓	SB 375
9	E-5	CO <sub>2</sub> Emissions Reduction per capita (modeled data)*		✓	SB 375 & MAP-21
* Indicator relates to Public Health			[PeMS]	Indicator for MPOs that have access to PeMS data	



The following table provides a summary of potential performance metrics for rural county Regional Transportation Planning Agencies as outlined in the report, *Transportation Performance Measures for Rural Counties in California* (Rural Counties Task Force, 2015), at:

[http://www.ruralcountiestaskforce.org/Assets/Resources/PerformanceMeasures/Final\\_Report-PerfMonIndicators\\_StudySept2015.pdf](http://www.ruralcountiestaskforce.org/Assets/Resources/PerformanceMeasures/Final_Report-PerfMonIndicators_StudySept2015.pdf)

These metrics were developed according to the following criteria:

- Measurement-based rather than model-based;
- Alignment with California state transportation goals and objectives;
- Capability of informing current goals and objectives of each rural and small-urban RTPA;
- Applicability across all rural and small-urban regions;
- Capability of being linked to specific decisions on transportation investments; and
- Normalized for population to provide equitable comparisons to urban regions.


Metric	Source	Website
Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) Per Capita By Locality By Facility Ownership Local vs. Tourist	Mobility Reporting	<a href="http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/traffops/sysmgtp/MPR/index">http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/traffops/sysmgtp/MPR/index</a>
	California DOF	<a href="http://www.dof.ca.gov/research/demographic/reports/estimates/e">http://www.dof.ca.gov/research/demographic/reports/estimates/e</a>
	HPMS	<a href="http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tsip/hpms/hpmslibrary/prd/2013prd/2013PRD-revised.pdf">http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tsip/hpms/hpmslibrary/prd/2013prd/2013PRD-revised.pdf</a>
Peak V/C Ratio or Thresholds	Traffic Counts: K and D Factors	<a href="http://traffic-counts.dot.ca.gov/">http://traffic-counts.dot.ca.gov/</a>
Journey to Work Mode	American Community Survey	<a href="http://factfinder.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/index.xhtml">http://factfinder.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/index.xhtml</a>
Total Accident Cost Per VMT Per Capita	Transportation Injury Mapping	<a href="http://tims.berkeley.edu/login.php?next=/tools/bc/main1">http://tims.berkeley.edu/login.php?next=/tools/bc/main1</a>
	SWIRS TASAS	<a href="http://iswitrs.chp.ca.gov/Reports/jsp/userLogin.jsp">http://iswitrs.chp.ca.gov/Reports/jsp/userLogin.jsp</a> Caltrans Public Information Request Form
Transit Operating Cost per Revenue Mile	Local Transit Providers	
Distressed Lane Miles Total and % Total By Jurisdiction By Facility Type	Federal Highway	<a href="http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/tpm/rule/pmfactsheet.pdf">http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/tpm/rule/pmfactsheet.pdf</a>
	Regional or local pavement management system	<a href="https://www.federalregister.gov/articles/2015/01/05/2014-30085/national-performance-management-measures-assessing-pavement-condition-for-the-national-highway">https://www.federalregister.gov/articles/2015/01/05/2014-30085/national-performance-management-measures-assessing-pavement-condition-for-the-national-highway</a>
Pavement Condition Index (PCI) for Local Roads	Regional or local pavement management system	
Land Use Efficiency	Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP) DOF Annual population estimates	<a href="http://www.conservation.ca.gov/dlrp/fmmp">http://www.conservation.ca.gov/dlrp/fmmp</a>



Additionally, the following documents contain planning practice examples for performance based planning:

- Transform report entitled “Creating Healthy Regional Transportation Plans” (2012) contains a chapter explaining what the RTP Guidelines are, how they support healthy outcomes, and best practices for public participation. <http://www.transformca.org/resource/creating-healthy-regional-transportation-plans>
- The Nature Conservancy report entitled “Sustainable Communities Strategies and Conservation” includes model policies and best practices for conservation policies in SCSs. <http://www.southernsierrapartnership.org/scs-policy-report.html>
- The ClimatePlan report entitled “Leading the Way: Policies and Practices for Sustainable Communities Strategies.” <http://www.climateplan.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/10/Leading-the-Way-Full-Report.pdf>
- US DOT: Management & Operations in the Metropolitan Transportation Plan: A Guidebook for Creating an Objectives-Driven, Performance-Based Approach <http://www.ops.fhwa.dot.gov/publications/moguidebook/index.htm>
- FHWA Model Long-Range Transportation Plans: A Guide for Incorporating Performance Based Planning (2014) [http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/planning/performance\\_based\\_planning/mlrtp\\_guidebook/](http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/planning/performance_based_planning/mlrtp_guidebook/)





# Memorandum

TAB 17

To: CHAIR AND COMMISSIONERS

CTC Meeting: January 18-19, 2017

Reference No.: 4.10  
Action

From:   
SUSAN BRANSEN  
Executive Director

Subject: ADOPTION OF THE 2017 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN GUIDELINES  
FOR METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATIONS AND REGIONAL  
TRANSPORTATION PLANNING AGENCIES (RESOLUTION G-17-02)

## ISSUE:

Should the California Transportation Commission (Commission) approve the proposed revised Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Guidelines for Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) and Regional Transportation Planning Agencies (RTPAs)?

## RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends that the Commission adopt the proposed revised RTP Guidelines for MPOs and RTPAs.

## BACKGROUND:

Prior to amending the RTP Guidelines, the Commission is required to hold two workshops, one in Southern California and one in Northern California, during regularly scheduled Commission meetings. The Commission held a Southern California workshop on December 7, 2016 at the Commission meeting in Riverside. The workshop held concurrent to this agenda item satisfies the required Northern California workshop.

The proposed revisions were undertaken in response to the passage of Assembly Bill (AB) 441 (Monning, 2012), as well as changes to federal regulations resulting from the passage of Fixing America's Surface Transportation (FAST) Act of 2015. The proposed revised guidelines represent a general consensus of guidance prepared by a workgroup representing MPOs and RTPAs, federal, state, regional, and local agencies, as well as individuals and organizations representing environmental, social equity, land-use, and business perspectives. For additional information on the revisions proposed and the revision process, please see the concurrent book item for Reference Number 4.15.

Final draft guidelines and a comprehensive log of all comments received and considered are available online at:

<http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tpp/offices/orip/rtp/>

Attachments:

Attachment A: Resolution G-17-02

Attachment B: 2017 Final Draft MPO RTP Guidelines

Attachment C: 2017 Final Draft RTPA RTP Guidelines