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State & Federal Highway Funding in CA

REVENUES

- Truck Weight Fees (Vehicle Code §4000.(c)(1)) $0.9
- State Fuel Excise Tax $2.0
- Other Revenues (interest, rents, sale of property, etc.) $0.2
- Federal Highway Trust Fund
  - Highway Acc’t Tax Shares
    - Gasoline/LPG: 15.45 $/gal
    - Diesel Fuel: 21.45 $/gal
    - Gasohol: 10.24-12.88 $/gal
    - Tire/Truck/Trailer Sales Taxes
    - Obligation Authority $3.0
- Fuel Tax Swap (S & H Code 2103) $1.3

EXPENDITURES

- Non-Capital Outlay
  - Mainten. & Operations $1.5
  - C/O Support $1.2
  - Other $0.5
- State Highway Operation & Protection Plan (SHOPP) $1.5
- Local Assistance (State & Federal Programs) $1.3
- Interregional Transportation Improvement Program (ITIP) $0.2
- Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) $0.7

STATE HIGHWAY ACCOUNT

STIP

1. Assembly Bill 105 (Fuel Tax Swap) directs revenues from the Truck Weight Fees to pay transportation bond debt service and loans to the General Fund.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Long-Range Plans</th>
<th>Project Selection</th>
<th>Project Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>US DOT</td>
<td>Federal gas tax</td>
<td>Sets requirements for states, MPOs, transit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>State gas tax +federal $</td>
<td>For state Sets reqs for local govt</td>
<td>Outside metro areas – State TIP</td>
<td>Build and maintain highways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>MPOs</td>
<td>Regional sales tax +federal, state $</td>
<td>For metro area</td>
<td>Inside metro areas – Regional TIP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transit agencies</td>
<td>Regional sales tax, fares +federal, state $</td>
<td>For transit</td>
<td>Transit projects, for inclusion in Regional TIP</td>
<td>Build and operate transit facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Planning DPW</td>
<td>Property tax, fees +federal, state, regional $</td>
<td>For city, under state law</td>
<td>Inside city – Capital Improvement Program</td>
<td>Build and maintain local roads, bike/ped facilities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
States in General

• State long-range plan
• Administration of federal funds
  – Suballocation to MPOs
  – Local programs, e.g. TE, Safe Routes to School
• Participation in MPO planning and funding programs
• State-funded programs
  – Amounts by category
  – Requirements
SB 45 (1997)

- **STIP cycle shortened:** From 7 to 5 years

- **Aims:**
  1. make *regions* “responsible and accountable” for identifying SHS priority needs
  2. make State (Caltrans) responsible for interregional system.

- **State Transp. Improvement Prog. (STIP) split into 2 programs:**
  1. the 75% Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) - CMAs
  2. the 25% Interregional Transportation Improvement Program (ITIP)

- **Challenges:**
  - Subvention, fragmentation, diversion
  - Underfunded ITIP?
CA State Allocation (under SB45)
California Transport & Climate Policy

Laws and Regulations

• **Assembly Bill 2140 (2000)** – MPOs can create scenario-based regional growth visions; basis of Blueprint program.

• **Assembly Bill 1493 (2002)** – 30% reduction in GHG emissions by 2016; first vehicle GHG legislation in the US.

• **Assembly Bill 857 (2002)** – State infrastructure expenditures must be consistent with infill development/redevelopment, cultural and historic resources, environmental and agricultural resources, and efficient development patterns.

• **Executive Order S-3-05 (2005)** – GHG reduction to 80 percent below 1990 levels by 2050.


• **Senate Bill 97 (2007)** – CEQA Guidelines update to incorporate GHG mitigation in environmental documents.

• **Senate Bill 375 (2008)** – GHG targets for MPOs and Sustainable Community Strategies in RTPs.

• **Senate Bill 732 (2008)** – Strategic Growth Council established to assist state and local entities in the planning of sustainable communities and meeting AB 32 climate change goals.

• **Assembly Bill 842 (2008)** – Department of Housing and Community Development to award preference or priority to projects located in areas where the local or regional entity has adopted a general plan, transportation plan, or regional blueprint that will reduce the growth of VMT by at least 10 percent, and the project must also be consistent with that planning document.

• **Senate Bill 391 (2009)** – Caltrans to update the California Transportation Plan by December 31, 2015 addressing how the State will achieve AB 32 and Executive Order S-3-05

Credit: Lauren Michele, Policy in Motion
AB32

The California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006

• 80% reduction of 1990 levels by 2050

http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/scopingplan/meetings/070808/slides_julyspworkshops.pdf
Climate Change Scoping Plan

a framework for change
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Assembly Bill 32: Scoping Plan

• California's Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006
• Establishes statewide greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions cap: 1990 emissions level by 2020
• Gives the Air Resources Board (ARB) responsibility for monitoring and reducing GHG emissions
• 5 million metric tons CO2 equivalent reduction from regional and local planning (absolute reduction)

Credit: Lauren Michele, Policy in Motion
Figure 1: California’s Greenhouse Gas Emissions (2002-2004 Average)\textsuperscript{14}

- Transportation, 38%
- Electricity, 23%
- Commercial and Residential, 9%
- Industry, 20%
- Recycling and Waste, 1%
- High GWP, 3%
- Agriculture, 6%
Figure 3: California Greenhouse Gas Emissions in 2020 and Recommended Reduction Measures

Reduction Measures
- Reductions from uncapped sectors:
  - Total reductions of 27.3 MMT
  - Industrial measures: 1.1 MMT
  - High GWP measures: 20.2 MMT
  - Recycling & waste: 1.0 MMT
  - Sustainable forests: 5.0 MMT

Total Emissions:
- 596 MMTCO2E
  - Agriculture
  - High GWP
  - Recycling & waste
  - Industry
  - Natural gas
  - Electricity
  - Transportation

Reductions from capped sectors:
- Total reductions of 146.7 MMT
  - (including 112.3 MMT from specified measures)
  - Pavley standards: 31.7 MMT
  - Energy efficiency: 26.3 MMT
  - 33% RPS: 21.3 MMT
  - LCFS: 15.0 MMT
  - Regional targets: 5.0 MMT
  - Vehicle efficiency: 4.5 MMT
  - Goods movement: 3.7 MMT
  - Million solar roofs: 2.1 MMT
  - Heavy/medium veh: 1.4 MMT
  - Industrial measures: 0.3 MMT
  - High speed rail: 1.0 MMT

Total Emissions: 422 MMTCO2E

Cap is set at 365 MMT

SB375 (2008)
Redesigning Communities to Reduce Greenhouse Gases

• Targets for GHG emissions reduction from cars and trucks for metropolitan areas, by reducing vehicle-miles travelled (VMT)

Even if vehicle fuel efficiency were to reach 55 mpg by 2030, we would still see only modest decreases in transportation carbon dioxide emissions without a decrease in vehicle miles traveled (VMT). Addressing VMT growth plays a key role in decreasing transportation related greenhouse emissions and should be included in overall efforts to prevent climate change. One way to achieve significant reductions in VMT is to develop more livable communities.

- Ray LaHood, Secretary for the US Department of Transportation
## Transportation vs. Land Use Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Transportation Agencies</th>
<th>Land Use Agencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>FHWA, FTA</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>DOT</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>MPO, Transit</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Planning, Public Works</td>
<td>Planning (City and County)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SB 375: How it works

• California Air Resources Board (CARB or ARB) works with MPOs to set regional targets

• MPOs include “Sustainable Communities Strategy” in regional transportation plans that shows how region will meet targets
  – If strategy falls short, must develop “alternative planning strategy” that will meet targets

• Transportation funding decisions must be consistent with Sustainable Communities Strategy
Tie to CEQA

• California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires review of environmental impacts for all public agency “projects”
  – Including public transportation projects and approval of private land development projects
• SB375 creates streamlining for projects that are consistent with the Sustainable Communities Strategy
SB375 Bottom Line?

• No requirement for local governments to adhere to Sustainable Communities Strategy (or Alternative Planning Strategy)

• Strategies provide basis for determining:
  – What projects are eligible for CEQA streamlining
  – What transportation projects are eligible for funding through the regional transportation plan
Sustainable Communities Strategies

• Identify the general location of uses, residential densities, and building intensities within the region;
• 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;
• Identify areas within the region sufficient to house an eight-year projection of the regional housing need for the region;
• Identify a transportation network to service the transportation needs of the region;
• Gather and consider the best practically available scientific information regarding resource areas and farmland in the region;
• Quantify the reductions in GHG emissions the SCS is projected to achieve and any shortfall in reaching the regional target.
SACOG’s Blueprint

Base Case

Preferred Scenario

http://www.sacregionblueprint.org/adopted/
A Message from the Director

I am pleased to present this document, *Smart Mobility 2010: A Call to Action for the New Decade*. It is with excitement that we launch this new approach to integration of transportation and land use. This approach addresses long-range challenges and provides short-term pragmatic actions to implement multimodal and sustainable transportation strategies in California. They can be used now, and in the coming decade, to help California, as well as the nation, continue work to develop a sustainable transportation system.

This document had its start with the idea that practical tools were needed to evaluate whether the goals and ideals of the Governor’s Strategic Growth Plan, the California Transportation Plan, and bond program projects would be realized. Further, California statutes, plans, and policy language direct the development of a transportation system that not only accommodates future growth, but does so in a way that is equitable, respects the environment, and fosters a sustainable economy.

This document does just that. It provides new tools and techniques to improve transportation by using performance-based measures to achieve sustainable outcomes. By considering land use place types and modified performance measures, the benefits of smart mobility can be realized, both now and in the future. Further, it sets the stage for the California Interregional Blueprint and data improvement efforts that will transform transportation decisions.

Fiscal constraints demand continued diligence, better decision making tools, and extra care in management of public resources. Today we have an opportunity — and this document represents the long range thinking needed amidst short term realities. *Smart Mobility 2010* addresses issues of climate change while providing usable tools. It suggests a path to transform our transportation system while at the same time acknowledging the significant work remaining to be done. It focuses on achieving multiple mobility goals while recognizing the path ahead is a challenging one.

I would like to commend the many Department staff, project partners, consultants, and partner agency representatives that participated in the development and creation of this comprehensive document. I offer this framework to you for your use and refinement so that we can address the important issues of creating the California of the future — sustainable, multimodal, equitable, “green,” accessible, and economically viable. Caltrans has shown leadership in providing this significant contribution to the pursuit of sustainable transportation infrastructure, and is ready to move forward. I invite you to join us.

RANDELL H. IWASAKI
Director, California Department of Transportation (Caltrans)

http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tpp/offices/ocp/smf_files/SmMblty_v6-3.22.10_150DPI.pdf
From the director...

• “It is with excitement that we launch this new approach to integration of transportation and land use.”

• “It provides new tools and techniques to improve transportation by using performance-based measures to achieve sustainable outcomes.”

• “I offer this framework to you for your use and refinement so that we can address the important issues of creating the California of the future — sustainable, multimodal, equitable, “green,” accessible, and economically viable.”
Smart Mobility Definition

Smart Mobility moves people and freight while enhancing California’s economic, environmental, and human resources by emphasizing:

– Convenient and safe multi-modal travel
– Speed suitability
– Accessibility
– Management of the circulation network
– Efficient use of land
Smart Mobility Principles

- Location efficiency
- Reliable mobility
- Health and safety
- Environmental stewardship
- Social equity
- Robust economy
Exhibit 5: Location-Efficient Regional Accessibility Elements

Development, Use, and Form Elements (Regional Accessibility)

- Affordable housing supply within and near urban centers and major employment centers
- Regional attractions such as major parks and open space, places of higher learning, health care and cultural institutions at central locations with high accessibility

Transportation System Elements (Regional Accessibility)

- High level of multi-modal circulation system connectivity to:
  - Other parts of the region
  - Interregional, and, where applicable, interstate and international destinations
  - Neighborhood and district-level circulation systems
- High level of multi-modal access for all users to:
  - Major institutions and neighborhoods throughout the region
  - Airports, ports and interregional rail facilities
Exhibit 8: Smart Mobility Place Types and Location Efficiency Potential

- 1. Urban Centers
- 2. Close-in Compact Communities
- 3. Compact Communities
- 4. Suburbs
- 5. Rural Towns
- 5, 6. Agricultural & Protected Lands

Community Design: Strong Presence vs. Weak Presence
Regional Accessibility: Location-Efficient Elements: Weak Presence vs. Strong Presence
## Exhibit 10: Smart Mobility Performance Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle</th>
<th>Performance Measure*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location Efficiency</strong></td>
<td>1. Support for Sustainable Growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Transit Mode Share</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Accessibility and Connectivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reliable Mobility</strong></td>
<td>4. Multi-Modal Travel Mobility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Multi-Modal Travel Reliability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Multi-Modal Service Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health and Safety</strong></td>
<td>7. Multi-Modal Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. Design and Speed Suitability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. Pedestrian and Bicycle Mode Share</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environmental Stewardship</strong></td>
<td>10. Climate and Energy Conservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11. Emissions Reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Equity</strong></td>
<td>12. Equitable Distribution of Impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13. Equitable Distribution of Access and Mobility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Robust Economy</strong></td>
<td>14. Congestion Effects on Productivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15. Efficient Use of System Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16. Network Performance Optimization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17. Return on Investment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Most of the performance measures relate to multiple principles. This Exhibit groups each of the performance measures with the principle with which it is most strongly related.
Summing it up...

- Trend at the federal level but even more so at the state level toward...
  - Incentives for coordination of land use planning with transportation planning. SB 375
  - Performance measures to ensure lower-level decisions work towards upper-level goals.
Next Time

• Regional Planning
• Read Chapter 3 of MPO Handbook
• Read Handy *Transport Policy* paper
• Read *TR News* articles on public involvement