Governor Newsom issued **EO N-19-19.** which required CalSTA to use discretionary state transportation funds to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from transportation and to increase climate adaptation.

Governor Newsom issued **EO N-79-20** which required CalSTA to publish a strategy to achieve zero-emission transportation.

CalSTA published the First Climate Action Plan for Transportation Infrastructure (CAPTI) in 2021, with an updated version in 2035.

CAPTI was developed after the most recent CTP update, but will affect the next.

CAPTI 13 included 14 recommended actions.

The CTC implemented three actions, which included establishing a new VMT-neutral suite of projects for the Solutions to Congested Corridors Program.

Before initiating a transportation project, Caltrans plans (often through its district offices) first identifies a need.

To initiate a transportation project and add it to the state's project delivery pipeline, Caltrans creates a Project ent (PSR).

To move a project through the pipeline, to the funding step, Caltrans uses the Caltrans System Investment Strategy (CSIS) to evaluate projects. The CSIS evaluates projects CAPTI to make climate-based data-driven decisions on which projects should move forward.

Based on CSIS evaluations and other considerations, Caltrans seeks funding from the ITIP and SB 1 for a subset of its project pipeline.

AB 857 establishes planning priorities focused on environmental protection and land use.

SB 391 requires Caltrans to update the CTP every five years to ensure how the CTP will achieve the goals of SB 32, EO B-16 and AB 32.

EO B-30-15 requires GHG emissions to cut 40% lower than 1990 levels by 2030.

EO S-3-5 requires GHG emissions from transportation to decline 80% from 1990 levels by 2050.

AB 32 requires GHG emissions to decline to 1990 levels by 2020. Does continue decline.

The State Legislature passed SB 1, the Road Repair and Accountability Act of 2017, which invested $5.4 billion into transportation.

Some experts argue that the CSIS has had a bias toward projects which projects are now moving forward through the pipeline that should no make highway expansions moving on.

The CTC administers discretionary funds programs (about $3 billion statewide may fluctuate in each budget).

Solutions for Congested Corridors Program ($250m/yr)

Trade Corridor Enhancement Program ($300m/yr)

Local Partnership Program ($200m/yr)

Active Transportation Program ($220m/yr)

The CTC developed Comprehensive Multimodal Corridor Plan guidelines.

Program guidelines were created through CTC consultation with stakeholders.

For the formula funds:

The CTC adopts a formulaic distribution of funding.

A local or regional transportation agency that has received voter approval of a transportation-specific tax/toll/fee, nominates projects.

For the competitive funds:

Local or regional transportation agencies that have received voter approval of a tax/toll/fee dedicated to transportation nominates projects.

Applicants (localities, regions, CCAs) develop Multimodal Corridor Plans that identify projects.

Applicants (localities, regions, CCAs) apply for CTC funding through this program.

Entities (localities, regions, CCAs) apply for CTC funding through this program.

The CTC screens the initial program of projects.

When a local or regional agency is ready to implement a project, they submit an allocation request.

Caltrans reviews requests and makes recommendations to the CTC.

The CTC evaluates projects and approves submitted applications.

Experts told us that although apportion commissioners make the ultimate decisions, the CTC's recommendations is done by a nonpartisan, unbiased committee.

SB 1 requires preference to be given to projects in corridor plans that demonstrate collaboration between Caltrans and local or regional partners.

Caltrans states that they incorporated principles of CAPTI into their most recent SHOPP updates.

Though it is not discretionary funds for SHOPP projects.

Caltrans submits a proposed State Highway System Management Plan to the CTC.

The CTC reviews the State Highway System Management Plan and the governor and state legislature.

Caltrans presents a draft Fund Estimate to the CTC.

The CTC adopts Caltrans' Fund Estimate.

Caltrans develops a federally required four-year program of projects (SHOPP).

Caltrans develops a federally required State Highway System Management Plan, which includes a disaster risk assessment. This plan impacts how Caltrans selects SHOPP projects.

Caltrans shares its draft proposed SHOPP with RTPAs

MPOs collaborate with Caltrans on the SHOPP project list.

Caltrans submits proposed SHOPP to the CTC.

The CTC adopts SHOPP and submits to the governor and Legislature.

Proceeds from California's cap-and-trade program go into the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund, which legislators appropriate through the state's budget.

Various funding programs for sustainable transportation are administered by CARB, CalSTA, and Caltrans.

All projects nominated for the ITIP must be programmed on either the ITIP or an RTIP.

Caltrans develops the long-range Interregional Transportation Plan (ITP).

Caltrans develops the Interregional Transportation Improvement Program (ITIP). Considering its ITP and at RTIPs.

The ITIP makes up only 25% of total STIP funds.

RTIPs make up 75% of total STIP funds.

Caltrans incorporates the baselines and projections from RTPs into the CTP.

Caltrans encourages MPOs to adopt CTP policies and recommendations while updating their RTP.

Each MPO develops a list of projects and programs in a Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) to implement the goals of their RTP/SCS.

Caltrans' districts often play the role of aggregator and collaborator with local projects.

Caltrans' districts nominate projects in their own projects on MPO's RTIP.

Localities nominate and advocate for their own projects to be included on the RTIP.

Local Problem 2.1
Adequate parking supply remains a top concern among local officials.

Local Problem 2.2
State law allows MPOs to approve projects that do not support their GHG reduction targets.

Local Problem 2.3
A string of much-needed state-imposed exemptions to CEQA for transportation can still be thwarted by citizen outcry.

Local Problem 3.2
Limitations on local governments' ability to raise revenue can incentivize greenfield development.

CARB and HCD host joint meetings. Experts said the meetings are rarely productive, but the preparation can be.

CARB sets regional emissions reduction targets for each COG.

MPOs collaborate with the state.

Each MPO develops a GHG emissions quantification methodology.

CARB approves each COG's methodology.

Local Problem 1.1
Preparing a Sustainable Communities Strategy imposes a significant burden on MPO staff and is accompanied by little support.

Cal. Gov't Code § 14522 gives the CTC the authority to prescribe study areas for MPOs' Sustainable Communities Strategies (SCS).

The CTC adopts guidelines for the development of RTPs.

Each MPO drafts a Sustainable Communities Plan, which includes their Sustainable Communities Strategy.

Localities consult on the development of the RTP/SCS.

CARB approves each Sustainable Communities Strategy.

Local Problem 2.4
The makeup and term lengths of MPO boards limit regional buy-in for state climate targets.

Local Problem 2.5
Lack what consequences for failing to comply with a state law, they are not taken seriously by regional and local stakeholders.

Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy

SB 375 requires RHNA plans to be consistent with SCS, often leading to simultaneous development.

California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) establishes the statewide housing need.

COGs collaborate with the state.

Each COG develops a RHNA allocation methodology.

California HCD approves each COG's methodology.

California HCD develops a RHNA for predominantly rural areas.

Each COG develops their RHNA plan.

California HCD approves each COGs RHNA plan.

Regional Housing Needs Assessment Plan

Local governments update the Housing Element of their General Plan (must be within 18 months of RHNA plan adoption).

Housing Elements include an inventory of sites that could accommodate new development.

If California HCD does not approve the rezoning:

A review is done by California HCD.

If a complaint or lawsuit is brought against the rezoning:

If there are no challenges to the rezoning

If California HCD approves the rezoning:

If rezoning is necessary to develop those sites:

If rezoning is not necessary to develop those sites:

Local governments must adopt their housing element within three years of RHNA plan adoption.

Local Problem 1.1
Local capacities are strained by CEQA and other requirements and new land use laws.

California HCD reviews the updated Housing Element.

General Plan Housing Element

Local governments submit an implementation report.

California HCD reviews implementation of local governments' housing elements.

Local governments are supposed to adopt policies and pursue projects that implement Sustainable Communities Strategies, but inaction in achieving goals GHG reduction is acceptable.

Local Problem 2.7
State law does not require localities' General Plans to align with their MPO's Sustainable Communities Strategy.

Local Government General Plan

Real estate and transportation projects in Coastal Zones must be in compliance with Coastal Commission and LCP requirements.

The California Coastal Act of 1976 extended that authority of the Coastal Commission to the coast.

Local governments in the Coastal Zone develop a Local Coastal Program (LCPs).

The LCP develops a Land Use Plan containing policies.

The LCP develops an implementation Plan including zoning ordinances, zoning maps, and other implementing actions.

The Coastal Commission certifies amendments to the LCP.

The Coastal Commission certifies the LCP and its components maps.

The local government issues most Coastal Development Permits under the LCP.

The Coastal Commission checks with and monitors local implementation of the LCP.

All projects implemented from the STIP must undergo CEQA.

The RTP/SCS has to go through CEQA.

Projects must be consistent with the SCS to meet the TPA screening threshold.

SB 743 includes five categories:

Projects in a Transit Priority Area (TPA), located within .5 miles of an existing major transit stop or a stop along a high-quality transit corridor, that also apply if projects have a floor-area-ratio of less than .75, include more parking than required by jurisdictions, or are inconsistent with the MPO's Sustainable Communities Strategy, or replace affordable housing units with less affordable units.

100% affordable housing projects in existing infill locations.

In areas with low VMT, based on existing models and projects incorporating similar features to those already in the low-VMT area.

Small projects attracting fewer than 110 trips per day, often office and neighborhood retail less than 10,000 feet.

Retail developments of less than or equal to 50,000 square feet.

If the project is exempt from review via 1) categorical exemption; 2) statutory exemption; or 3) no possible significant effect, the lead agency can file a notice of exemption.

If the project is ministerial or is an emergency project, or guidelines from Title 15378, no further action is required.

A project, plan, or program subject to CEQA is initiated.

If the project is not exempt from CEQA:

If more than one agency involved, determine which one is lead.

Lead agency

The lead agency performs its initial study.

The responsible agencies provide informal consultation.

If the lead agency decides to do an EIR:

The lead agency sends Notice of Preparation to the responsible agency.

If lead agency decides to do negative declaration:

The lead agency prepares a draft EIR.

The responsible agency responds to the Notice of Preparation.

The responsible agency responds to the contents of the draft EIR.

The responsible agency comments on the adequacy of the draft EIR.

The lead agency files a Notice of Completion and gives public notice of the availability of the draft EIR.

Lead agency gives public notice of the availability of the negative declaration.

The responsible agency comments on the adequacy of the draft negative declaration.

The draft EIR goes through its public review period.

The negative declaration goes through its public review period.

The lead agency prepares a final EIR, including responses to comments on the draft EIR.

The decisionmaking body for the responsible agency considers the final EIR or negative declaration.

The decisionmaking body considers and approves the final EIR.

The decisionmaking body considers and approves the final negative declaration.

The responsible agency makes findings on the feasibility of reducing or avoiding significant environmental impacts.

The lead agency issues findings on the feasibility of reducing or avoiding significant environmental impacts.

The responsible agency makes a decision on the permit.

The lead agency makes a decision on the project.

Depending on who initiated CEQA, a Notice of Determination is filed with OPR and/or the County Clerk.

Depending on who initiated CEQA, a Notice of Determination is filed with OPR and/or the County Clerk.

If the permit is issued:

If the project is approved:

The lead agency monitors the implementation of VMT mitigation measures and may monitor VMT levels after completion.

Local Problem 4.4
The state provides limited funding for VMT mitigation.

Local Problem 2.6
There are limited state incentives for developers to help pay for supportive infrastructure.

SB 743 requires VMT analysis as part of CEQA.

If the project is scoped out from full VMT analysis:

The lead agency uses screening criteria to decide if a complete VMT analysis is required.

If no screening criteria apply:

The lead agency decides whether to use project performance or effect for VMT effect type.

The lead agency chooses an efficiency metric.

The lead agency chooses its baseline geography.

The lead agency chooses a significance threshold.

The lead agency performs analysis to decide whether there is potential significant VMT impact.

Local Problem 1.3
For all levels of government, California Environmental Quality Act review and subsequent mitigation efforts) exhaust resources.

Legend

OUTCOMES Documents, plans, EOs, laws, etc.

COMPONENTS Specific recommendations, parts of plans, etc.

ACTIONS Implementing recommendations, preparing plans/programs

Problem # — Problem

Positive process (usually flagged by expert)

Denotes a positive process

Governor

Legislature

CalSTA

Caltrans

CTC

CARB

California Department of Finance

California Department of Housing and Community Development

California Coastal Commission

Region/MPO

Local: City or county