The California Transportation Plan (CTP) provides a long-range policy framework to meet our future mobility needs and reduce greenhouse gas emissions. The CTP defines goals, performance-based policies, and strategies to achieve our collective vision for California’s future statewide integrated multimodal transportation system. The plan envisions a sustainable system that improves mobility and enhances our quality of life.

Key to this vision is considering “The 3 E’s of Sustainability”: a prosperous Economy, quality Environment and social Equity -- in all transportation decisions.

The current focus is to review and update the CTP for a 2040 planning horizon by incorporating elements of the previous plans (CTP 2025 and 2030 Addendum) and the California Intergovernmental Blueprint (CIB) in response to Senate Bill 391 (Liu, 2009). The CIB is a state-level blueprint that articulates the State’s vision for an integrated multimodal transportation system that complements regional transportation plans and land use visions. Ongoing community outreach through an interactive website, as well as workshops and focus groups throughout the State, are important elements of the plan’s development. By sharing your ideas, you can influence the content of the final plan and, ultimately, decisions on how your transportation dollars are invested.

The CTP 2040 is scheduled for approval in December 2015. To offer your input on this Scope Document & Timeline, and the California Transportation Plan 2040, please visit our website.

www.californiatransportationplan2040.org

Scope Document & Timeline
www.californiatransportationplan2040.org

Working with transportation partners and stakeholders, Caltrans will take the following actions in developing the California Transportation Plan 2040:

- **Validate** and build on CTP 2025 vision, goals, policies, and strategies.
- **Review** current trends, challenges, and emerging issues such as the economy and job growth, climate change, population and housing growth, public health, freight mobility, and transportation financing.
- **Evaluate** all proposed strategies in the broader context of sustainability considering how they affect California’s economy, environment, and social equity.
- **Integrate** statewide modal plans, programs, and tools.
- **Build** on MPOs’ RTPs/SCSs and rural RTPAs’ land use visions.
- **Expand** the direction set in the 2030 Addendum to include consideration of environmental issues early in the transportation planning process.
- **Identify** the statewide integrated multimodal transportation system needed to achieve maximum feasible greenhouse gas emission reductions.
- **Consider** the use of alternative fuels, new technology, tail pipe emission reductions, and the expansion of public transit, commuter rail, intercity rail, high-speed rail, bicycling, and walking as mandated by Senate Bill 391.
- **Integrate** performance measures and develop targets to meet requirements of Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century.
- **Analyze** the effects of policies, programs, and major investments on transportation, the economy, and the environment on a statewide scale.
- **Use** travel demand forecasting models to evaluate transportation and land use scenarios and policies.
APPENDIX H: PROJECT REVIEW CHECKLIST

Purpose
This checklist was developed to assist project sponsors in defining and developing projects and local plans using the Monterey Bay Area Complete Streets Guidebook. The checklist is a mechanism for incorporating the perspectives of all stakeholders into the planning and design process for projects. Use of the checklist will result in projects that are consistent with local, regional and state complete street policies, consider adjacent land uses and meet the needs of all users of the roadway.

How to Use the Checklist
The checklist enables project sponsors to document how each existing and future roadway user was considered and accommodated throughout the project development process. Project sponsors are encouraged to reference the Monterey Bay Area Complete Streets Guidebook while going through the checklist for complete streets applications and roadway design ideas.

Public Works and Planning departments should use the checklist to review projects within or affecting the public right-of-way. If projects do not incorporate complete streets design treatments, project sponsors should document why not and what accommodations will be provided for pedestrians, bicyclists and/or transit users unless the project is exempt.

Threshold Requirements
The Complete Streets Project Review Checklist should be used to review the following types of projects:

1. Street improvements requiring permits or approvals by the Department of Planning and/or Public Works which requests a change of the public right of way; or

2. Public Works Department capital projects that alter or maintain the public right of way prior to the issuance of any permit or approval.

Such that any one or more of the following apply:

- A traffic study is required
- A signalized intersection is affected
- Repaving/restriping needed
- Rehab/maintenance needed
CHECKLIST - Exemptions

Projects Exempt from Using the Complete Streets Project Review Checklist

* Roadways that restrict bicycle and pedestrian access (ex/Freeways)

* Documented absence of current and future need

Projects in which it is not appropriate to accommodate all users but may be appropriate to accommodate more than one user group should use the checklist to identify which users should be considered in the project design.

Projects Exempt from CEQA

Some complete streets projects may be exempt from the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act. The following exemptions may apply:

* Projects that are built within the existing right-of-way 15301(c)

* Re-striping projects (per Section 15282(j))

If the project is exempt from CEQA further explanation and documentation is needed to comply with California law. The project sponsor should draft a memo describing why the project is exempt and file a notice of exemption.
### CHECKLIST - General Project Information

1. **Project Title**
   - Project Description
   - Project Location

2. **Contact Information**
   - Implementing Agency
   - Contact Person
   - Phone
   - Fax
   - Email

3. **Project Schedule** *(Circle Current Project Phase)*
   - Project Milestone | Date Started/Anticipated End Date
     - Planning
     - Preliminary Design
     - Final Design
     - Construction

PHOTO
## CHECKLIST - Existing Conditions

### 4. Existing Land Uses (check all that apply)
- Residential
- Mixed Use
- Institutional/School
- Civic/Public Facilities
- Park/Open Space
- Visitor-Serving/Commercial
- Senior Housing
- Rural/Agricultural

### 5. Safety (See Complete Streets Needs Assessment Matrix & http://tims.berkeley.edu/)
- Are there perceived safety/speeding issues in the project area? [ ] Yes [ ] No
- Is there a history of collisions in the project area? [ ] Pedestrian [ ] Bicyclist [ ] Motorist

### 6. Congestion
- Does the roadway experience congestion? [ ] Yes [ ] No
- If so, at what time(s) is it congested? [ ] AM Peak [ ] PM Peak

### 7. Existing Roadway Conditions/Context

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Functional Classification</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROW Width</td>
<td>Ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadway Pavement Width</td>
<td>Ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Lanes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB/EB:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB/WB:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Way Center Turn lane</td>
<td>[ ] Yes [ ] No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk Width</td>
<td>Ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscaping/Parking</td>
<td>[ ] Yes [ ] No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoulder Width</td>
<td>Ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike Lane Width (&lt;5')</td>
<td>[ ] Yes [ ] No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection(s)</td>
<td>[ ] Signalized [ ] Unsignalized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavement Condition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posted Speed Limit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Volumes (AADT)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Route/ Stops</td>
<td>[ ] Yes [ ] No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truck Route</td>
<td>[ ] Yes [ ] No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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CHECKLIST - Future Conditions

8. Future Roadway Conditions

Are there planned transportation & land use projects that could affect circulation in the project area?

☐ Yes  ☐ No

If so, please list the project(s)

Are planned projects anticipated to increase travel demand in the area? (mark yes or no for each mode)

☐ Car Yes ☐ No  ☐ Transit Yes ☐ No  ☐ Bicycle Yes ☐ No  ☐ Pedestrian

9. Stakeholder Outreach (check all that apply)

Please indicate which stakeholder groups provided input on project scope and design:

☐ Neighborhood Group  ☐ Bicycle Committees  ☐
☐ Business Association  ☐ Pedestrian Committee  ☐
☐ School  ☐ Senior Group  ☐
☐ Property Owners  ☐ Transit Agency  ☐
☐ Environmental Group  ☐ Transportation  ☐
☐ Disadvantaged  ☐

☐ Specific changes requested by stakeholders?

☐ Yes  ☐ No

10. Circle the Complete Street Design Type - (See Table 2 of Guidebook)

Street Design Type

- Main Street
- Avenue
- Boulevard
- Parkway
- Local/Subdivision Street
  - Local
  - Collector
  - Arterial
- Pedestrian/Bicycle-Oriented
- Auto/Truck-Oriented
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11. Transportation Network Deficiencies (Refer to Existing Conditions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lacking/Insufficient Bicycle Facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lacking/Insufficient Pedestrian Facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle/Pedestrian Connectivity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lacking/Insufficient Transit Facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient accommodations for seniors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient accommodations for disabled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient accommodations for students/youth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given the Existing and Future Conditions the project area is a candidate for:

- Road Diet (3 or more lanes; AADT<20,000; bicycle collisions)  
  - Yes  
  - No
- Traffic Calming  
  - Yes  
  - No
- Roundabout  
  - Yes  
  - No
- Transit-Oriented Development/Transit Corridor (15 min headway)  
  - Yes  
  - No
- Neighborhood Shared Street  
  - Yes  
  - No
- Pedestrian Place  
  - Yes  
  - No
- Transit/Bicycle/Pedestrian Prioritization at Intersections  
  - Yes  
  - No
CHECKLIST - Design

The purpose of this section is to ensure all users have been considered in the design of the project. Complete street design is context-sensitive and a complete street in a rural area may look different than one in an urban area. Refer to safety and special user needs identified in the existing and future conditions sections. The Monterey Bay Area Complete Streets Guidebook Chapter 5 contains design best-practices and sample accommodations for these users.

### 12. Pedestrian Design

Which, if any, of the following is provided or improved through the project design?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Existing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimize Driveways</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk/Path</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscaping/Parking Buffer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADA Access</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Trees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossing Treatments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Calming</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayfinding Signage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audible Countdown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Describe)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 13. Bicycle Design

Which, if any, of the following is provided or improved through the project design?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Existing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Lanes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared-Lane Markings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiuse Path</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route/Wayfinding Signs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Parking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Detection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Box</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Color-Treated Bike</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floating Bike Lanes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Describe)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
14. Transit Design

Which, if any, of the following is provided or improved through the project design?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Existing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Priority Bus Lane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Bulbs/Pull-Outs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Time Bus Arrival Info</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITS/Signal Priority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Service (15 min headways)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wi-Fi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stop/Station Amenities*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Describe)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Transit Amenities include: Bench, lighting, trash can, route information/maps, concessions, music, and public art.
15. **Project Trade-Offs**

Is the recommended complete street cross section/design supportable?  
☐ Yes  ☐ No

If not, explain why:

- Lack of ROW width
- Trees/Environmental Features
- Existing Structures
- Insufficient Funding
- Other ____________________________

Have alternative designs been considered?  
☐ Yes  ☐ No

**What refinements to the cross section/needed were needed?**

- Removed/partial zones (Ch. 5) for:
  - Pedestrians
  - Bicyclists
  - Parking
  - Landscaping
  - Vehicles

- Considered alternative routes/locations for:
  - Pedestrians
  - Bicyclists
  - Landscaping
  - Vehicles

16. **Exemptions** (Refer to Ch. 6 of the Guidebook)

Is the project exempt from accommodating certain users?  
☐ Yes  ☐ No

Cost of accommodation is excessively disproportionate to the need or probably use?  
☐ Yes  ☐ No

Documented absence of current and future need?  
☐ Yes  ☐ No

Other ____________________________
APPENDIX J: Economics of Complete Streets

Summary of Economics of Complete Streets

An important question about complete streets is, Are the benefits greater than the costs; are complete streets a good investment? The economic impact of transportation project is particularly important in an environment where regions are pursuing a variety of economic development strategies to improve the quality of life for residents and resources for transportation investments are scarce.

Careful evaluation of the benefits of costs can reveal some of the downstream effects complete streets have on economic activity. However, isolating the economic impacts of a concept as broad and indefinite as complete street makes simple conclusions difficult. The diversity of complete street types and specific implementations suggests a diversity of effects. Moreover, the effects depend on the development, market, and socioeconomic environment in which a complete street is implementing.

The White Paper on the Economics of Complete Streets presents a framework for evaluating the economic impacts of complete streets. The paper was prepared by ECONorthwest, a consulting firm specializing in economics, finance, and planning. ECONorthwest’s findings recognize that complete streets are a relatively new concept and that attempts to rigorously evaluate their economic impacts are limited. ECONorthwest’s research relies heavily on case studies rather than controlled time-series or cross-section studies. While case studies are excellent tools to confirm or challenge theory, to generalize their results into implementable policies comes with risk because one case study’s conditions may or may not be comparable to another.
Approach to Evaluating Economic Benefits of Complete Streets

Transportation systems should aim to do an efficient job of getting people and goods to many desired places safely and quickly. The efficiency of the system is typically evaluated in terms of congestion. Although complete streets investments may address congestion, through managing demand and better use of the existing system, determining the economic impacts of complete streets must go beyond looking at its impacts on congestion. Furthermore, secondary economic impacts can result from transportation investments.

ECONorthwest groups complete street impacts by direct transportation impacts including: trip volume, trip duration, trip quality, safety and construction and maintenance cost, and indirect transportation impacts including: access to amenities, health, and transportation costs, in addition to congestion. ECONorthwest then evaluates the economic effect of the impacts relative to investments, business activity, property values, and government fiscal health.

The white paper notes several points important to the interpretation of its findings. Factors such as existing conditions, transportation geography, time period, perspectives, distribution of impacts, and exogenous trends should be considered when applying the economic framework. The transportation and non-transportation effects of complete streets depend on the details of how complete streets are designed and implemented and on the modes they attempt to influence.

Economic effects of Complete Streets

Given the transportation effects and the non-transportation effects of complete streets, what are the likely effects on economic activity (employment, output, value added, sales, payroll/income, and property values) when measured through investment, business activity, property values and fiscal impacts?

There are some good theoretical reasons for believing that complete streets can have positive effects on the regional or local economy. The limited literature suggests that, in some instances, measures of economic activity have changed with implementation of complete streets. Because the literature is limited, due to the limited empirical work on the
topic, the anecdotal nature of the work, little known about the distributional impacts it does not support unambiguous statements like, “If complete streets are built, the net economic effects will be x.”

**Investment**
Do the levels and composition of public and private investment change with the introduction of complete streets?

Transportation investments play an important role in the redevelopment of a center or corridor. Some research suggests that complete street accompany increases in investment for an area. It is reasonable to presume that as a street’s safety, health, and amenities improve, private and public entities will be more willing to invest in the area. But complete street may be part of broader redevelopment efforts that included other public investments. Such investment makes it difficult to separate out the unique effects of complete streets. For instance, it is possible that decisions to invest in complete streets makes areas more competitive for the awarding of such development funds. On the other hand it may be true for any type of transportation project. Theory and case studies support the conclusion that complete street can be an important part of a public investment policy that can change the distribution of economic activity within a region.

**Business Activity**
Do measures of business activity (e.g., business creation, employments, wages/income, sales, revenues) change around complete streets? Do consumes spending patterns change because of complete streets?

Some instances of complete streets have led to more business activity around them. However, an increase of jobs and businesses after the implementation of complete streets does not, by itself, give any indication of how much of that increase is attributable to complete streets. For example, other market forces and location, the amount of new public investment, or pre-development losses such that any new development would have increased measures of business activity.

Consumption patterns could be impacted by a change in the total number of consumers, the cost of goods to consumers, and a change in land values as a result of complete streets. One should expect more economic activity the greater the density and better access. The number of consumers could increase due to potential growth in trip volumes and proximity. Although the number of consumers may increase due to a potential for a growth in trip volumes and proximity, cost of goods may decrease because the transportation cost to the consumer may decrease,
and the higher densities and land values may result in higher rents and higher prices, none of these factors are expected to be affected in a big way. It is unlikely that complete streets decrease consumption. Research reveals that non-motorized consumers are competitive consumers. Although case studies suggest that complete street-type policies may improve bottom lines, it is possible that these kinds of changes will be primarily distributional. A possible exception to the distribution issues is the case where more isolated cities in recreational areas could increase the regional economic activity if they can create “Main Street” environments that are attractive to tourists.

**Property Values**

Do property values change with the introduction of complete streets?

People choose to live in a certain area, in part, because of the amenities it offers. If people value the effects of complete streets they are more likely to choose to live in or near complete street areas. In the event that complete streets increase amenity and travel by non-auto modes, and do not decrease the effectiveness of the automobile too much, complete streets could be correlated with increased property values. However, even if traffic calming features reduce vehicle volume, several studies show property values still increase. The role of improving walkability on increasing property values is depending upon densities and destinations. For example, making a five-lane road servicing commercial strip complete and walkable may have little effect on walking, transit and auto travel, while making a desirable shopping district more walkable cold raise property values.

Social engagement would also be increased if complete streets lead to more people use alternative modes of transportation and allowing users to interact more, which may also affect property values.

Increased property values would likely be a benefit to landowners, as their incomes would increase. Increased property values could be a cost to businesses and residents already operating and living there, as the increase could make the area unaffordable to them.

**Government Fiscal Health**

What is the net fiscal effect of complete streets on local governments and agencies?
In terms of revenues, while there are solid theoretical arguments and some empirical work for specific cases which explain why complete streets as a type of smart growth policy, could improve fiscal health due to increase sales tax, there is no way to tell that other factors aren’t responsible for the increase in tax revenue and sales tax alone do not tell the story of fiscal health.

As a type of transportation investments, complete streets will involve expenditures in public and private funds. Complete streets may increase the up-from implementation costs since they may be above and beyond existing project design improvements. In a 2012 analysis, City of Charlotte Department of Transportation staff found that complete street components, specifically bike lanes and sidewalks, only slightly increase the cost of a project (on the order of 3-5%). In cases where complete street design elements replace larger automotive infrastructure requires, the cost may remain constant or decrease.

If complete streets cause users to shift away from cars, then complete streets could have some maintenance cost savings. However the savings may be minimal because heavy vehicles cause a disproportionate share of road ware. On the other hand, complete street may create a more complicated environment to maintain and higher standards for maintenance, which would generate a higher maintenance cost.

**Effects of Health on Economic Growth**
Complete streets design frequently incorporates some element of traffic calming which can reduce the number of collisions. Though the safety impacts are worth pursing for their moral merits alone, reducing the number of deaths and injuries has tangible economic benefits. Given the documented potential for complete streets improvements to reduce the number and severity of crashes, it is possible that the safety benefits alone justify complete streets as a policy.

Beyond gains in safety, complete street could facilitate health improvements by increasing activity levels, and reducing noise. If complete streets contribute to healthier people, the economic benefits of that improved health could be measured as longer life expectancy, improved productivity and reduced costs for health care. Although, complete streets could improve health outcomes for some, it could worsen health outcomes for those who remain automotive uses and are whose trip times could increase and for those who experience injuries, such as a sprained ankle from switching to other modes.
### Economic Framework for Evaluating Complete Streets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories of Economic Activity</th>
<th>Direct and Non-Direct Transportation Impacts</th>
<th>Effect on Economic Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Possibly Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Activity</td>
<td>Access&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Activity</td>
<td>Trip Volume</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Activity/ Investment</td>
<td>Trips Duration&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal Impact</td>
<td>Construction&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal Impact</td>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Values/ Investment</td>
<td>Amenities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Growth</td>
<td>Health&lt;sup&gt;4&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

<sup>1</sup> New facilities for non-automobiles are likely to have a larger positive impact on economic activity than improving existing facilities.

<sup>2</sup> An increase in trip duration for automobiles may negatively impact economic activity, while a reduction in trip duration for non-automobiles may result in a positive impact on economic activity.

<sup>3</sup> Construction of new facilities may have significant economic impacts, while adding new elements may have no to little economic impacts.

<sup>4</sup> If complete streets contribute to healthier people by encouraging regular physical activity, Complete Streets could positively impact the economic activity by...