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The Problem with Today’s Paradigm

Traditional Transportation Planning Process

Land Use Planning → Thresholds Based Transportation Planning
- LOS
- Functional Class
- Design Standards

Recommended Transportation Plan
- Sized to Threshold

Process results in a plan that has unknown costs and is unlikely to be fully implemented resulting in traffic operations that will be worse than projected.
The Result of Today’s Paradigm

Disconnect between Perception & Reality
Funding Has Not Kept Pace with Inflation
Funds Have Not Grown with Road Use

REAL GAS TAX REVENUES IN CALIFORNIA HAVE NOT KEPT PACE WITH ROAD USE

Fiscal Year
- Orange: Vehicle (VMT) Miles Traveled
- Purple: Inflation-Adjusted Gas Tax Revenue
- Teal: Inflation-Adjusted Gas Tax Revenue per VMT
The “New” Transportation Planning Process

Land Use Planning ➔ Constraints Based Transportation Planning
- Funding
- Environmental
- Political

Recommended Transportation Plan
- Sized to Constraints for design year
- ROW based on thresholds

Feedback Available (if plan is politically unacceptable)

Process results in a plan that is consistent with constraints (especially available funding) and provides a realistic assessment of future traffic operations. ROW is still preserved based on thresholds.
Adapting to Constraints

- Refine the land use plan to fit within identified constraints.
- Increase revenues by identifying new funding mechanisms.
- Change the design of proposed projects (roadway or transit) to reduce costs and promote all modes (including walking and biking).
- Decrease expectations about the transportation system’s future operating performance (i.e. lower the LOS threshold or use multi modal level of service.)
Limited Decision Making Options

- Statement of Override precluded
- Improvements required upfront
- Land use locked in
New Paradigm Forces?

- SB 375 (Steinberg)
- Climate change
- Greenhouse gas emission reductions
City of Chico
2030 General Plan Update
City of Chico Background

- Location: North Valley/Foothill Interface
- Population: 110,000 (in region), 87,000 (Chico proper)
- Expected growth: 40,000 more by 2030
- Demographics: Many young adults due to Chico State and Butte College, out migrating young adults looking for jobs, and in-migrating older adults and retirees for quality of life.
- 75% commute trips internal within City: jobs to housing balance
Elements of the Chico General Plan

CGC Section 65302

• Land Use
• Circulation
• Housing
• Open Space
• Conservation
• Safety
• Noise
• Sustainability & Community Design
• Infrastructure and Finance Plan
Identifying a Preferred Land Use
Goals of the 2030 General Plan

- Creating a shared vision for Chico's future for the year 2030.
- Continuing theme of compact urban form and emphasis on sustainability and infill development.
- 25% GHG emission reduction goal by 2020
- Looking for redevelopment potential along underutilized commercial corridors through mixed use designation and policy incentives.
Goals of the 2030 General Plan- continued

- Successfully achieving a Ring Transportation Corridor system (in essence a loop that links the Downtown, University, the older residential neighborhoods, key services, and Enloe Hospital and the associated medical services).
- For Special Planning Areas looking to create complete neighborhoods (TND code) where SFR and MFR are in close proximity to Mixed Use Neighborhood Cores and job opportunities.
- And, of course, providing a multi-modal system and enhancing transit opportunities.
- Use 4D model in EIR to assess traffic impacts of mixed use development pattern vs. historical pattern
Funding Reality vs. GP Expectations

Transportation Element – Policy TG 11 and 12
• Strive to maintain traffic LOS C on residential streets, LOS D on arterial and collectors and accept LOS E on arterials in built out areas and Downtown where no feasible mitigation exists.

Public Facilities Element – Policy PP I-64
• Provide adequate public facilities and assure funding for required improvements within a specified time of project occupancy for new development.

Nexus Study – Development Impact Fees
• Continue to require that new development pays a fair share of the costs of street and other traffic and transportation improvements based on traffic generated and impacts on service levels.
Transportation Impact Fees for Commercial Uses

- **All Streets**: $15.83 per Commercial SF
- **State Facilities**: $6.27
Constraints to Developing Circulation Element

- Financial?
- Political?
- Environmental?
- Multi-Modal Focus?
Travel Characteristics in Chico

- Worked at Home, 3.8%
- Auto, 70.0%
- Public Transportation, 1.9%
- Carpool (Car, Truck, Van), 12.6%
- Bike, 5.2%
- Walk, 5.5%
- Other, 1.0%

Commuting to Work

Source: 2000 Census
Paradigm Shift Process for Chico

1. Develop Draft Land Use Plan (complete)
2. Identify Preliminary Transportation Policies (underway)
3. Identify Infrastructure Requirements Based on Policies
4. Estimate Costs of Infrastructure
5. Estimate Fees to Fund Infrastructure
6. Receive Input From Council
7. Revisit (if needed):
   • Land Use
   • Circulation Policies
   • Ensure Element is Fully Funded
Wrap-up/Questions?