FEHR PEERS

TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM

Date: 11.11.19

To: Steve Smith (SBCTA), Josh Lee (SBCTA), Albert Espinoza (City of Rancho Cucamonga), Jason Welday (City of Rancho Cucamonga), Baldwin Ngai (City of Rancho Cucamonga)

From: Jason Pack, PE and Delia Votsch, PE

Subject: SB 743 Implementation Mitigation and TDM Strategy Assessment OC18-0585

This technical memorandum summarizes our assessment of new research related to transportation demand management (TDM) effectiveness for reducing vehicle miles of travel (VMT). The purpose of this work was to understand what options are available to mitigate VMT, to compile new TDM information that has been published in research papers since release of the *Quantifying Greenhouse Gas Mitigation Measures,* CAPCOA, August 2010 and to identify those strategies suited to SBCTA member jurisdictions given the varying land use context. The land use and transportation context for SBCTA presents a challenge to the effectiveness of common TDM strategies for VMT reduction when applied at individual project sites due to limited travel choices. The matrix in Attachment A summarizes the overall evaluation of all the CAPCOA strategies while the matrix in Attachment B identifies the top twelve strategies suited for the study area.

Mitigation Programs

The approach to the overall assessment includes two parts. The first part evaluated how VMT reduction strategies or projects could be developed or incorporated into existing funding programs such as Transportation Impact Fee (TIF) program. The purpose of incorporating VMT reduction strategies directly into existing programs is to provide greater certainty and effectiveness for VMT impact mitigation. The second part of the assessment identified potential new mitigation program concepts that may be worthy of further evaluation.

Existing Programs

Most SBCTA member jurisdictions maintain Traffic Impact Fees. These programs collect a fair-share fee payment from new development to contribute to the cost of a capital improvement program (CIP) consisting of long-term transportation network expansion projects identified to accommodate planned population and employment growth. A common theme for the existing programs is that they focus on vehicle trips or vehicle LOS as the key metric for determining deficiencies and developing CIP projects.

In their current form, most of the impact fees would not qualify as VMT impact mitigation programs. Most CIPs include roadway capacity expansion that contributes to VMT increases. Expanding roadway capacity in congested areas induces new vehicle travel that diminishes congestion relief benefits and generates new VMT and emissions. Refer to the following websites for more research information and technical details.

- http://www.dot.ca.gov/newtech/researchreports/reports/2015/10-12-2015-NCST_Brief_InducedTravel_CS6_v3.pdf
- https://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/sb375/policies/hwycapacity/highway_capacity_brief.pdf
- https://trrjournalonline.trb.org/doi/abs/10.3141/2653-02

Many CIPs also include operational improvements, such as signal coordination projects, which would not contribute to an increase in VMT. Most CIPs also include some transit, bicycle, and pedestrian projects that could contribute to VMT reduction.

If the transit, bicycle, and pedestrian projects were separated into a stand-alone CIP with a supporting nexus study based on VMT reduction, then a new VMT fee program could be developed that is dedicated to VMT impact mitigation. This could be a new program implemented by the SBCTA member jurisdictions as a collaborative or as individual jurisdictions. An example of this type of program has been developed the City of Los Angeles as part of their Coastal Transportation Corridor Specific Plan and West Los Angeles Transportation Improvement and Mitigation Specific Plan. Details are provided at the following website. http://www.westsidemobilityplan.com/ctcspwla-timp-final-eir/

It may also be possible for a development project applicant to fully fund a transit, bicycle, or pedestrian project from a CIP as an alternative to paying the fee directly. Some fee programs currently allow fee credits for development that expedites and completes CIP-identified projects. Using this option requires inclusion of the mitigation in a development agreement or an EIR.

Managing and reducing demand could accomplish the goal of reducing peak period VMT. The main source of congestion is typically defined as vehicles move too slowly (i.e., peak period speeds are lower than posted speed limits). This definition of congestion describes a symptom and fails to recognize that peak period travel consists of vehicles with poor seat utilization caused by not managing demand more

effectively and mispricing travel demand. The existing roadway network has a limited capacity and this capacity is routinely filled up during peak periods in San Bernardino County by vehicles with solo drivers (i.e., low seat utilization). Further, limited facilities exist that prioritize travel by high occupancy vehicles. Increasing vehicle speeds and reducing delays substantially requires much greater seat utilization in existing vehicles (i.e., private vehicles and public transit). This change would also reduce VMT. Hence, refocusing on the combination of congestion management and VMT reduction would result in a different CIP that could qualify as VMT impact mitigation.

New Mitigation Program Concepts

Beyond the conventional programs described above are two new concepts that are not currently available in The SBCTA area. For purposes of this study, these programs are defined as follows.

- **VMT Mitigation Exchange** – An exchange program is a concept where VMT generators can select from a pre-approved list of mitigation projects that may be located within the same jurisdiction or possibly from a larger area. The intent is to match the project's needed VMT reduction with a specific mitigation project of matching size and to provide evidence that the VMT reduction will reasonably occur.

- **VMT Mitigation Bank** – A mitigation bank is intended to serve as an entity or organization that pools fees from development projects across multiple jurisdictions to spend on larger scale mitigation projects. This concept differs from the more conventional impact fee program approach described above in that the fees are directed to a few larger projects that have the potential for a more significant reduction in VMT and the program is regional in nature.

As these new mitigation program concepts are still evolving, the specific descriptions and elements of the programs will likely change. The first resource document to describe and assess these programs was recently published by U.C. Berkeley and is entitled, "Implementing SB 743, An Analysis of Vehicle Miles Traveled Banking and Exchange Frameworks," The University of California Institute of Transportation Studies, October 2018. This document is a useful starting place for a dialogue about these programs.

The findings of the report are supportive of these concepts noting the following about the reasoning for their consideration.

> *Yet while methods for reducing VMT impacts—such as mileage pricing mechanisms, direct investments in new public transit infrastructure, transit access subsidies, and infill development incentives—are well understood, they may be difficult in some cases to implement as mitigation projects directly linked or near to individual developments. As a result, broader and more flexible approaches to mitigation may be necessary. In response, state and local policy makers are considering the creation of mitigation "banks" or "exchanges." In a mitigation bank, developers*

would commit funds instead of undertaking specific on-site mitigation projects, and then a local or regional authority could aggregate these funds and deploy them to top-priority mitigation projects throughout the jurisdiction. Similarly, in a mitigation exchange, developers would be permitted to select from a list of pre-approved mitigation projects throughout the jurisdiction (or propose their own), without needing to mitigate their transportation impacts on-site. Both models can be applied at a city, county, regional, and potentially state scale, depending on local development patterns, transportation needs and opportunities, and political will.

This reasoning is important for lead agencies in the SBCTA area because mitigating VMT impacts on a project-by-project basis is challenging especially in suburban land use contexts where travel choices are limited. That said, the UCB report and research conducted for this study identified the following key challenges with these types of programs.

- Challenges for Mitigation Exchanges
    - Potential mismatch between funds and mitigation projects available
    - Potential for reduced oversight of project selection
    - Difficulty in verifying VMT reductions and their sustainability especially with VMT generation changing over time due to disruptive transportation trends such as transportation network companies (TNCs) and autonomous vehicles (AVs)
    - Difficulty in demonstrating an essential nexus
    - Potential opposition to mitigation not directly occurring in the project impact area especially if impacts are concentrated in or near disadvantaged communities and the mitigation occurs in more affluent areas

- Challenges for Mitigation Banks
    - Increased need to conduct careful CEQA/Mitigation Fee Act analysis
    - Accounting challenge in delay from fee payment to project funding
    - Greater need for program administration budget
    - Political difficulty in distributing mitigation projects and coordinating across jurisdictions
    - Difficulty in verifying VMT reductions and their sustainability especially with VMT generation changing over time due to disruptive transportation trends such as transportation network companies (TNCs) and autonomous vehicles (AVs)
    - Difficulty in demonstrating an essential nexus
    - Potential opposition to mitigation not directly occurring in the project impact area especially if impacts are concentrated in or near disadvantaged communities and the mitigation occurs in more affluent areas

Another important element for either of these concepts is to have an entity that is responsible for establishing, operating, and maintaining the program. This is a potential role for a sub-regional or regional entity especially for programs that would extend mitigation projects beyond individual

jurisdictional boundaries. A key part of 'operations' is that the entity will need the capability to provide verification of the VMT reduction performance and to adjust the program projects over time. Whether the entity is regional or sub-regional is another important consideration. A sub-regional entity could help minimize potential concerns about mitigation not occurring near the project site or in the same community.

The potential desire for VMT Mitigation Exchanges or Banks may depend on how lead agencies and developers respond to the initial implementation of SB 743 currently schedule to go into effect July 1, 2020. If many projects are found to have significant VMT impacts and problems occur with finding feasible mitigation measures for individual projects, then interest may grow for more program-based mitigation.

TDM Strategies

This information can be used as part of the SB 743 implementation to determine potentially feasible VMT mitigation measures for individual land use projects in the SBCTA area. An important consideration for the mitigation effectiveness is the scale for TDM strategy implementation. The biggest effects of TDM strategies on VMT (and resultant emissions) derive from regional policies related to land use location efficiency and infrastructure investments that support transit, walking, and bicycling. While there are many measures that can influence VMT and emissions that relate to site design and building operations, they have smaller effects that are often dependent on final building tenants. **Figure 1** presents a conceptual illustration of the relative importance of scale.

Figure 1: Transportation-Related GHG Reduction Measures



Of the 50 transportation measures presented in the CAPCOA 2010 report *Quantifying Greenhouse Gas Mitigation Measures*, 41 are applicable at building and site level. The remaining nine are functions of, or depend on, site location and/ or actions by local and regional agencies or funders. **Table 1** summarizes the strategies according to the scope of implementation and the agents who would implement them.

TABLE 1: SUMMARY OF TRANSPORTATION-RELATED CAPCOA MEASURES

Scope	Agents	CAPCOA Strategies (see full CAPCOA list below)
Building Operations	Employer, Manager	**26 total** from five CAPCOA strategy groups: • **3** from 3.2 Site Enhancements group • **3** from 3.3 Parking Pricing Availability group • **15** from 3.4 Commute Trip Reduction group • **2** from 3.5 Transit Access group • **3** from 3.7 Vehicle Operations group
Site Design	Owner, Architect	**15 total** from three strategy groups: • **6** from 3.1 Land Use group • **6** from 3.2 Site Enhancements group • **1** from 3.3 Parking group • **2** from 3.6 Road Access group
Location Efficiency	Developer, Local Agency	**3 shared** with Regional and Local Policies
Alignment with Regional and Local Policies	Regional and local agencies	**3 shared** with Location Efficiency
Regional Infrastructure and Services	Regional and local agencies	**6 total**

Of these strategies, some are likely to be effective in denser areas, while others will be less applicable in rural or suburban setting. In the SBCTA area, key factors that determine which reduction measures will be effective such as density and access to transit vary throughout and within the jurisdictions. To help narrow the list, we reviewed how land use context could influence each strategy's effectiveness and identified the seven for more detailed review. These strategies are described in Attachment B and listed below. Please note that disruptive trends, including but not limited to, transportation network companies (TNCs), autonomous vehicles (AVs), internet shopping, and micro-transit may affect the future effectiveness of these strategies.

1. Increase diversity of land uses – This strategy focuses on inclusion of mixed uses within projects or in consideration of the surrounding area to minimize vehicle travel in terms of both the number of trips and the length of those trips.

2. Provide pedestrian network improvements – This strategy focuses on creating a pedestrian network within the project and connecting to nearby destinations. Projects in the SBCTA area range in size, so the emphasis of this strategy for smaller projects would likely be the construction of network improvements that connect the project sites directly to nearby destinations. For larger projects, this strategy could focus on the development of a robust pedestrian network within the project itself. Alternatively, implementation could occur through an impact fee program such as the TUMF or benefit/assessment district based on local or regional plans.

3. Provide traffic calming measures and low-stress bicycle network improvements – This strategy combines the CAPCOA research focused on traffic calming with new research on providing a low-stress bicycle network. Traffic calming creates networks with low vehicle speeds and volumes that are more conducive to walking and bicycling. Building a low-stress bicycle network produces a similar outcome. Implementation options are similar to strategy 2 above. One potential change in this strategy over time is that e-bikes (and e-scooters) could extend the effective range of travel on the bicycle network, which could enhance the effectiveness of this strategy.

4. Implement car-sharing program – This strategy reduces the need to own a vehicle or reduces the number of vehicles owned by a household by making it convenient to access a shared vehicle for those trips where vehicle use is essential. Note that implementation of this strategy would require regional or local agency implementation and coordination and would not likely be applicable for individual development projects.

5. Increase transit service frequency and speed – This strategy focuses on improving transit service convenience and travel time competitiveness with driving. While the SBCTA area has fixed route rail and bus service that could be enhanced, it's also possible that new forms of low-cost demand-responsive transit service could be provided. The demand-responsive service could be provided as subsidized trips by contracting to private TNCs or Taxi companies. Alternatively, a public transit operator could provide the subsidized service but would need to improve on traditional cost effectiveness by relying on TNC ride-hailing technology, using smaller vehicles sized to demand, and flexible driver employment terms where drivers are paid by trip versus by hour. This type of service would reduce wait times for travelers and improve the typical in-vehicle travel time compared to traditional transit. Note that implementation of this strategy would require regional or local agency implementation, substantial changes to current transit practices, and would not likely be applicable for individual development projects.

6. Encourage telecommuting and alternative work schedules – This strategy relies of effective internet access and speeds to individual project sites/buildings to provide the opportunity for telecommuting. The effectiveness of the strategy depends on the ultimate building tenants and this should be a factor in considering the potential VMT reduction.

7. Provide ride-sharing programs – This strategy focuses on encouraging carpooling and vanpooling by project site/building tenants and has similar limitations as strategy 10 above.

Because of the limitations noted above, strategies 1, 2, 3, 4, and 7 are initially considered the highest priorities for individual land use project mitigation subject to review and discussion with the project team.

The VMT reduction strategies can be quantified using CACPOA calculation methodologies and recent ARB research findings. Attachment C provides calculation methodologies for each of the mitigations provided above, along with their range of effectiveness.

Summary

To help understand the full range of VMT impact mitigation and their benefits and challenges, Table 2 provides a high-level summary comparison.

Table 2 – Summary of VMT Impact Mitigation Options

Mitigation Option	Description	Benefits	Challenges
No feasible action	This option recognizes that feasible mitigation is not available due to the land use or transportation context.	- Recognizes the limitations of VMT impact mitigation when alternatives to driving are not reasonably available.	Could result in more significant and unavoidable (SAU) impacts that require an EIR instead of a negative declaration.
Change project	This option would tend to focus on changing built environment characteristics of a project such as its land use density or diversity to reduce vehicle travel.	- Mitigation may not require long-term monitoring (see substantial evidence summarized in the *SB 743 Implementation TDM Strategy Assessment Technical Memorandum dated 6.11.18*). - Mitigation reduces VMT (and other vehicle travel) in immediate vicinity of the project site.	Project applicants may resist land use or other built environment changes due to financial concerns and market feasibility.
TDM	This option relies on strategies to reduce vehicle travel through incentives and disincentives often tied to the cost and convenience of vehicle travel.	- Mitigation reduces VMT (and other vehicle travel) in immediate vicinity of the project site. - Multiple mitigation strategies to choose from such that a project applicant may find co-benefits from the strategies also serving as project amenities.	- Mitigation monitoring required because effectiveness depends on building tenants, which can change over time. As a result, impacts will remain SAU. - Creates potential financial equity issues between existing and new land uses. Existing land use with TDM mitigation will have lower operating costs. - Limited reduction based on applicable or relevant strategies
Impact fee program	This option requires developing a new impact fee program with a nexus	- Provides clear expectations for	- Requires lead agency to develop stakeholder support and funding to

Table 2 – Summary of VMT Impact Mitigation Options

Mitigation Option	Description	Benefits	Challenges
	based on VMT reduction. This type of nexus would allow the fee program capital improvement program (CIP) to include transit, bicycle, pedestrian and other types of projects that can demonstrate VMT reduction effectiveness.	developers about the VMT mitigation costs. - Increases funding for VMT reduction projects such that larger and more effective projects may be implemented. - May result in greater levels of VMT reduction compared to project-by-project mitigation.	create and maintain the fee program. - Mitigation (e.g., CIP projects) may not occur in immediate vicinity of the project site where impacts of vehicle travel will be most directly felt by neighbors.
Mitigation bank/exchange	This option matches VMT generators with VMT reducers within or beyond jurisdictional boundaries through a third party.	- Could create mitigation options that may not otherwise be available or feasible. - Not limited to jurisdictional boundaries. - Could create incentive for new innovative mitigation ideas.	- Requires an entity capable of operating and maintaining the program with the ability to verify VMT reductions. - Mitigation may not occur in immediate vicinity of the project site where impacts of vehicle travel will be most directly felt by neighbors.
General plan coverage	This option would address VMT impacts through a general plan update or amendment EIR and rely on CEQA Guidelines Section 15183 for subsequent project streamlining (as summarized in the *SB 743 Implementation Thresholds Assessment Technical Memorandum dated 10.31.18*).	- Addresses VMT reduction expectations in consideration of other jurisdictional objectives. - Offers a wider range of mitigation options than at the project-scale. - For subsequent projects consistent with the general plan, additional VMT impact analysis would not be required.	- General plan updates or amendments require substantial time and funding commitments.

FEHR PEERS

ATTACHMENT A

FEHR & PEERS

Comparison of CAPCOA Strategies Versus New Research Since 2010

CAPCOA Category	CAPCOA #	CAPCOA Strategy	CAPCOA Reduction	Strength of Substantial Evidence for CEQA Impact Analysis?	New Information Since CAPCOA Was Published in 2010		
					New information	Change in VMT reduction compared to CAPCOA	Literature or Evidence Cited
Land Use/Location	3.1.1	LUT-1 Increase Density	0.8% - 30% VMT reduction due to increase in density	Adequate	Increasing residential density is associated with lower VMT per capita. Increased residential density in areas with high jobs access may have a greater VMT change than increases in regions with lower jobs access. The range of reductions is based on a range of elasticities from -0.04 to -0.22. The low end of the reductions represents a -0.04 elasticity of demand in response to a 10% increase in residential units or employment density and a -0.22 elasticity in response to 50% increase to residential/employment density.	0.4% -10.75%	Primary sources: Boarnet, M. and Handy, S. (2014). Impacts of Residential Density on Passenger Vehicle Use and Greenhouse Gas Emissions - Policy Brief and Technical Background Document. California Air Resources Board. Retrieved from: https://arb.ca.gov/cc/sb375/policies/policies.htm Secondary source: Stevens, M. (2017). Does Compact Development Make People Drive Less? Journal of the American Planning Association, 83(1), 7-18.
Land Use/Location	3.1.9	LUT-9 Improve Design of Development	3.0% - 21.3% reduction in VMT due to increasing intersection density vs. typical ITE suburban development	Adequate	No update to CAPCOA literature; advise applying CAPCOA measure only to large developments with significant internal street structure.	Same	N/A
Land Use/Location	3.1.4	LUT-4 Increase Destination Accessibility	6.7%-20% VMT reduction due to decrease in distance to major job center or downtown	Adequate	Reduction in VMT due to increased regional accessibility (jobs gravity). Locating new development in areas with good access to destinations reduces VMT by reducing trip lengths and making walking, biking, and transit trips more feasible. Destination accessibility is measured in terms of the number of jobs (or other attractions) reachable within a given travel time, which tends to be highest at central locations and lowest at peripheral ones.	0.5%-12%	Primary sources: Handy, S. et al. (2014). Impacts of Network Connectivity on Passenger Vehicle Use and Greenhouse Gas Emissions - Policy Brief and Technical Background Document. California Air Resources Board. Retrieved from: https://arb.ca.gov/cc/sb375/policies/policies.htm Handy, S. et al. (2013). Impacts of Regional Accessibility on Passenger Vehicle Use and Greenhouse Gas Emissions - Policy Brief and Technical Background Document. California Air Resources Board. Retrieved from: https://arb.ca.gov/cc/sb375/policies/policies.htm Secondary source: Holtzclaw, et al. (2002.) Location Efficiency: Neighborhood and Socioeconomic Characteristics Determine Auto Ownership and Use – Studies in Chicago, Los Angeles, and Chicago. Transportation Planning and Technology, Vol. 25, pp. 1–27.

Comparison of CAPCOA Strategies Versus New Research Since 2010

CAPCOA Category	CAPCOA #	CAPCOA Strategy	CAPCOA Reduction	Strength of Substantial Evidence for CEQA Impact Analysis?	New Information Since CAPCOA Was Published in 2010		
					New information	Change in VMT reduction compared to CAPCOA	Literature or Evidence Cited
Land Use/ Location	3.1.3	LUT-3 Increase Diversity of Urban and Suburban Developments	9%-30% VMT reduction due to mixing land uses within a single development	Adequate	1] VMT reduction due to mix of land uses within a single development. Mixing land uses within a single development can decrease VMT (and resulting GHG emissions), since building users do not need to drive to meet all of their needs. 2] Reduction in VMT due to regional change in entropy index of diversity. Providing a mix of land uses within a single neighborhood can decrease VMT (and resulting GHG emissions), since trips between land use types are shorter and may be accommodated by non-auto modes of transport. For example when residential areas are in the same neighborhood as retail and office buildings, a resident does not need to travel outside of the neighborhood to meet his/her trip needs. At the regional level, reductions in VMT are measured in response to changes in the entropy index of land use diversity.	1] 0%-12% 2] 0.3%-4%	1] Ewing, R. and Cervero, R. (2010). Travel and the Built Environment - A Meta-Analysis. Journal of the American Planning Association,76(3),265-294. Cited in California Air Pollution Control Officers Association. (2010).Quantifying Greenhouse Gas Mitigation Measures. Retrieved from: http://www.capcoa.org/wp-content/uploads/2010/11/CAPCOA-Quantification-Report-9-14-Final.pdf Frank, L., Greenwald, M., Kavage, S. and Devlin, A. (2011). An Assessment of Urban Form and Pedestrian and Transit Improvements as an Integrated GHG Reduction Strategy. WSDOT Research Report WA-RD 765.1. Washington State Department of Transportation. Retrieved from: http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/research/reports/fullreports/765.1.pdf Nasri, A. and Zhang, L. (2012). Impact of Metropolitan-Level Built Environment on Travel Behavior. Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board, 2323(1), 75-79. Sadek, A. et al. (2011). Reducing VMT through Smart Land-Use Design. New York State Energy Research and Development Authority. Retrieved from: https://www.dot.ny.gov/divisions/engineering/technical-services/trans-r-and-d-repository/C-08-29%20Final%20Report_December%202011%20%282%29.pdf Spears, S.et al. (2014). Impacts of Land-Use Mix on Passenger Vehicle Use and Greenhouse Gas Emissions- Policy Brief and Technical Background Document. California Air Resources Board. Retrieved from: https://arb.ca.gov/cc/sb375/policies/policies.htm 2] Zhang, Wengia et al. "Short- and Long-Term Effects of Land Use on Reducing Personal Vehicle Miles of Travel."
Land Use/ Location	3.1.5	LUT-5 Increase Transit Accessibility	0.5%-24.6% reduce in VMT due to locating a project near high-quality transit	Adequate	1] VMT reduction when transit station is provided within 1/2 mile of development (compared to VMT for sites located outside 1/2 mile radius of transit). Locating high density development within 1/2 mile of transit will facilitate the use of transit by people traveling to or from the Project site. The use of transit results in a mode shift and therefore reduced VMT. 2] Reduction in vehicle trips due to implementing TOD. A project with a residential/commercial center designed around a rail or bus station, is called a transit-oriented development (TOD). The project description should include, at a minimum, the following design features: • A transit station/stop with high-quality, high-frequency bus service located within a 5-10 minute walk (or roughly ¼ mile from stop to edge of development), and/or • A rail station located within a 20 minute walk (or roughly ½ mile from station to edge of development) • Fast, frequent, and reliable transit service connecting to a high percentage of regional destinations • Neighborhood designed for walking and cycling	1] 0%-5.8% 2] 0%-7.3%	1] Lund, H. et al. (2004). Travel Characteristics of Transit-Oriented Development in California. Oakland, CA: Bay Area Rapid Transit District, Metropolitan Transportation Commission, and Caltrans. Tal, G. et al. (2013). Policy Brief on the Impacts of Transit Access (Distance to Transit) Based on a Review of the Empirical Literature. California Air Resources Board. Retrieved from: https://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/sb375/policies/transitaccess/transit_access_brief120313.pdf 2] Zamir, K. R. et al. (2014). Effects of Transit-Oriented Development on Trip Generation, Distribution, and Mode Share in Washington, D.C., and Baltimore, Maryland. Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board. 2413, 45–53. DOI: 10.3141/2413-05

Comparison of CAPCOA Strategies Versus New Research Since 2010

CAPCOA Category	CAPCOA #	CAPCOA Strategy	CAPCOA Reduction	Strength of Substantial Evidence for CEQA Impact Analysis?	New Information Since CAPCOA Was Published in 2010		
					New information	Change in VMT reduction compared to CAPCOA	Literature or Evidence Cited
Land Use/ Location	3.1.6	LUT-6 Integrate Affordable and Below Market Rate Housing	0.04%-1.20% reduction in VMT for making up to 30% of housing units BMR	Weak - Should only be used where supported by local data on affordable housing trip generation.	Observed trip generation indicates substantial local and regional variation in trip making behavior at affordable housing sites. Recommend use of ITE rates or local data for senior housing.	N/A	"Draft Memorandum: Infill and Complete Streets Study, Task 2.1: Local Trip Generation Study." *Measuring the Miles: Developing new metrics for vehicle travel in LA.* City of Los Angeles, April 19, 2017.
Neighborhood Site Enhancements	3.2.1	SDT-1 Provide Pedestrian Network Improvements	0%-2% reduction in VMT for creating a connected pedestrian network within the development and connecting to nearby destinations	Adequate	VMT reduction due to provision of complete pedestrian networks. Only applies if located in an area that may be prone to having a less robust sidewalk network.	0.5%-5.7%	Handy, S. et al. (2014). Impacts of Pedestrian Strategies on Passenger Vehicle Use and Greenhouse Gas Emissions - Policy Brief and Technical Background Document. California Air Resources Board. Retrieved from: https://arb.ca.gov/cc/sb375/policies/policies.htm
Neighborhood Site Enhancements	3.2.2	SDT-2 Provide Traffic Calming Measures	0.25%-1% VMT reduction due to traffic calming on streets within and around the development	Adequate	Reduction in VMT due to expansion of bike networks in urban areas. Strategy only applies to bicycle facilities that provide a dedicated lane for bicyclists or a completely separated right-of-way for bicycles and pedestrians. Project-level definition: Enhance bicycle network citywide (or at similar scale), such that a building entrance or bicycle parking is within 200 yards walking or bicycling distance from a bicycle network that connects to at least one of the following: at least 10 diverse uses; a school or employment center, if the project total floor area is 50% or more residential; or a bus rapid transit stop, light or heavy rail station, commuter rail station, or ferry terminal. All destinations must be 3-mile bicycling distance from project site. Include educational campaigns to encourage bicycling.	0%-1.7%	Zahabi, S. et al. (2016). Exploring the link between the neighborhood typologies, bicycle infrastructure and commuting cycling over time and the potential impact on commuter GHG emissions. Transportation Research Part D: Transport and Environment. 47, 89-103.
Neighborhood Site Enhancements	3.2.3	SDT-3 Implement an NEV Network	0.5%-12.7% VMT reduction for GHG-emitting vehicles, depending on level of local NEV penetration	Weak - not recommended without supplemental data.	Limited evidence and highly limited applicability. Use with supplemental data only.	N/A	City of Lincoln, MHM Engineers & Surveyors, Neighborhood Electric Vehicle Transportation Program Final Report, Issued 04/05/05, and City of Lincoln, A Report to the California Legislature as required by Assembly Bill 2353, Neighborhood Electric Vehicle Transportation Plan Evaluation, January 1, 2008. Cited in: California Air Pollution Control Officers Association. (2010). Quantifying Greenhouse Gas Mitigation Measures. Retrieved from: http://www.capcoa.org/wp-content/uploads/2010/11/CAPCOA-Quantification-Report-9-14-Final.pdf

Comparison of CAPCOA Strategies Versus New Research Since 2010

CAPCOA Category	CAPCOA #	CAPCOA Strategy	CAPCOA Reduction	Strength of Substantial Evidence for CEQA Impact Analysis?	New Information Since CAPCOA Was Published in 2010		
					New information	Change in VMT reduction compared to CAPCOA	Literature or Evidence Cited
Neighborhood Site Enhancements	3.4.9	TRT-9 Implement Car-Sharing Program	0.4% - 0.7% VMT reduction due to lower vehicle ownership rates and general shift to non-driving modes	Adequate	Vehicle trip reduction due to car-sharing programs; reduction assumes 1%-5% penetration rate. Implementing car-sharing programs allows people to have on-demand access to a shared fleet of vehicles on an as-needed basis, as a supplement to trips made by non-SOV modes. Transit station-based programs focus on providing the "last-mile" solution and link transit with commuters' final destinations. Residential-based programs work to substitute entire household based trips. Employer-based programs provide a means for business/day trips for alternative mode commuters and provide a guaranteed ride home option. The reduction shown here assumes a 1%-5% penetration rate.	0.3%-1.6%	Lovejoy, K. et al. (2013). Impacts of Carsharing on Passenger Vehicle Use and Greenhouse Gas Emissions - Policy Brief and Technical Background Document. California Air Resources Board. Retrieved from: https://arb.ca.gov/cc/sb375/policies/policies.htm *Need to verify with more recent UCD research.*
Parking Pricing	3.3.1	PDT-1 Limit Parking Supply	5%-12.5% VMT reduction in response to reduced parking supply vs. ITE parking generation rate	Weak - not recommended. Fehr & Peers has developed new estimates for residential land use only that may be used.	CAPCOA reduction range derived from estimate of reduced vehicle ownership, not supported by observed trip or VMT reductions. Evidence is available for mode shift due to presence/absence of parking in high-transit urban areas; additional investigation ongoing	Higher	Fehr & Peers estimated a linear regression formula based on observed data from multiple locations. Resulting equation produces maximum VMT reductions for residential land use only of 30% in suburban locations and 50% in urban locations based on parking supply percentage reductions.
Parking Pricing	3.3.2	PDT-2 Unbundle Parking Costs from Property Cost	2.6% -13% VMT reduction due to decreased vehicle ownership rates	Adequate - conditional on the agency not requiring parking minimums and pricing/managing on-street parking (i.e., residential parking permit districts, etc.).	Reduction in VMT, primarily for residential uses, based on range of elasticities for vehicle ownership in response to increased residential parking fees. Does not account for self-selection. Only applies if the city does not require parking minimums and if on-street parking is priced and managed (i.e., residential parking permit districts).	2%-12%	Victoria Transport Policy Institute (2009). Parking Requirement Impacts on Housing Affordability. Retrieved March 2010 from: http://www.vtpi.org/park-hou.pdf.

Comparison of CAPCOA Strategies Versus New Research Since 2010

CAPCOA Category	CAPCOA #	CAPCOA Strategy	CAPCOA Reduction	Strength of Substantial Evidence for CEQA Impact Analysis?	New Information Since CAPCOA Was Published in 2010		
					New information	Change in VMT reduction compared to CAPCOA	Literature or Evidence Cited
Parking Pricing	3.3.3	PDT-3 Implement Market Price Public Parking	2.8%-5.5% VMT reduction due to "park once" behavior and disincentive to driving	Adequate	Implement a pricing strategy for parking by pricing all central business district/employment center/retail center on-street parking. It will be priced to encourage park once" behavior. The benefit of this measure above that of paid parking at the project only is that it deters parking spillover from project supplied parking to other public parking nearby, which undermine the vehicle miles traveled (VMT) benefits of project pricing. It may also generate sufficient area-wide mode shifts to justify increased transit service to the area. VMT reduction applies to VMT from visitor/customer trips only. Reductions higher than top end of range from CAPCOA report apply only in conditions with highly constrained on-street parking supply and lack of comparably-priced off-street parking.	2.8%-14.5%	Clinch, J.P. and Kelly, J.A. (2003). Temporal Variance Of Revealed Preference On-Street Parking Price Elasticity. Dublin: Department of Environmental Studies, University College Dublin. Retrieved from: http://www.ucd.ie/gpep/research/workingpapers/2004/04-02.pdf. Cited in Victoria Transport Policy Institute (2017). Transportation Elasticities: How Prices and Other Factors Affect Travel Behavior. Retrieved from: http://www.vtpi.org/tdm/tdm11.htm Hensher, D. and King, J. (2001). Parking Demand and Responsiveness to Supply, Price and Location in Sydney Central Business District. Transportation Research A. 35(3), 177-196. Millard-Ball, A. et al. (2013). Is the curb 80% full or 20% empty? Assessing the impacts of San Francisco's parking pricing experiment. Transportation Research Part A. 63(2014), 76-92. Shoup, D. (2011). The High Cost of Free Parking. APA Planners Press. p. 290. Cited in Pierce, G. and Shoup, D. (2013). Getting the Prices Right. Journal of the American Planning Association. 79(1), 67-81.
Transit System	3.5.3	TST-3 Expand Transit Network	0.1-8.2% VMT reduction in response to increase in transit network coverage	Adequate	Reduction in vehicle trips due to increased transit service hours or coverage. Low end of reduction is typical of project-level implementation (payment of impact fees and/or localized improvements).	0.1%-10.5%	Handy, S. et al. (2013). Impacts of Transit Service Strategies on Passenger Vehicle Use and Greenhouse Gas Emissions - Policy Brief and Technical Background Document. California Air Resources Board. Retrieved from: https://arb.ca.gov/cc/sb375/policies/policies.htm
Transit System	3.5.4	TST-4 Increase Transit Service Frequency/Speed	0.02%-2.5% VMT reduction due to reduced headways and increased speed and reliability	Adequate	Reduction in vehicle trips due to increased transit frequency/decreased headway. Low end of reduction is typical of project-level implementation (payment of impact fees and/or localized improvements).	0.3%-6.3%	Handy, S. et al. (2013). Impacts of Transit Service Strategies on Passenger Vehicle Use and Greenhouse Gas Emissions - Policy Brief and Technical Background Document. California Air Resources Board. Retrieved from: https://arb.ca.gov/cc/sb375/policies/policies.htm
Transit System	3.5.1	TST-1 Provide a Bus Rapid Transit System	0.02%-3.2% VMT reduction by converting standard bus system to BRT system	Adequate	No new information identified.	Same	N/A
Commute Trip Reduction	3.4.1	TRT-1 Implement CTR Program - Voluntary	1.0%-6.2% commute VMT reduction due to employer-based mode shift program	Adequate - Effectiveness is building/tenant specific. Do not use with "TRT-2 Implement CTR Program - Required Implementation/Monitoring" or with CAPCOA strategies TRT-3.4.3 through TRT-3.4.9.	Reduction in vehicle trips in response to employer-led TDM programs. The CTR program should include all of the following to apply the effectiveness reported by the literature: • Carpooling encouragement • Ride-matching assistance • Preferential carpool parking • Flexible work schedules for carpools • Half time transportation coordinator • Vanpool assistance • Bicycle end-trip facilities (parking, showers and lockers)	1.0%-6.0%	Boarnet, M. et al. (2014). Impacts of Employer-Based Trip Reduction Programs and Vanpools on Passenger Vehicle Use and Greenhouse Gas Emissions - Policy Brief and Technical Background Document. California Air Resources Board. Retrieved from: https://arb.ca.gov/cc/sb375/policies/policies.htm
Commute Trip Reduction	3.4.2	TRT-2 Implement CTR Program - Required Implementation/Monitoring	4.2%-21.0% commute VMT reduction due to employer-based mode shift program with required monitoring and reporting	Adequate - Effectiveness is building/tenant specific. Do not use with "TRT-1 Implement CTR Program - Voluntary" or with CAPCOA strategies TRT-3.4.3 through TRT-3.4.9.	Limited evidence available. Anecdotal evidence shows high investment produces high VMT/vehicle trip reductions at employment sites with monitoring requirements and specific targets.	Same	Nelson/Nygaard (2008). South San Francisco Mode Share and Parking Report for Genentech, Inc.(p. 8) Cited in: California Air Pollution Control Officers Association. (2010). Quantifying Greenhouse Gas Mitigation Measures. Retrieved from: http://www.capcoa.org/wp-content/uploads/2010/11/CAPCOA-Quantification-Report-9-14-Final.pdf

Comparison of CAPCOA Strategies Versus New Research Since 2010

CAPCOA Category	CAPCOA #	CAPCOA Strategy	CAPCOA Reduction	Strength of Substantial Evidence for CEQA Impact Analysis?	New Information Since CAPCOA Was Published in 2010		
					New information	Change in VMT reduction compared to CAPCOA	Literature or Evidence Cited
Commute Trip Reduction	3.4.4	TRT-4 Implement Subsidized or Discounted Transit Program	0.3%-20% commute VMT reduction due to transit subsidy of up to $6/day	Adequate - Effectiveness is building/tenant specific. Do not use with "TRT-1 Implement CTR Program - Voluntary" or "TRT-2 Implement CTR Program - Required Implementation/Monitoring."	1] Reduction in vehicle trips in response to reduced cost of transit use, assuming that 10-50% of new bus trips replace vehicle trips; 2] Reduction in commute trip VMT due to employee benefits that include transit 3] Reduction in all vehicle trips due to reduced transit fares system-wide, assuming 25% of new transit trips would have been vehicle trips.	1] 0.3%-14% 2] 0-16% 3] 0.1% to 6.9%	1] Victoria Transport Policy Institute. (2017). Understanding Transport Demands and Elasticities. Online TDM Encyclopedia. Retrieved from: http://www.vtpi.org/tdm/tdm11.htm 2] Carolina, P. et al. (2016). Do Employee Commuter Benefits Increase Transit Ridership? Evidence rom the NY-NJ Region. Washington, DC: Transportation Research Board, 96th Annual Meeting. 3] Handy, S. et al. (2013). Impacts of Transit Service Strategies on Passenger Vehicle Use and Greenhouse Gas Emissions - Policy Brief and Technical Background Document. California Air Resources Board. Retrieved from: https://arb.ca.gov/cc/sb375/policies/policies.htm
Commute Trip Reduction	3.4.15	TRT-15 Employee Parking Cash-Out	0.6%-7.7% commute VMT reduction due to implementing employee parking cash-out	Weak - Effectiveness is building/tenant specific. Research data is over 10 years old (1997).	Shoup case studies indicate a reduction in commute vehicle trips due to implementing cash-out without implementing other trip-reduction strategies.	3%-7.7%	Shoup, D. (1997). Evaluating the Effects of Cashing Out Employer-Paid Parking: Eight Case Studies. Transport Policy. California Air Resources Board. Retrieved from: https://www.arb.ca.gov/research/apr/past/93-308a.pdf. This citation was listed as an alternative literature in CAPCOA.
Commute Trip Reduction	3.4.14	TRT-14 Price Workplace Parking	0.1%-19.7% commute VMT reduction due to mode shift	Adequate - Effectiveness is building/tenant specific.	Reduction in commute vehicle trips due to priced workplace parking; effectiveness depends on availability of alternative modes. Workplace parking pricing may include: explicitly charging for parking, implementing above market rate pricing, validating parking only for invited guests, not providing employee parking and transportation allowances, and educating employees about available alternatives.	0.5%-14%	Primary sources: Concas, S. and Nayak, N. (2012), A Meta-Analysis of Parking Price Elasticity. Washington, DC: Transportation Research Board, 2012 Annual Meeting. Dale, S. et al. (2016). Evaluating the Impact of a Workplace Parking Levy on Local Traffic Congestion: The Case of Nottingham UK. Washington, DC: Transportation Research Board, 96th Annual Meeting. Secondary sources: Victoria Transport Policy Institute. (2017). Understanding Transport Demands and Elasticities. Online TDM Encyclopedia. Retrieved from: http://www.vtpi.org/tdm/tdm11.htm Spears, S. et al. (2014). Impacts of Parking Pricing on Passenger Vehicle Use and Greenhouse Gas Emissions - Policy Brief and Technical Background Document. California Air Resources Board. Retrieved from: https://arb.ca.gov/cc/sb375/policies/policies.htm
Commute Trip Reduction	3.4.6	TRT-6 Encourage Telecommuting and Alternative Work Schedules	0.07%-5.5% commute VMT reduction due to reduced commute trips	Adequate - Effectiveness is building/tenant specific. Do not use with "TRT-1 Implement CTR Program - Voluntary" or "TRT-2 Implement CTR Program - Required Implementation/Monitoring."	VMT reduction due to adoption of telecommuting. Alternative work schedules could take the form of staggered starting times, flexible schedules, or compressed work weeks.	0.2%-4.5%	Handy, S. et al. (2013). Policy Brief on the Impacts of Telecommuting Based on a Review of the Empirical Literature. California Air Resources Board. Retrieved from: https://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/sb375/policies/telecommuting/telecommuting_brief120313.pdf
Commute Trip Reduction	3.4.7	1] TRT-7 Implement CTR Marketing 2] Launch Targeted Behavioral Interventions	0.8%-4.0% commute VMT reduction due to employer marketing of alternatives	Adequate - Effectiveness is building/tenant specific. Do not use with "TRT-1 Implement CTR Program - Voluntary" or "TRT-2 Implement CTR Program - Required Implementation/Monitoring."	1] Vehicle trips reduction due to CTR marketing; 2] Reduction in VMT from institutional trips due to targeted behavioral intervention programs	1] 0.9% to 26% 2] 1%-6%	1] Pratt, Dick. Personal communication regarding the Draft of TCRP 95 Traveler Response to Transportation System Changes – Chapter 19 Employer and Institutional TDM Strategies. Transit Cooperative Research Program. Cited in California Air Pollution Control Officers Association. (2010).Quantifying Greenhouse Gas Mitigation Measures. Retrieved from: http://www.capcoa.org/wp-content/uploads/2010/11/CAPCOA-Quantification-Report-9-14-Final.pdf Dill, J. and Mohr, C. (2010). Long-Term Evaluation of Individualized Marketing Programs for Travel Demand Management. Portland, OR: Transportation Research and Education Center (TREC). Retrieved from: http://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/usp_fac 2] Brown, A. and Ralph, K. (2017.) "The Right Time and Place to Change Travel Behavior: An Experimental Study." Washington, DC: Transportation Research Board, 2017 Annual Meeting. Retrieved from: https://trid.trb.org/view.aspx?id=1437253

TDM STRATEGY EVALUATION - DRAFT V 1.0

FEHR PEERS

Comparison of CAPCOA Strategies Versus New Research Since 2010

CAPCOA Category	CAPCOA #	CAPCOA Strategy	CAPCOA Reduction	Strength of Substantial Evidence for CEQA Impact Analysis?	New Information Since CAPCOA Was Published in 2010		
					New information	Change in VMT reduction compared to CAPCOA	Literature or Evidence Cited
Commute Trip Reduction	3.4.11	TRT-11 Provide Employer-Sponsored Vanpool/Shuttle	0.3%-13.4% commute VMT reduction due to employer-sponsored vanpool and/or shuttle service	Adequate - Effectiveness is building/tenant specific.	1] Reduction in commute vehicle trips due to implementing employer-sponsored vanpool and shuttle programs; 2] Reduction in commute vehicle trips due to vanpool incentive programs; 3] Reduction in commute vehicle trips due to employer shuttle programs	1] 0.5%-5.0% 2] 0.3%-7.4% 3] 1.4%-6.8%	1] Concas, Sisinnio, Winters, Philip, Wambalaba, Francis, (2005). Fare Pricing Elasticity, Subsidies, and Demand for Vanpool Services. Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board, 1924, pp 215-223. 2] Victoria Transport Policy Institute. (2015). Ridesharing: Carpooling and Vanpooling. Online TDM Encyclopedia. Retrieved from: http://vtpi.org/tdm/tdm34.htm 3] ICF. (2014). GHG Impacts for Commuter Shuttles Pilot Program.
Commute Trip Reduction	3.4.3	TRT-3 Provide Ride-Sharing Programs	1%-15% commute VMT reduction due to employer ride share coordination and facilities	Adequate - Effectiveness is building/tenant specific. Do not use with "TRT-1 Implement CTR Program - Voluntary" or "TRT-2 Implement CTR Program - Required Implementation/Monitoring."	Commute vehicle trips reduction due to employer ride-sharing programs. Promote ride-sharing programs through a multi-faceted approach such as: • Designating a certain percentage of parking spaces for ride sharing vehicles • Designating adequate passenger loading and unloading and waiting areas for ride-sharing vehicles • Providing an app or website for coordinating rides	2.5%-8.3%	Victoria Transport Policy Institute. (2015). Ridesharing: Carpooling and Vanpooling. Online TDM Encyclopedia. Retrieved from: http://vtpi.org/tdm/tdm34.htm
Commute Trip Reduction	3.4.10	TRT-10 Implement a School Pool Program	7.2%-15.8% reduction in school VMT due to school pool implementation	Adequate - School VMT only.	Limited new evidence available, not conclusive	Same	Transportation Demand Management Institute of the Association for Commuter Transportation. TDM Case Studies and Commuter Testimonials. Prepared for the US EPA. 1997. (p. 10, 36-38) WayToGo 2015 Annual Report. Accessed on March 12, 2017 from http://www.waytogo.org/sites/default/files/attachments/waytogo-annual-report-2015.pdf
Commute Trip Reduction	3.4.13	TRT-13 Implement School Bus Program	38%-63% reduction in school VMT due to school bus service implementation	Adequate - School VMT only.	VMT reduction for school trips based on data beyond a single school district. School district boundaries are also a factor to consider. VMT reduction does not appear to be a factor that was considered in a select review of CA boundaries. VMT reductions apply to school trip VMT only.	5%-30%	Wilson, E., et al. (2007). The implications of school choice on travel behavior and environmental emissions. Transportation Research Part D: Transport and Environment 12(2007), 506-518.
Not Applicable - not a CAPCOA strategy	Not Applicable - not a CAPCOA strategy	Not Applicable - not a CAPCOA strategy	Not Applicable - not a CAPCOA strategy	Not Applicable - not a CAPCOA strategy	Bikeshare car trip substitution rate of 7-19% based on data from Washington DC, and Minneapolis/St. Paul. Annual VMT reduction of 151,000 and 57,000, respectively. Includes VMT for rebalancing and maintenance. VMT reduction of 0.023 miles per day per bikeshare member estimated for Bay Area bikeshare, utilizing Minneapolis/St. Paul data from study above.	57,000-151,000 annual VMT reduction, based on two large US cities. VMT reduction of 0.023 miles per day per member, based on one large US city estimate.	Fishman, E., Washington, S., & Haworth, N. (2014). Bike share's impact on car use: Evidence from the United States, Great Britain, and Australia. Transportation Research Part D: Transport and Environment, 31, 13-20. TDM Methodology: Impact of Carsharing Membership, Transit Passes, Bikesharing Membership, Unbundled Parking, and Parking Supply Reductions on Driving. Center for Neighborhood Technology, Peter Haas and Cindy Copp, with TransForm staff, May 5, 2016.

FEHR PEERS

ATTACHMENT B

FEHR & PEERS

Relevant Strategies for Implementation in SBCTA Jurisdictions Due to Land Use Context

CAPCOA Category	CAPCOA #	CAPCOA Strategy	CAPCOA Reduction	Strength of Substantial Evidence for CEQA Impact Analysis?	New Information Since CAPCOA Was Published in 2010		
					New information	Change in VMT reduction compared to CAPCOA(1)	Literature or Evidence Cited
Land Use/ Location	3.1.3	LUT-3 Increase Diversity of Urban and Suburban Developments	9%-30% VMT reduction due to mixing land uses within a single development	Adequate	1] VMT reduction due to mix of land uses within a single development; 2] Reduction in VMT due to regional change in entropy index of diversity.	1] 0%-12% 2] 0.3%-4%	1] Ewing, R. and Cervero, R. (2010). Travel and the Built Environment - A Meta-Analysis. Journal of the American Planning Association,76(3),265-294. Cited in California Air Pollution Control Officers Association. (2010).Quantifying Greenhouse Gas Mitigation Measures. Retrieved from: http://www.capcoa.org/wp-content/uploads/2010/11/CAPCOA-Quantification-Report-9-14-Final.pdf Frank, L., Greenwald, M., Kavage, S. and Devlin, A. (2011). An Assessment of Urban Form and Pedestrian and Transit Improvements as an Integrated GHG Reduction Strategy. WSDOT Research Report WA-RD 765.1. Washington State Department of Transportation. Retrieved from: http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/research/reports/fullreports/765.1.pdf Nasri, A. and Zhang, L. (2012). Impact of Metropolitan-Level Built Environment on Travel Behavior. Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board, 2323(1), 75-79. Sadek, A. et al. (2011). Reducing VMT through Smart Land-Use Design. New York State Energy Research and Development Authority. Retrieved from: https://www.dot.ny.gov/divisions/engineering/technical-services/trans-r-and-d-repository/C-08-29%20Final%20Report_December%202011%20%282%29.pdf Spears, S.et al. (2014). Impacts of Land-Use Mix on Passenger Vehicle Use and Greenhouse Gas Emissions- Policy Brief and Technical Background Document. California Air Resources Board. Retrieved from: https://arb.ca.gov/cc/sb375/policies/policies.htm 2] Zhang, Wengia et al. "Short- and Long-Term Effects of Land Use on Reducing Personal Vehicle Miles of Travel."
Neighborhood Site Enhancements	3.2.1	SDT-1 Provide Pedestrian Network Improvements	0%-2% reduction in VMT for creating a connected pedestrian network within the development and connecting to nearby destinations	Adequate	VMT reduction due to provision of complete pedestrian networks.	0.5%-5.7%	Handy, S. et al. (2014). Impacts of Pedestrian Strategies on Passenger Vehicle Use and Greenhouse Gas Emissions - Policy Brief and Technical Background Document. California Air Resources Board. Retrieved from: https://arb.ca.gov/cc/sb375/policies/policies.htm
Neighborhood Site Enhancements	3.2.2	SDT-2 Provide Traffic Calming Measures	0.25%-1% VMT reduction due to traffic calming on streets within and around the development	Adequate	Reduction in VMT due to building out a low-stress bike network; reduction in VMT due to expansion of bike networks in urban areas.	0%-1.7%	1] California Air Resources Board. (2016). Greenhouse Gas Quantification Methodology for the California Transportation Commission Active Transportation Program Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund Fiscal Year 2016-17. Retrieved from: https://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/capandtrade/auctionproceeds/ctc_atp_finalqm_16-17.pdf. 2] Zahabi, S. et al. (2016). Exploring the link between the neighborhood typologies, bicycle infrastructure and commuting cycling over time and the potential impact on commuter GHG emissions. Transportation Research Part D: Transport and Environment. 47, 89-103.
Neighborhood Site Enhancements	3.4.9	TRT-9 Implement Car-Sharing Program	0.4% - 0.7% VMT reduction due to lower vehicle ownership rates and general shift to non-driving modes	Adequate	Vehicle trip reduction due to car-sharing programs; reduction assumes 1%-5% penetration rate. Car sharing effect on VMT is still evolving due to TNC effects. UCD research showed less effect on car ownership due to car sharing participation and an uncertain effect on VMT.	0.3%-1.6%	Lovejoy, K. et al. (2013). Impacts of Carsharing on Passenger Vehicle Use and Greenhouse Gas Emissions - Policy Brief and Technical Background Document. California Air Resources Board. Retrieved from: https://arb.ca.gov/cc/sb375/policies/policies.htm Clewlow, Regina R. and Mishra, Gouri Shankar, (2017). Disruptive Transportation: The Adoption, Utilization, and Impacts of Ride-Hailing in the United States. UC Davis, Institute of Transportation Studies. Research Report - UCD-ITS-RR-17-07.
Transit System	3.5.4	TST-4 Increase Transit Service Frequency/Speed	0.02%-2.5% VMT reduction due to reduced headways and increased speed and reliability	Adequate	Reduction in vehicle trips due to increased transit frequency/decreased headway.	0.3%-6.3%	Handy, S. et al. (2013). Impacts of Transit Service Strategies on Passenger Vehicle Use and Greenhouse Gas Emissions - Policy Brief and Technical Background Document. California Air Resources Board. Retrieved from: https://arb.ca.gov/cc/sb375/policies/policies.htm

FEHR & PEERS

Relevant Strategies for Implementation in SBCTA Jurisdictions Due to Land Use Context

CAPCOA Category	CAPCOA #	CAPCOA Strategy	CAPCOA Reduction	Strength of Substantial Evidence for CEQA Impact Analysis?	New Information Since CAPCOA Was Published in 2010		
					New information	Change in VMT reduction compared to CAPCOA(1)	Literature or Evidence Cited
Commute Trip Reduction	3.4.6	TRT-6 Encourage Telecommuting and Alternative Work Schedules	0.07%-5.5% commute VMT reduction due to reduced commute trips	Adequate - Effectiveness is building/tenant specific. Do not use with "TRT-1 Implement CTR Program - Voluntary" or "TRT-2 Implement CTR Program - Required Implementation/Monitoring."	VMT reduction due to adoption of telecommuting	0.2%-4.5%	Handy, S. et al. (2013). Policy Brief on the Impacts of Telecommuting Based on a Review of the Empirical Literature. California Air Resources Board. Retrieved from: https://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/sb375/policies/telecommuting/telecommuting_brief120313.pdf
Commute Trip Reduction	3.4.3	TRT-3 Provide Ride-Sharing Programs	1%-15% commute VMT reduction due to employer ride share coordination and facilities	Adequate - Effectiveness is building/tenant specific. Do not use with "TRT-1 Implement CTR Program - Voluntary" or "TRT-2 Implement CTR Program - Required Implementation/Monitoring."	Commute vehicle trips reduction due to employer ride-sharing programs	2.5%-8.3%	Victoria Transport Policy Institute. (2015). Ridesharing: Carpooling and Vanpooling. Online TDM Encyclopedia. Retrieved from: http://vtpi.org/tdm/tdm34.htm

NOTES:

(1) For specific VMT reduction ranges, refer to the cited literature.