Shifting Gears in Transportation Analysis

Revised CEQA Guidelines Proposal
Implementing SB 743
SB 743 Timeline

• SB 743 signed 2013
• Preliminary Evaluation of Alternative Methods of Transportation Analysis (Dec 2013)
• Preliminary Discussion Draft of Updates to the CEQA Guidelines Implementing Senate Bill 743 (August 2014)
• Revised Proposal on Updates to the CEQA Guidelines on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA (January 2016)
  – Public review ended February 29, 2016
• Currently: Finalizing proposal
• Next: To Natural Resources Agency formal rulemaking process
• SB 743 effective late 2016 or early 2017
• 2 year opt-in period; implementation required statewide late 2018 or early 2019
Analysis of infill development using LOS
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Relatively little vehicle travel loaded onto the network
Analysis of **infill** development using LOS

Relatively little vehicle travel loaded onto the network

...but numerous LOS impacts
Analysis of greenfield development using LOS
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Typically three to four times the vehicle travel loaded onto the network relative to infill development
Analysis of greenfield development using LOS

Typically three to four times the vehicle travel loaded onto the network relative to infill development

...but relatively few LOS impacts

Traffic generated by the project is disperse enough by the time it reaches congested areas that it doesn’t trigger LOS thresholds, even though it contributes broadly to regional congestion.
Level of Service A
Level of Service F
Opportunities/benefits in shift from LOS to VMT

1. Remove a key barrier to infill, TOD
2. Streamline transit and active transportation projects
3. VMT is easier to model
4. VMT is already in use
5. Reduction in infrastructure capital and maintenance costs
6. Attack regional congestion more effectively
7. Health benefits (active transport & transit trips)
8. GHG reduction
Picturing A Low VMT Future
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CEQA Guidelines and Technical Advisory

- Primary metric of transportation impact statewide is VMT
- Use VMT screening maps for residential and office projects
- Presume development near transit leads to a less than significant impact*
- Recommendation that transit, active transportation projects presumed less than significant
- More stringent thresholds may be applied at lead agency discretion

* The following void presumption:
  - FAR < 0.75
  - Parking > minimum requirements
  - Inconsistent with SCS

VMT Map of Fresno COG, generated by the California Statewide Travel Demand Model
**CEQA Guidelines and Technical Advisory**

**Residential** project threshold recommendation:

**15 percent below regional or city VMT/cap**

**Office** project threshold recommendation:

**15 percent below regional VMT/empl**

- Caltrans Strategic Plan: 15% VMT/cap
- SB 375 targets ≈ 15% GHG/cap
- AB 32 Scoping plan recommends local governments set GHG reduction targets at 15% below existing
- 15% VMT mitigation generally achievable*
  
  * see CAPCOA’s *Quantifying Greenhouse Gas Mitigation Measures*
Retail project recommendations:

- *Retail which increases VMT compared to previous shopping patterns may be considered significant*
- Local-serving retail presumed less than significant
Transportation Project recommendations:

• Presume transit and active transportation projects lead to less than significant VMT

• Threshold considers VMT allowable to achieve 2030 GHG reduction target

• Option to use simple method using researched elasticities
Induced and Latent Demand

- Congestion
- More People Drive
- Widen Roadway
- Faster Driving
Inconvenient Truth #2: Induced VMT

- Adding highway capacity induces VMT
- For each 1% increase in lane miles, VMT goes up by 0.6 to 1.0%
- The added VMT is new, not shifted from elsewhere
- The new VMT increases GHGs
- The new highway capacity does not increase overall employment or economic activity, but simply shifts it

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans White Paper</td>
<td><a href="https://caltranstag-public.pbworks.com/w/file/103925443/Induced%20Travel%20Technical%20Investigation%20TASK%203%20FINAL.docx">https://caltranstag-public.pbworks.com/w/file/103925443/Induced%20Travel%20Technical%20Investigation%20TASK%203%20FINAL.docx</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARB Brief</td>
<td><a href="http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/sb375/policies/hwycapacity/highway_capacity_brief.pdf">http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/sb375/policies/hwycapacity/highway_capacity_brief.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARB Technical Background</td>
<td><a href="http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/sb375/policies/hwycapacity/highway_capacity_bkgd.pdf">http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/sb375/policies/hwycapacity/highway_capacity_bkgd.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Safety

• Neither SB 743 statute nor OPR Technical Advisory recommend additional safety analysis
• Technical Advisory provides broad recommendations regarding approach on any traffic safety analysis that might be undertaken under CEQA
Queue length is the cumulative effect of many land use and transportation decisions, not the result of last-in projects.
Problems:

- Recreates the last-in problem
- Undermines streamlining for infill
- Replaces project-level LOS with a yet more onerous and inaccurate analysis
Caltrans and SB 743

**Transportation Analysis Guidelines** and **Transportation Impact Study Guidelines (TAG-TISG)**

- Caltrans is developing
  - TAG: New guidelines describing methods for analyzing the effects of transportation projects
  - TISG: New guidelines recommending an approach to characterize land use project impact on the state highway system
- Will benefit from broad stakeholder involvement
  - Caltrans contact: [gary.arnold@dot.ca.gov](mailto:gary.arnold@dot.ca.gov)
Thanks!

Chris Calfee: christopher.calfee@opr.ca.gov
Chris Ganson: chris.ganson@opr.ca.gov