SB 743 Implementation

A Programmatic Approach for Governments to Consider
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Status Update

— Update to CEQA Guidelines

— Latest draft published in January 2016
   — Led by Office of Planning and Research (OPR)
   — Recommendation: VMT to replace LOS as measure of impact

— Currently in bureaucratic pipeline
   — Review by Office of Administrative Law

— Additional comment period may be upcoming
California’s Policy Goals

Overall legislative guidance:

— Encourage infill & Smart Growth
— Encourage multimodal transportation
— Discourage GHG emissions
— Discourage sprawl
Why Does VMT Best Meet Policy Goals?

— Encourages infill & Smart Growth
— Discourages sprawl
— Directly informs GHG emissions analysis
How is VMT Responsive to Smart Growth?

VMT = Auto Trips Generated × Average Trip Length

Sensitive to smart growth, multimodal access

Sensitive to proximity of jobs, shopping etc.
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How Does VMT Inform GHG Emissions Analysis?

Vehicle Miles Traveled x \( \frac{\text{CO}_2\text{e}/\text{VMT}}{\text{VMT}} \) = \( \text{CO}_2\text{e} \)
Benefits of SB 743

— Allows CEQA to work *toward* state transportation and climate goals, instead of against
  — *State law no longer* facilitates wider roads

— Cities can adopt whatever standards best advance their policy goals
  — *Could be funding multimodal transportation projects*

— Makes certain projects easier
  — *Mixed use, urban infill, TOD*
Common Myths of SB 743

— Contrary to myth, SB 743 *will not* prohibit cities from:
  — Requiring Traffic Impact Studies (TIS)
  — Maintaining their own Level of Service (LOS) standards
  — Using mitigation to fund roadway widening projects

— Cities may continue to do any of the above if they choose
Challenges of SB 743

1. The change to VMT can result in lost transportation mitigation

San Diego Region:
Residential VMT per capita vs. regional average
Challenges of SB 743

2. GHG targets & VMT thresholds may not be consistent

- Transportation: 39%
- Industrial: 23%
- Electricity: 19%
- Agriculture: 8%
- Other: 11%

2. GHG targets & VMT thresholds may not be consistent
### Challenges of SB 743

3. Not every region & community will be able to reduce VMT equally

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>SB 375 2035 GHG Target</th>
<th>SB 743 VMT Reduction Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>– 16%</td>
<td>– 15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco Bay Area</td>
<td>– 15%</td>
<td>– 15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>– 13%</td>
<td>– 15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>– 13%</td>
<td>– 15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Joaquin Valley</td>
<td>– 10%</td>
<td>– 15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Luis Obispo</td>
<td>– 8%</td>
<td>– 15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monterey Bay</td>
<td>– 5%</td>
<td>– 15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tahoe</td>
<td>– 5%</td>
<td>– 15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>– 15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shasta</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>– 15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butte</td>
<td>+ 1%</td>
<td>– 15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Challenges of SB 743

4. Reducing & mitigating for VMT impacts requires **new solutions**

VMT-Reducing Transportation Strategies: This general guidance is largely at the **project level**, and will require more locally focused study to be an effective mitigation tool. (CAPCOA, 2010)
Challenges of SB 743

5. Local policies on traffic or parking may conflict with the goal to reduce VMT

- Parking standards
- Zoning regulations
- Traffic Impact Guidelines
- Congestion management policies

???
What Agencies Are Doing

1. Project-level approach
   — VMT Only: San Francisco, Caltrans IGR
   — VMT + Other Metrics: Pasadena

2. Programmatic approach
Programmatic Approach for Local Governments to Consider

Objectives:

— *Unified framework* of plans & policies
— *Fair share* of reductions
— *Certainty* in the entitlement process
— *New funding* for transportation
Programmatic Approach for Local Governments to Consider

1. Develop a *Climate Action Plan* that achieves GHG-reduction targets
   — *Complements Regional Transportation Plan / Sustainable Communities Strategy*

2. Set VMT thresholds consistent with GHG plan
   — *Ensures development review is consistent with GHG goals*

3. Consider setting GHG & VMT targets by community
   — *Fair & realistic share of reductions*
   — *Optional but recommended*
Programmatic Approach for Local Governments to Consider

4. Develop land use & transportation plans that achieve CAP targets
   — *Multimodal plans may also include road widening*

5. Perform transportation impact studies (TISs) at the plan level
   — *Can reduce time and cost of project-level TISs*

6. Conduct nexus & fee study to supplement funding
   — *Direct mitigation of VMT impacts under CEQA*
   — *Non-CEQA infrastructure fee program for regional projects & growth*
   — *Goal: Fair-share contributions to GHG & transportation plans*
Programmatic Approach for Local Governments to Consider

7. Update (or eliminate) TIS guidelines
   — Consistent with plan-level TIS (Step 5)
   — Simplifies & adds certainty to development review

8. Perform a programmatic EIR
   — For reduced LOS metrics
   — Collecting money to mitigate direct impacts
   — For future tiering and mitigation phasing
Key Benefits of Programmatic Approach

— Creates a *unified framework* of transportation, land use, & climate plans
  — *Consistent with development policies*

— Assigns each community a *fair share* of reductions

— Adds *certainty* to the entitlement process
  — *Minimizes cost of development review*

— Explores a *new revenue* source for transportation
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