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Fehr & Peers

BCAG
Project Work Plan

- SB 743 Overview and Local Plan Review
- VMT Methodology and Metric Form
- VMT Thresholds
  - Case studies
- VMT Mitigation
- VMT Screening Tool
Project Schedule and Input Opportunities

- 7 Months from Dec 2020 – Jun 2021
- 3 Stakeholder Meetings
  - Jan 28 (Overview)
  - Mar 25 (Methodology and Thresholds)
  - Apr 22 (Mitigation and Screening)
- BCAG Board Acceptance – Jun 24
Legal and Technical Factors

Methodology Decisions

- VMT Methodology
  - Model
  - Metric
  - Screening
Model choices

- California Statewide Travel Demand Model (CSTDM)

- BCAG TDM
  - http://www.bcag.org/Planning/Transportation-Forecasting/index.html
Metric Choices

- Partial vs total VMT
  - Auto vs truck
  - Select trip purposes
- Efficiency VMT metrics
- Full accounting of trip lengths
Metric recommendations

Total VMT

Total VMT Generated by a Project

Total VMT per Service Population
Metric recommendations

Technical Factors

Home-based VMT per resident

Home-based VMT per employee
VMT Threshold Options

CEQA Guidelines

(b) Criteria for Analyzing Transportation Impacts.

(1) Land Use Projects. Vehicle miles traveled exceeding an applicable threshold of significance may indicate a significant impact. Generally, projects within one-half mile of either an existing major transit stop or a stop along an existing high quality transit corridor should be presumed to cause a less than significant transportation impact. Projects that decrease vehicle miles traveled in the project area compared to existing conditions should be presumed to have a less than significant transportation impact.
VMT Threshold Options

OPR Technical Advisory

those thresholds is supported by substantial evidence.” (CEQA Guidelines, § 15064.7, subd. (c).) Based on OPR’s extensive review of the applicable research, and in light of an assessment by the California Air Resources Board quantifying the need for VMT reduction in order to meet the State’s long-term climate goals, OPR recommends that a per capita or per employee VMT that is fifteen percent below that of existing development may be a reasonable threshold.

Interfere with State VMT/GHG Reduction Goals

16.4.2 Criteria for Determining Significance

For the purposes of this EIR, SACOG has determined that adoption and/or implementation of the proposed MTP/SCS would result in significant impacts under CEQA, if any of the following would occur:

TRN-1 Substantially interfere with achievement of VMT reductions consistent with CARB’s 2017 Scoping Plan.
VMT Threshold Recommendations

- Land use projects
  - Residential
  - Office
  - Retail
  - Other?
- Land use plans
- Transportation projects
VMT Threshold Recommendations

Baseline VMT – Citywide or Regional Average

-15% OPR (cars only)
-14.3% ARB (cars and trucks)
-16.8% ARB (cars only)


Sources: Provided in SB 743 Overview and Thresholds Technical Memorandums
Planned VMT Growth in Butte Co.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BCAG Region</th>
<th>Biggs</th>
<th>Chico</th>
<th>Gridley</th>
<th>Oroville</th>
<th>Paradise</th>
<th>Uninc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2018</strong></td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2020</strong></td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2040</strong></td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Decisions and Evidence

15% below 2020 regional average
VMT Impact Screening

- Not currently applicable in Butte County
Screening Decisions
- Low VMT Areas
VMT Impact Screening

Figure 1: California Total Projected Population Growth and VMT Growth

The Connection Between VMT and GHG emissions

California CO2 and VMT per Capita Trends

California CO2 and VMT per Capita Trends

The Connection Between VMT and GHG emissions

Source: http://auditor.ca.gov/reports/2020-114/summary.html
What’s Next?

- Technical Memorandums
  - Case Studies
  - Policy Recommendations
- Final Document Package
- Screening Tool

- Stakeholder Meetings
  - #3 – Mitigation and Screening
- BCAG Board Meeting
- Lead Agency Decisions
Case Studies

- Typical Land Uses
  - Residential
  - Retail
  - Office
  - Mixed-Use

- Unique Land Uses
  - Hospital
  - Hotel
  - Entertainment

- Scope includes 4 case studies
- Prefer to use past projects
Policy Recommendations

- Use of General Plan EIRs to provide CEQA streamlining
  - Section 15183 Exemption
    - VMT reduction addressed in general plan
    - VMT analysis is project level and so is mitigation
Questions and Answers