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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
VMT Impact Screening

1. Small Project: the project is estimated to generate or attract fewer than 110 daily vehicle trips.

2. Low VMT Areas: the project is located in a TAZ where VMT generation is 15 percent or more below the applicable land use threshold.
   a) Residential projects – 15 percent or more below the regional home-based VMT per resident.
   b) Office projects – 15 percent or more below the regional home-based work VMT per worker.
VMT Impact Screening

3. Affordable Residential Development: the project consists of 100 percent affordable housing units.

4. Local Serving Retail: the project is anticipated to be local serving (as opposed to regional-serving retail development) and is less than 50,000 square feet (<50 KSF) in size.
VMT Impact Screening Tool

Low VMT Screening - Residential and Office
VMT Impact Screening

- Projects within a Transit Priority Area (TPA)
VMT Impact Screening
Case Studies

VMT Impact Analysis - Screening by Land Use
# Case Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Screening Criteria</th>
<th>Screening Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Small Project</td>
<td>Low VMT Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Study 1 – Stonegate</td>
<td>SFR Units, MFR Units</td>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commercial Park</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Study 2 – Ashlock-Garden Oak Estates</td>
<td>SFR Units, MFR Units Commercial Park</td>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>Fail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Study 3 – Leen</td>
<td>SFR Units</td>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>Pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Study 4 – Estates at Lindo Channel</td>
<td>SFR Units</td>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>Pass</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

N/A = Not Applicable.

(1) A small local park may qualify as local serving and have the same beneficial VMT effects presumed for local serving retail.
CEQA Guidelines Section 15364

Feasible means capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, legal, social, and technological factors.
What is Feasible Mitigation?

- Two types of VMT reduction strategies
  - Built-environment changes
  - Transportation demand management (TDM)
- Limitations
  - Is changing the project or transportation network feasible?
  - Will TDM be effective given dependence on building tenant performance?
What is Feasible Mitigation?

Butte County - Community Strategies
1. Pedestrian network improvements
2. Bicycle/traffic calming network improvements
3. Increase transit frequency
4. Car-Sharing
5. School Pools
Mitigation Decisions - Feasibility

What is Feasible Mitigation?

Butte County – Project Strategies

1. Land use diversity
2. Ride-sharing programs
3. End of trip bicycle facilities
4. Subsidized transit passes
5. Telecommute and alternative work schedules
6. Employer marketing of commute alternatives
7. Employer-sponsored vanpools/shuttles
8. Parking management
Mitigation Decisions
- Project vs Program

VMT Mitigation Effectiveness

- Impact Fee Program
- VMT Mitigation Bank
- VMT Mitigation Exchange
## Mitigation Program Comparison

### Table 1: VMT Mitigation Program Type Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Type</th>
<th>Pros</th>
<th>Cons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact Fee Program</td>
<td>• Common and accepted practice</td>
<td>• Time consuming and expensive to develop and maintain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Accepted for CEQA mitigation</td>
<td>• Requires clear nexus between CIP projects and VMT reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Adds certainty to development costs</td>
<td>• Increases mitigation costs for developers because it increases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Allows for regional scale mitigation projects</td>
<td>feasible mitigation options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Increases potential VMT reduction compared to project site mitigation only</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation Exchange</td>
<td>• Limited complexity</td>
<td>• Requires additionality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Reduced nexus obligation</td>
<td>• Potential for mismatch between mitigation need (project site) and mitigation project location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Expands mitigation to include costs for programs, operations, and maintenance</td>
<td>• Increases mitigation costs for developers because it increases feasible mitigation options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Allows for regional scale mitigation projects</td>
<td>• Unknown timeframe for mitigation life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Allows for mitigation projects to be in other jurisdictions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Increases potential VMT reduction compared to project site mitigation only</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation Bank</td>
<td>• Adds certainty to development costs</td>
<td>• Requires additionality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Allows for regional scale projects</td>
<td>• Time consuming and expensive to develop and maintain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Allows for mitigation projects to be in other jurisdictions</td>
<td>• Requires strong nexus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Allows regional or state transfers</td>
<td>• Political difficulty distributing mitigation dollars/projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Expands mitigation options to include costs for programs, operations, and maintenance</td>
<td>• Increases mitigation costs for developers because it increases feasible mitigation options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Increases potential VMT reduction compared to project site mitigation only</td>
<td>• Unknown timeframe for mitigation life</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Plan/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
What’s Next?

- Final Document Package
- Screening Tool

- BCAG Board Meeting
- Lead Agency Decisions
Questions and Answers