


# Quantifying Greenhouse Gas Mitigation Measures

A Resource for Local Government  
 to Assess Emission Reductions from  
 Greenhouse Gas Mitigation Measures



August, 2010



# **Quantifying Greenhouse Gas Mitigation Measures**

**A Resource for Local Government to Assess  
Emission Reductions from Greenhouse Gas  
Mitigation Measures**

August, 2010

California Air Pollution Control Officers  
Association

with

Northeast States for  
Coordinated Air Use Management

National Association of  
Clean Air Agencies

Environ

Fehr & Peers

# Acknowledgements

*This Report benefited from the hard work and creative insights of many people. CAPCOA appreciates the efforts of all who contributed their time and energy to the project. In particular, the Association thanks the following individuals:*

## ***Principal Author***

Barbara Lee, NSCAPCD

## ***Project Coordination***

Jill Whynot, SCAQMD

## ***Project Oversight Panel***

Larry Allen, SLOAPCD  
Aeron Arlin-Genet, SLOAPCD  
Dan Barber, SJVAPCD  
Jeane Berry, SMAQMD  
Elaine Chang, SCAQMD  
Yusho Chang, PCAQMD  
Joseph Hurley, SMAQMD  
Aaron Katzenstein SCAQMD  
Barbara Lee, NSCAPCD (Chair)  
Paul Miller, NESCAUM

Ian Peterson, BAAQMD  
Tim Taylor, SMAQMD  
Tom Thompson, PCAQMD  
David Vintze, BAAQMD  
Barry Wallerstein, SCAQMD  
David Warner, SJVAPCD  
Jill Whynot, SCAQMD (Vice Chair)  
Abby Young, BAAQMD  
Mel Zeldin, CAPCOA  
Yifang Zhu, SCAQMD

## ***External Reviewers***

Martha Brook, CEC

Pete Parkinson, County of Sonoma    Bill Loudon, DKS Associates

## ***Editing, Proofing & Layout***

Fernando Berton, CAPCOA  
Jessica DePrimo, NSCAPCD

Arlene Farol, SCAQMD

## ***Technical Analysis & Discussion of Methods***

Shari Libicki, Environ  
David Kim, Environ  
Jennifer Schulte, Environ

Jerry Walters, Fehr & Peers  
Meghan Mitman, Fehr & Peers  
Tien-Tien Chan, Fehr & Peers

## Disclaimer

*The California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA) has prepared this report on quantifying greenhouse gas emissions from select mitigation strategies to provide a common platform of information and tools to support local governments.*

*This paper is intended as a resource, not a guidance document. It is not intended, and should not be interpreted, to dictate the manner in which a city or county chooses to address greenhouse gas emissions in the context of projects it reviews, or in the preparation of its General Plan.*

*This paper has been prepared at a time when California law and regulation, as well as accepted practice regarding how climate change should be addressed in government programs, is undergoing change. There is pending litigation that may have bearing on these decisions, as well as active legislation at the federal level. In the face of this uncertainty, local governments are working to understand the new expectations, and how best to meet them. This paper is provided as a resource to local policy and decision makers to enable them to make the best decisions they can during this period of uncertainty.*

*Finally, in order to provide context for the quantification methodologies it describes, this report reviews requirements, discusses policy options, and highlights methods, tools, and resources available; these reviews and discussions are not intended to provide legal advice and should not be construed as such. Questions of legal interpretation, or requests for legal advice, should be directed to the jurisdiction's counsel.*



## Table of Contents

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>Executive Summary</b> .....  | <b>1</b>  |
| <b>Chapter 1: Introduction</b> .....  | <b>3</b>  |
| Background .....  | 3         |
| Intent and Audience .....   | 4         |
| Using the Document.....   | 4         |
| <b>Chapter 2: The Purpose of Quantifying Mitigation Measures</b> .....            | <b>7</b>  |
| Quantification Framework .....  | 7         |
| Quantifying Measures for Different Purposes.....                                  | 8         |
| Voluntary Reductions .....  | 8         |
| Reductions to Mitigate Current or Future Impacts.....                             | 9         |
| Reductions for Regulatory Compliance .....  | 17        |
| Reductions for Credit .....   | 20        |
| <b>Chapter 3: Quantification Concepts</b> .....                                   | <b>25</b> |
| Baseline .....  | 25        |
| Business-as-Usual Scenario .....  | 26        |
| Mitigation Measure Types .....  | 27        |
| Mitigation Measure or Project Scope .....   | 29        |
| Lifecycle Analysis.....   | 29        |
| Accuracy and Reliability .....  | 31        |
| Additionality .....   | 32        |
| Verification .....  | 32        |
| <b>Chapter 4: Quantification Approaches &amp; Methods</b> .....                   | <b>33</b> |
| General Emission Quantification Approach.....                                     | 33        |
| Quantification of Baseline Emissions .....  | 35        |
| Quantification of Emission Reductions for Mitigation Measures.....                | 35        |
| Quantification Methods .....  | 37        |
| Limitations to Quantification of Emission Reductions for Mitigation Measures..... | 38        |
| <b>Chapter 5: Discussion of Select Quantified Measures</b> .....                  | <b>43</b> |
| Building Energy Use.....  | 43        |
| Outdoor Water Use .....   | 44        |
| Indoor Water Use .....  | 45        |
| Municipal Solid Waste.....  | 45        |
| Public Area and Traffic Signal Lighting .....                                     | 46        |
| Vegetation (including Trees) .....  | 46        |
| Construction Equipment.....   | 47        |
| Transportation .....  | 47        |
| On-site Energy Generation.....  | 48        |
| Miscellaneous .....   | 48        |

|  |               |
|--|---------------|
| <b>Chapter 6: Understanding and Using the Fact Sheets .....</b>                | <b>51</b>     |
| Mitigation Strategies and Fact Sheets.....                                     | 51            |
| Grouping of Strategies .....   | 56            |
| Rules for Combining Strategies or Measures.....                                | 56            |
| Range of Effectiveness of Mitigation Measures .....                            | 63            |
| Applicability of Quantification Fact Sheets Outside of California .....        | 75            |
| How to Use a Fact Sheet to Quantify a Project.....                             | 76            |
| <br><b>Chapter 7: Quantification Fact Sheets for Individual Measures .....</b> | <br><b>81</b> |
| Introduction .....   | 81            |
| Index of Fact Sheets and Cross References (Table 7-1) .....                    | 82            |
| Measures   |               |
| Energy .....   | 85            |
| Transportation.....  | 155           |
| Water .....  | 332           |
| Landscaping Equipment.....   | 384           |
| Solid Waste.....   | 392           |
| Vegetation.....  | 402           |
| Construction.....  | 410           |
| Miscellaneous .....  | 433           |
| General Plans .....  | 444           |

## **Appendices**

- A. Glossary of Terms
- B. Calculation Methods for Unmitigated Emissions
- C. Transportation Methods
- D. Building Quantification Methods
- E. Select Data Tables

This report on *Quantifying Greenhouse Gas Mitigation Measures: A Resource for Local Government to Assess Emission Reductions from Greenhouse Gas Mitigation Measures* was prepared by the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association with the Northeast States for Coordinated Air Use Management and the National Association of Clean Air Agencies, and with technical support from Environ and Fehr & Peers. It is primarily focused on the quantification of project-level mitigation of greenhouse gas emissions associated with land use, transportation, energy use, and other related project areas. The mitigation measures quantified in the Report generally correspond to measures previously discussed in CAPCOA's earlier reports: *CEQA and Climate Change*; and *Model Policies for Greenhouse Gases in General Plans*. The Report does not provide policy guidance or advocate any policy position related to greenhouse gas emission reduction.

The Report provides a discussion of background information on programs and other circumstances in which quantification of greenhouse gas emissions is important. This includes voluntary emission reduction efforts, project-level emission reduction efforts, reductions for regulatory compliance, and reductions for some form of credit. The information provided covers basic terms and concepts and again, does not endorse or provide guidance on any policy position.

Certain key concepts for quantification are covered in greater depth. These include baseline, business-as-usual, types of emission reductions, project scope, lifecycle analysis, accuracy and reliability, additionality, and verification.

In order to provide transparency and to enhance the understanding of underlying strengths and weaknesses, the Report includes a detailed explanation of the approaches and methods used in developing the quantification of the mitigation measures. There is a summary of baseline methods (which are discussed in greater detail in Appendix B) as well as a discussion of methods for the measures. This includes the selection process for the measures, the development of the quantification approaches, and limitations in the data used to derive the quantification.

The mitigation measures were broken into categories, and an overview is provided for each category. The overview discusses specific considerations in quantifying emissions for measures in the category, as well as project-specific data the user will need to provide. Where appropriate and where data are readily available, the user is directed to relevant data sources. In addition, some tables and other information are included in the appendices.

The mitigation measures are presented in Fact Sheets. An overview of the Fact Sheets is provided which outlines their organization and describes the layout of information. The Report also includes a step-by-step guide to using a Fact Sheet to quantify a project, and discusses the use of Fact Sheets outside of California. The Report also discusses the grouping of the measures, and outlines procedures and limitations for

quantifying projects where measures are combined either within or across categories. These limitations are critical to ensure that emission reductions are appropriately quantified and are not double counted. As a general guide, approximate ranges of effectiveness are provided for each of the measures, and this is presented in tables at the end of Chapter 6. These ranges are for reference only and should not be used in lieu of the actual Fact Sheets; they do not provide accurate quantification on a project-specific basis.

The Fact Sheets themselves are presented in Chapter 7, which includes an index of the Fact Sheets and cross references each measure to measures described in CAPCOA's earlier reports: *CEQA and Climate Change*; and *Model Policies for Greenhouse Gases in General Plans*. Each Fact Sheet includes a description of the measure, assumptions and limitations in the quantification, a baseline methodology, and the quantification of the measure itself. There is also a sample project calculation, and a discussion of the data and studies used in the development of the quantification.

In the Appendices, there is a glossary of terms. The baseline methodology is fully explained, and there is additional supporting information for the transportation methods and the non-transportation methods. Finally, the Report includes select reference tables that the user may consult for select project-specific factors that are called for in some of the Fact Sheets.

## Background

The California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA) prepared the report, *Quantifying Greenhouse Gas Mitigation Measures: A Resource for Local Government to Assess Emission Reductions from Greenhouse Gas Mitigation Measures* (Quantification Report, or Report), in collaboration with the Northeast States for Coordinated Air Use Management (NESCAUM) and the National Association of Clean Air Agencies (NACAA), and with contract support from Environ, and Fehr & Peers, who performed the technical analysis. The Report provides methods for quantifying emission reductions from a specified list of mitigation measures, primarily focused on project-level mitigation. The emissions calculations include greenhouse gases (GHGs), particulate matter (PM), carbon monoxide (CO), oxides of nitrogen (NO<sub>x</sub>), sulfur dioxide (SO<sub>2</sub>), and reactive organic gases (ROG), as well as toxic air pollutants, where information is available.

The measures included in this Report were selected because they are frequently considered as mitigation for GHG impacts, and standardized methods for quantifying emissions from these projects were not previously available. Measures were screened on the basis of the feasibility of quantifying the emissions, the availability of robust and meaningful data upon which to base the quantification, and whether the measures (alone or in combination with other measures) would result in appreciable reductions in GHG emissions. CAPCOA does not mean to suggest that other measures should not be considered, or that they might not be effective or quantifiable; on the contrary, there are many options and approaches to mitigate emissions of GHGs. CAPCOA sought to provide a high quality quantification tool to local governments with the broadest applicability possible, given the resource limitations for the project. CAPCOA encourages local governments to be bold and creative as they approach the challenge of climate change, and does not intend this Report to limit the scope of measures considered for mitigation.

The majority of the measures in the Report have been discussed in CAPCOA's previous resource documents: *CEQA and Climate Change*, and *Model Policies for Greenhouse Gases in General Plans*. The measures in this Report are cross-referenced to those prior reports. The quantification methods provided here are largely project-level in nature; they can certainly inform planning decisions, however a complete planning-level analysis of mitigation strategies will entail additional quantification.

In developing the quantification methods, CAPCOA and its contractors conducted an extensive literature review. The goal of the Report was to provide accurate and reliable quantification methods that can be used throughout California and adapted for use outside of the state as well.

## **Intent and Audience**

This document is intended to further support the efforts of local governments to address the impacts of GHG emissions in their environmental review of projects and in their planning efforts. Project proponents and others interested in quantifying mitigation measures will also find the document useful.

The guidance provided in this Report specifically addresses appropriate procedures for applying quantification methods to achieve accurate and reliable results. The Report includes background information on programs and concepts associated with the quantification of GHG emissions. The Report does not provide policy guidance on any of these issues, nor does it dictate how any jurisdiction should address questions of policy. Policy considerations are left to individual agencies and their governing boards. Rather, this Report is intended to support the creation of a standardized approach to quantifying mitigation measures, to allow emission reductions and measure effectiveness to be considered and compared on a common basis.

Because the quantification methods in this Report were developed to meet the highest standards for accuracy and reliability, CAPCOA believes they will be generally accepted for most quantification purposes. The decision to accept any quantification method rests with the reviewing agency, however. Further, while the Report discusses the quantification of GHG emissions for a variety of purposes, including the quantification of reductions for credit, using these methods does not guarantee that credit will be awarded.

## **Using the Document**

Chapters 2 and 3 of this Report discuss programs and concepts associated with GHG quantification. They are intended to provide background information for those interested in the context in which reductions are being made. Chapter 4 discusses the underpinnings of the quantification methods and specifically addresses limitations in the data used as well as limitations in applying the methods; it is important for anyone using this Report to review Chapter 4. Chapter 5 provides an overview of the mitigation measure categories, including key considerations in the quantification of emission reductions in those categories. Chapter 6 explains how to use the fact sheets for each measure's quantification method, and also discusses the effectiveness of the measures and how combining measures changes the effectiveness.

Once the user understands the quantification context, and the limitations of the methods, the fact sheets can be used like recipes in a cookbook. In using the fact sheets, however, CAPCOA strongly advises the reader to pay careful attention to the assumptions and limitations set forth for each individual measure, and to make sure that these are respected and appropriately considered.

The fact sheets with the actual quantification methods for each individual measure are contained in Chapter 7. The baseline methods are explained in Appendix B. It is the responsibility of the user to ensure that all data inputs are provided as called for in the methods, and that the data are of appropriate quality.

CAPCOA will not be able to provide case-by-case review or adjustments for specific projects outside of the provision for project-specific data inputs that is part of each fact sheet. Questions about individual projects may be referred to your local air district.

As a final note, the methods contained in this document include generalized information about the measures themselves. This information includes emission factors, usage rates, and other data from various sources, most commonly published data from public agencies. The data were carefully reviewed to ensure they represent the best information available for this purpose. The use of generalized information allows the quantification methods to be used across a range of circumstances, including variations in geographical location, climate, and population density, among others.

Where good quality, project-specific data is available that provides a superior characterization of a particular project, it should be used instead of the more generalized data presented here. The methods provided for baseline and mitigated emissions scenarios allow for such substitution. The local agency reviewing the project should review the project-specific data, however, to ensure that it meets standards for data quality and will not result in an inappropriate under- or overestimation of project emissions or mitigation.

(page intentionally left blank)

## Quantification Framework

The Quantification Report has been prepared to support a range of quantification needs. It is based on the premise that quantification of GHG emissions and reductions should rest on a foundation of clear assumptions, limits, and calculations. When these elements and the methods of applying them are transparent, a common “language” is created that allows us to talk about, compare, and evaluate GHGs with confidence that we are looking at “apples to apples.”

For the purpose of this report, GHGs are the six gases identified in the Kyoto Protocol: carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>), nitrous oxide (N<sub>2</sub>O), methane (CH<sub>4</sub>), hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs), perfluorocarbons (PFCs), and sulfur hexafluoride (SF<sub>6</sub>). GHGs are expressed in metric tons (MT) of CO<sub>2</sub>e (carbon dioxide equivalents). Individual GHGs are converted to CO<sub>2</sub>e by multiplying values by their global warming potential (GWP). Global warming potentials represent a ratio of a gas’ heat trapping characteristics compared to CO<sub>2</sub>, which has a global warming potential of 1.

As a general rule, the quantification methods in this report are only accurate to the degree that the project adheres to the assumptions, limitations, and other criteria specified for a given measure. Where specific data inputs are indicated for either the baseline or the project scenario calculations, those data must be provided for the calculations to be valid. Further, the quality of the data used will substantially impact the quality of the results achieved. For example, if a calculation method calls for a traffic count, the calculations can’t be made without supplying a traffic count number. However, the number used could be a rough estimate, could be based on a small, one-time sample, or could be derived through a full traffic study over a representative period of time or times. Clearly, using a rough estimate for any of the data inputs will yield results that are less accurate than they would be if higher quality data inputs were provided.

This does not mean that rough estimates cannot be used. There will be times when the quantification does not need to be precise. In order to speak the common language, however, it is important to identify how precise your data inputs are. It is also important to give careful consideration to the intended use of the quantification, to make sure that the results you achieve will be sufficiently rigorous to support the conclusions you draw from them.

The quantification methods in this report rely on very specific assumptions and limitations for each mitigation measure. Unlike the discussion of data inputs, the measure assumptions and limits affect more than the precision of the calculations: they determine whether the calculation is valid at all. For example, there is a method for calculating GHG reductions for each percentage in improvement in building energy use beyond the performance standards in California’s Title 24; that method states that the measure is specifically for electricity and natural gas use in residential and commercial

buildings subject to Title 24. If the building is located outside of California, where Title 24 is not applicable, the method will not yield accurate results unless the baseline assumptions are adjusted to reflect the standards that actually apply. Further, the measure effectiveness is based on assumptions that certain other energy efficiency measures are also applied (such as third-party HVAC-commissioning); if those additional measures are not applied, the calculated reductions will not be accurate and will overestimate the reductions compared to what will actually be achieved.

There may be situations where you choose to apply a method even if the assumptions do not match the specific conditions of the project; while CAPCOA does not recommend this, if you do it, it is imperative that any deviations are clearly identified. While you may still be able to calculate a reduction for your measure, in many cases the error in your result will be so large that any conclusions you would draw from the analysis could be completely wrong.

### **Quantifying Measures for Different Purposes**

There are several reasons that a person might implement measures to reduce GHG emissions. Some measures are implemented simply because it's a good thing to do. Knowing how many metric tons of GHG emissions were reduced might not be important in that case. There are other reasons for undertaking a project to reduce GHGs, however, and for some of these purposes quantification (and verification) become increasingly important, and sensitive. This chapter discusses the role of quantification, and to a lesser extent verification, in reductions undertaken for a range of reasons. These include: voluntary reductions, reductions undertaken specifically to mitigate current or future impacts, reductions for regulatory compliance, and reductions where some form of credit is being sought, including credits that may be traded on a credit exchange. The purpose for which reductions are quantified will determine the level of detail involved in the quantification, as well as the degree of verification needed to support the quantification. As stated previously, this discussion is provided for information purposes only; it should not be construed to advocate or endorse any particular policy position.

### **Voluntary Reductions**

Voluntary reductions of GHG emissions are reductions that are not required for any reason, including a regulation, law, or other form of standard. Even when reductions are not mandatory, however, there may be reasons to quantify them. The project proponent may simply want to know how effective the project is. Examples of this would be when a project is undertaken in an educational setting, or to demonstrate the general feasibility of a concept, or promote an image of environmental responsibility. In such a case, the focus may be on implementing the project more than documenting exactly how many tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e have been reduced,



and a reasonable estimate might be sufficient. The project proponent may wish to track reductions to fulfill an organizational policy or commitment, or to establish a track record in GHG reductions. For these purposes, the quantification does not need to be precise, but it should still be based on sound principles and accepted methods.

When reductions are purely voluntary, they may be estimated using the methods contained in this document, even if all of the variables are not known, or if some of the assumptions are not fully supported by the specifics of the project. If the quantification is performed without the level of detail outlined in the method for a given measure (or specified for the baseline calculations), the results will be less accurate. The same is true if a method is used in a situation where the assumptions are not fully supported, or if the method is used outside the noted limitations. As one would expect, the greater the degree of variation from the conditions put forth in the fact sheets, the less accurate the quantification will be.



Significant deviation can result in very large errors.

If there is any possibility that the project proponent may at some point wish to use the reductions to fulfill a future regulatory or mitigation requirement, or seek some form of credit for the reductions, the proponent should not deviate from the methods and should ensure that all necessary data are included, and all assumptions and limitations are appropriately addressed. Acceptance of the quantification methods in this Report to fulfill any requirement is solely at the discretion of the approving agency. Use of these methods does not guarantee that credit of any kind will be awarded for reductions made.

## Reductions to Mitigate Current or Future Impacts


One of the most common reasons for quantifying emissions of GHG is to analyze and mitigate current or future impacts of specific actions or activities. This can include project-level impacts, such as those evaluated under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), or plan-level impacts, such those resulting from the implementation of a General Plan or Climate Action Plan. Quantification of projects and mitigation under CEQA was the main focus in preparing this guidance document. Most of the measures quantified in the Report are project-level in nature. Many of these are also good examples of the kinds of policies and actions that would be included in a General Plan or a Climate Action Plan. The quantification methods provided here can be used to support conclusions about the effectiveness of different measures in a planning context; however, a full analysis of plan-level impacts will require consideration of additional factors, depending on the nature of the measure. Some of the measures have been specifically identified as General Plan measures, and a discussion is included about appropriate analysis of these measures, where study data exist to support such analysis.

**Project-Level Mitigation:** Existing environmental law and policy requires that environmental impacts of projects be evaluated and disclosed to the public, and where those impacts are potentially significant, that they be mitigated. At the federal level, the National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA) governs this evaluation. Many states have their own programs as well; in California, the California Environmental Quality Act, or CEQA, sets forth the requirements and the framework for the review.

The responsibility to evaluate impacts, to determine significance, and to define appropriate mitigation rests with the Lead Agency. This is typically a city or county with land-use decision-making authority, although other agencies can be Lead Agencies, depending on the nature of the project and the jurisdiction of the agency.

Guidance on CEQA and Climate Change: There are currently two resources for Lead Agencies on incorporating considerations of climate change into their CEQA processes. The first was prepared by CAPCOA, and the most recent is an amendment to the official CEQA Guidelines prepared by the California Natural Resources Agency (Resources Agency).

CAPCOA Guidance- In January of 2008, CAPCOA released a resource document, “CEQA and Climate Change: Evaluating and Addressing Greenhouse Gas Emissions from Projects Subject to the California Environmental Quality Act,” that discussed different approaches to determining whether GHG emissions from projects are significant under CEQA. It reviewed the models and other tools available at that time for conducting GHG analyses, and the document also contained a list of mitigation measures. A copy of the report is available at <http://www.capcoa.org>.



Resources Agency Guidance- Since the release of that report, the California Natural Resources Agency (Resources Agency) finalized its guidance on GHG emissions and CEQA in December of 2009. Under Senate Bill 97 (Chapter 148, Statutes of 2007), the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research (OPR) was required to prepare amendments to the state’s CEQA Guidelines addressing analysis and mitigation of the potential effects of GHG emissions in CEQA documents. The legislation required the Resources Agency to adopt the amended Guidelines by 2010.

The CEQA Guidelines Amendments adopted by the Resources Agency made material changes to 14 sections of the Guidelines. The changes include dealing with the determination of significance (principally in Public Resource Code Section 15064) and cumulative impacts, as well as areas such as the consultation process for the draft EIR, the statement of overriding considerations, the environmental setting, mitigation measures, and tiering and streamlining. Overall, the discussion of determining significance in



these amendments is consistent with the earlier report released by CAPCOA.

In the Final Statement of Reasons (SOR) for the adoption of the amendments to the CEQA Guidelines, the Resources Agency makes two points that are important with regard to quantification of GHG emissions from projects. First, it states that the Guidelines “appropriately focus on a project’s potential incremental contribution of GHGs” and that the amendments “expressly incorporate the fair argument standard.”<sup>1</sup> This sets the parameters for the analysis to be performed. The Resources Agency further states that the analysis for GHGs must be consistent with existing CEQA principles, which includes standards for the substantial evidence needed to support findings.

Second, the Final SOR specifically states that the amendments “interpret and make specific statutory CEQA provisions and case law ... determining the significance of GHG emissions that may result from proposed projects.”<sup>2</sup> In this context, they cite specific case law as well as CEQA Guidelines Section 15144 that require a lead agency to “meaningfully attempt to quantify the Project’s potential impacts on GHG emissions and determine their significance.”<sup>3</sup>

Complete copies of the 2009 CEQA Guidelines Amendments and the Final Statement of Reasons may be downloaded at: <http://ceres.ca.gov/ceqa/docs/>.

Quantification of Projects: Project level quantification, especially as it pertains to CEQA, was CAPCOA’s main focus in developing this Report. The baseline conditions and quantification methods were selected to be consistent with the implementation of AB 32, as well as the Scoping Plan developed by ARB. The list of mitigation measures selected for the Report reflects the types of strategies that local governments and project proponents have shown interest in, and sought direction on quantifying. For the most part, they entail clearly delineated boundary conditions, and have been designed to be applicable across a range of circumstances.

This Quantification Report does not provide any policy guidance on what amount of GHG emissions would be significant. The determination of significance, including any thresholds, is the exclusive purview of the Lead Agency and its policy board. CAPCOA’s Quantification Report provides methods to quantify emissions from specific types of mitigation projects or measures. It is based on a careful review of existing studies and determinations to develop rigorous quantification methods that meet the substantial evidence requirements of CEQA.

A project proponent or reviewer who wishes to use these methods to quantify emissions for the purpose of complying with CEQA must adhere to the assumptions and limitations

---

<sup>1</sup> California Natural Resources Agency: “Final Statement of Reasons for Regulatory Action: Amendments to the State CEQA Guidelines Addressing and Analysis and Mitigation of Greenhouse Gas Emissions Pursuant to SB 97,” December, 2009; p 12.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid: p. 18.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid: p. 18.

specified in the methods for each project type. If these assumptions and limitations are not followed, the quantification will not be valid. Ultimately, the Lead Agency will have the responsibility to review and decide whether to allow any requests for deviations from the method, and to determine whether those deviations have a substantive impact on the results. Lead Agencies may contact their local air district for assistance in making such a review, but CAPCOA will not be in a position to provide any case-by-case review of changes to the quantification methods in this report.


As stated previously, where good quality, project-specific data are available, they should be substituted for the more generalized data used in the baseline and mitigation emissions calculations. The quality of the data inputs can significantly affect the accuracy and reliability of the results. When quantification is performed for CEQA compliance, CAPCOA recommends that project-specific data be as robust as possible. We discourage the use of approximations or unsubstantiated numbers. In any case, CAPCOA strongly recommends that the source(s) and/or basis of all project-specific data supplied by the project proponent be clearly identified in the analysis, and the limitations of the data be discussed.

**Plan-Level Mitigation:** Cities and counties, as well as other entities, develop environmental planning documents. The most common are General Plans, which specify the blueprint for land-use, transportation, housing, growth, and resource management for cities, counties, and regions. These plans are periodically updated, and in recent updates, the California Attorney General has put jurisdictions on notice that their plans must consider climate change.

A stand-alone plan that considers climate change is a Climate Action Plan. Climate Action Plans can be developed for a school or company, for a city, county, region, or larger jurisdiction. A Climate Action Plan will typically identify a reduction target or commitment, and then set forth the complement of goals, policies, measures, and ordinances that will achieve the target. These policies and other strategies will typically include measures in transportation, land use, energy conservation, water conservation, and other elements.

Guidance on Planning and Climate Change: CAPCOA prepared a guidance document on GHGs and General Plans for local governments. There are also several important processes under way that will have a significant impact on the planning process in the coming years. These include the early implementation of Senate Bill 375 (Steinberg, Statutes of 2008); the development of new General Plan Guidelines; and statewide planning for adaptation to the impacts of climate change. They are described below.


CAPCOA Guidance for General Plans- In June of 2009, CAPCOA released “*Model Policies for Greenhouse Gases in General Plans: A Resource for Local Government to Incorporate General Plan Policies to Reduce Emissions of Greenhouse Gases.*” This document embodied a menu of GHG mitigation measures that could



be included in a General Plan or a Climate Action Plan. It was structured around the elements of a General Plan, provided model language that could be taken and dropped into a plan, and also provided a worksheet for evaluating which measures to use. The CAPCOA Model Policies document focused on strategies to reduce GHG emissions; it did not address climate change adaptation, which is an important, but separate consideration.

Senate Bill 375- Senate Bill 375 is considered a landmark piece of legislation that aligns regional land use, transportation, housing, and greenhouse gas reduction planning efforts. The bill requires the ARB to set greenhouse gas emission reduction targets for light trucks and passenger vehicles for 2020 and 2035. The 18 Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) are responsible for preparing Sustainable Communities Strategies and, if needed, Alternative Planning Strategies (APS), that will include a region's respective strategy for meeting the established targets. An APS is an alternative strategy that must show how the region would, if implemented, meet the target if the SCS does not.

To develop the targets, SB 375 called for a Regional Targets Advisory Committee (RTAC), which included representatives from the MPOs, cities and counties, air districts, elected officials, the business community, nongovernmental organizations, and



experts in land use and transportation. The RTAC provided recommendations on the targets to ARB in a formal report in September, 2009. The report covers a range of important considerations in target setting and implementation. Target setting topics include: the use of empirical data and modeling; key underlying assumptions; best management practices; the base year, the metric, targets for 2020 and 2035; and both statewide and regional factors affecting transportation patterns. For implementation, the report considers housing and social equity issues; local government challenges in meeting the targets; funding and other support at the state and federal level;

and a variety of other important considerations. A complete copy of the report may be downloaded at: <http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/sb375/rtac/report/092909/finalreport.pdf>.

ARB staff released draft regional targets for 2020 for the four largest MPOs in June, 2010, along with placeholder targets for 2035. Placeholder targets were also issued for both 2020 and 2035 for MPOs in the San Joaquin Valley. An alternative approach to target setting was proposed for the remaining MPOs. As required by SB 375, ARB expects to formally adopt the final targets before the end of September, 2010.

Additional information about the target setting process can be found at: <http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/sb375/sb375.htm>.

For the four largest MPOs, the draft 2020 targets are expressed as a percent reduction in emissions based on the potential reductions from land use and transportation planning scenarios provided by the MPOs, with a proposed range for the targets

between 5% and 10%<sup>4</sup>. This reduction excludes the expected emission reductions from Pavley GHG vehicle standards and low carbon fuel standard measures. Each of the four regions has its own placeholder targets for 2035, shown in Table 2-1, below.

| <b>Table 2-1: Draft Regional Targets for 2035</b>     |                            |
|---|----------------------------|
| Regional MPO  | Draft GHG Reduction Target |
| Metropolitan Planning Commission (MTC)                | 3-12%                      |
| Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG)        | 13-17%                     |
| San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG)         | 5-19%                      |
| Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) | 3-12%                      |


Source: ARB: “Draft Regional Greenhouse Gas Emission Reduction Targets For Automobiles and Light Trucks Pursuant to Senate Bill 375” page 4.

The placeholder targets for the MPOs in the San Joaquin Valley range from 1-7% for both 2020 and 2035. Placeholder targets were provided in lieu of draft targets to allow the MPOs to provide additional information for ARB to consider before finalizing the targets. For the remaining six MPOs, ARB proposes to use the most current per-capita GHG emissions data, adjusted for the impacts of the recession, as the basis for setting individual regional targets in those areas.

In addition to serving on the RTAC, local districts will support the MPOs as they develop their strategies to meet their regional targets, and local cities and counties as they incorporate sustainable strategies into their own planning efforts. Two of the contractors who developed the quantification methods in this Quantification Report also served on the RTAC, and every effort has been made to ensure that work here will ultimately be compatible with, and useful in, the implementation of SB 375.

General Plan Guidelines- The Governor’s Office of Planning and Research (OPR) provides technical assistance on land use planning and CEQA matters to local governments. In this effort, OPR is required to adopt and periodically revise advisory guidelines to assist local governments in the preparation of local general plans. Commonly referred to as the General Plan Guidelines, the most current edition was released in 2003.

In the 2003 edition, OPR included an overview of the General Plan statutory requirements, a review of CEQA’s role in the general plan process, implementation techniques, and the General Plan’s relationship to other statutory planning requirements. The 2003 Guidelines do not specifically address GHG emissions or climate change.




<sup>4</sup> ARB: “Draft Regional Greenhouse Gas Emission Reduction Targets For Automobiles and Light Trucks Pursuant to Senate Bill 375,” June, 2010; page 4.

It is important to note that the General Plan Guidelines are advisory, not mandatory. Nevertheless, it is the state's only official document explaining California's legal requirements for general plans. The General Plan Guidelines are continually shaped to reflect current trends, changes in applicable laws, and incorporate additional statutory requirements. This includes anticipated effects from AB 32 and SB 375.

An update to the 2003 General Plan Guidelines has been in development and includes a Climate Change Supplement. This update is expected to be finalized by the end of 2010.

**Adaptation-** Adaptation has not received the same attention that has been given to steps that might prevent or mitigate the extent of climate change, however it is a topic that should not be ignored in General Plans. The overwhelming body of scientific studies point to a certain amount of change in our climate that is inevitable, even if we are aggressive and diligent in our efforts to prevent it. Many regions of the state (indeed, the nation) are projected to see substantial impacts on agriculture, climate dependant business (such as recreation and tourism), infrastructure, and habitat. Coastal areas will see a rise in sea level, currently projected to be between one and three meters by 2100. Wild fires are expected to increase in number, size, and severity. Stresses on the environment, combined with extreme weather events, are projected to increase the incidence and severity of a number of infectious diseases and other medical conditions. These and myriad other changes pose tremendous risks to people and our way of life.

For that reason, in December, 2009, a team of California state agencies released a report: "The 2009 Climate Adaptation Strategy." In it, the team states that 2.5 trillion dollars' worth of infrastructure in California is at risk from the various projected climate-related changes in our environment. The estimated cost of addressing the impacts on that infrastructure is about \$3.9 billion, annually.<sup>5</sup> The report identifies a number of



steps to be taken in the near term to appropriately plan for and address this threat. Highlights of the actions include: the formation of a Climate Adaptation Advisory Panel; new approaches to water management; revised land-use planning to avoid construction in highly vulnerable areas; evaluation of all state infrastructure projects to avoid exacerbating threats to infrastructure; and, more specific planning by emergency response agencies, public health agencies, and others to fortify existing communities and resources, and prepare for future stressors. For more information, the full report may be

downloaded at: <http://www.energy.ca.gov/2009publications/CNRA-1000-2009-027/CNRA-1000-2009-027-F.PDF>.

**Quantification for Planning Purposes:** Quantification of the impacts of measures for planning purposes is a different exercise than quantification for a specific project. By its

<sup>5</sup> California Natural Resources Agency: "2009 Climate Adaptation Strategy" Dec. 2009; p. 5.

very nature, planning involves a future set of conditions about which less is known, and indeed knowable. The art and science of planning depend upon the interpretation of present conditions and trends, and the application of that interpretation to create a picture of future conditions. This document does not address detailed planning analysis in a comprehensive manner.

The majority of the measures described and quantified here are project-level measures; only a few are plan-level measures by design. That said, many of the project level measures are good examples of the implementation of planning-level policies that were described in the CAPCOA Model Policies report. The quantification of these measures will provide important and useful information for the planner to use in the context of quantifying anticipated effects in broader planning efforts.

In a planning context, it is especially important to be mindful of the interactions of different measures. A more detailed explanation is provided in Chapter 6, but the main concern is that certain measures do interact with each other, and their effects are not independent. This means that some measures will have little effect on their own, but in combination with other measures may have significant effect. The classic example of this is the bus shelter. A clean, well-lit, and comfortable bus shelter can enhance ridership on the buses stopping at that shelter and therefore reduce vehicle trips; but without the underlying bus service, the shelter itself does not reduce vehicle trips.

There are also instances where a measure is less effective in combination with other measures than it might be by itself. There are several reasons why this can occur. In some cases this happens because of a diminishing return for consecutive efforts. For example, there may be six good methods to increase ridership on a public transit line, any one of which might increase transit ridership by 20%. But implementing all of them will not necessarily increase ridership by 120%. In fact, for each successive method applied, it is likely that a lesser effect will be observed. Another example is where the measures are in some sense competing, as in a campaign to increase ridership on a commuter rail line at the same time that a new public transit bus line is established with overlapping service areas. Although the ridership campaign might be expected to cause 5% of drivers to switch to rail, some of those potential new riders might use the new bus service instead, making the ridership campaign less effective. At the same time, the new bus line might also be expected to reduce vehicle trips by 5%, but the actual reduction may be lower in reality if some of the ridership comes from those who would have been rail passengers and not from driving. Together, the ridership campaign for the rail line and the new bus line may only reduce vehicle trips by 7%, not the 10% predicted from the estimates of their independent effectiveness.<sup>6</sup>

These effects become more pronounced when considered in a city-wide, county-wide, or regional context. The interplay of land use decisions and transportation infrastructure development will be better assessed with more integrated computer modeling efforts. The quantification of some of the strategies at the individual, project level will provide

---

<sup>6</sup> Please note that the effectiveness estimates provided here are only for the purposes of illustration and should not be taken as actual quantification of such measures.

insight into how useful and appropriate the strategies will be in the planning effort, however. More detailed discussion of how to quantify combinations of measures is provided in Chapter 6.

## Reductions for Regulatory Compliance

There are three basic types of regulations for which emissions quantification is likely to be required: command-and-control regulations, permitting, and participation in a cap-and-trade program. A discussion of each is provided for information purposes, as is a discussion of quantification for mandatory emissions reporting regulations. The quantification methods in this document are intended primarily for use in project-level mitigation. Regulatory programs are likely to have specific requirements for monitoring, reporting, and quantification, which may or may not allow the use of the methods in this Report.

**Command and Control Regulations:** Some local air districts have command-and-control regulations for GHGs already on the books. These include limitations on the use of certain chemicals that are active in the atmosphere, performance requirements for landfill gas collection, and for systems that use GHGs with high Global Warming Potential, as well as efficiency standards for specific equipment or processes. Under the umbrella of the Scoping Plan, the ARB is also developing command-and-control regulations for a number of source categories. Regulations already adopted include standards for various GHGs that have a high global warming potential, such as sulfur hexafluoride ( $\text{SF}_6$ ) used in the electricity sector, semiconductors, and other operations; perfluorocarbons in semiconductor manufacturing; certain refrigerants; and materials used in consumer products. There are also GHG emission limits on light-duty vehicles, rules for port drayage trucks and other heavy-duty vehicles, as well as landfill methane control requirements, and the Low Carbon Fuel Standard. Additional rulemaking is currently underway.



For these types of regulations, compliance may not rest upon quantification of emissions or emissions reductions. In many cases, installation of a specific technology, substitution of materials, or implementation of inspection and maintenance programs meets the requirements of the rule, and is presumed to have a certain effectiveness in reducing emissions from a baseline level. When a focused regulation does require quantification of emissions, it will generally specify a method for testing emissions, where appropriate, or for calculating emissions from other measured parameters.

A related, but more flexible type of regulation for emission reductions is an overall emissions cap for facilities or operations. Under this approach, sometimes referred to as a “bubble,” the regulation calls for an overall reduction in emissions from a specified baseline, but the operator has the discretion to decide how to achieve those reductions. This is different from a cap-and-trade program (see below), in that there is no trading

between facilities, or purchasing of credits to offset obligations. Because energy efficiency and other conservation projects are a likely strategy to meet a facility-wide GHG emission reduction requirement, the quantification of measures in this Report may be useful for compliance with such a cap. Of course, the caveats about assumptions and data inputs are also important here. Further, demonstration of compliance with this kind of limit will also involve verification of the emissions reductions, and is likely to include ongoing compliance tracking.

The regional targets of SB 375 are a type of emissions cap. It is important to note that the quantification presented in this Report may ultimately be useful in demonstrating reductions towards those targets. Although much of the work of implementing SB 375 will involve extensive land use and transportation modeling, the project level quantification in this Report may allow cities and counties to track their contribution towards their region's goal.

**Permitting Programs:** In addition to land-use permitting (discussed under “Project-level Mitigation” above), there may be requirements for operations to have permits to emit GHGs because GHGs are air pollutants. Federal air permitting requirements for stationary sources will become effective on January 1, 2011 (and will apply to applications that have not been acted upon prior to that date), under several federal permit programs, including Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) and Title V. These programs are implemented by the local air districts. Applicability of these programs is based on annual potential to emit GHGs, with thresholds initially set between 75,000 and 100,000 tons per year, depending on the program, and decreasing over time, with final thresholds for smaller sources of GHG to be determined by a future federal rulemaking.

Because these permit programs are threshold-driven, quantification of emissions is an important element of compliance. At present, there is no specific federal guidance on quantifying GHG emissions pursuant to these programs, other than general guidelines for quantifying emissions of other regulated pollutants. This Quantification Report does not specifically address stationary source emissions, however some of the methods may be useful for certain elements of these programs, such as energy efficiency, water efficiency, and other associated measures of carbon use by a facility. The local air district with jurisdiction will be able to provide guidance on calculating emissions for a specific project, both for applicability and for compliance.


In addition, most permits require some form of verification, and ongoing demonstration on compliance. These obligations will be established as part of the permit.

**Cap-and-Trade:** A cap-and-trade program is a specific type of emissions trading program. Emissions trading in general is discussed in the next section. A brief explanation of cap-and-trade programs is provided below as background information for interested readers. It is not necessary to understand cap and trade programs, or emissions trading in general, in order to use the quantification methods in this report.

Further, these quantification methods were not developed specifically for the purposes of complying with cap and trade requirements, or for emissions trading more generally.

A cap-and-trade regulation establishes “allowances” for carbon emissions, expressed as CO<sub>2</sub> equivalents, usually in tons, or metric tons. An emitter of carbon must hold enough allowances to cover the amount of carbon it actually emits. Allowances are obtained on a carbon exchange, or market. In some cases they may be allocated by the government to emitters. There is a “cap” placed on the amount of allowances available in the market, and the cap declines over time. Carbon emitters must either reduce their emissions or purchase allowances from someone else; this is the “trade” part of the program. In this way, the program should cause carbon to be reduced wherever the reduction costs are lowest. The ARB is developing a cap-and-trade program which they currently expect will be considered for Board approval before the end of 2010. Information about the developing ARB program can be obtained from the conceptual drafts released by staff.

Legislation is also pending at the federal level that would establish cap-and-trade on a national scale, but the ultimate scope and content of the program is still unknown. The most recent ARB draft proposal may be downloaded at: <http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/capandtrade/capandtrade.htm>.



From ARB materials for AB 32 Program Design Technical Stakeholder Working Group Meeting, April 25, 2008, Figure 1, page 3



Although compliance with a cap-and-trade program is not likely to be a reason for quantifying GHG reductions today, it is likely to be one in the future. When that time comes, there will be several important considerations in deciding whether to use this Quantification Report in meeting those obligations.

**Mandatory Reporting:** The ARB currently has a Mandatory Reporting Rule for specified stationary sources with GHG emissions greater than 25,000 metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e per year. This rule was established pursuant to the requirements of AB 32, and was intended to provide information to support the development of the Scoping Plan and its implementing regulations. At the time the Mandatory Reporting Rule was approved by the ARB Board, staff indicated that the Rule was not intended, nor did it include the level of detail necessary, to implement the cap-and-trade program (which, at that time, was not yet proposed). Applicable quantification protocols will be developed and approved by the ARB Board as part of its cap-and-trade regulation, as will a revised Mandatory Reporting Rule. More information about the ARB’s Mandatory Reporting Rule may be obtained at <http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/reporting/ghg-rep/ghg-rep.htm>.

The U.S. EPA also has a Mandatory Reporting Rule. Under this rule, suppliers of fossil fuels or greenhouse gases that are used in industrial operations, manufacturers of vehicles and engines, and facilities that emit 25,000 metric tons or more per year of GHG emissions are required to submit annual reports to EPA. The EPA rule does not currently specify quantification methods, and CAPCOA anticipates that any methods in this Report that would be applicable to affected reporters (e.g., building energy use) would be also be acceptable for use under the rule. Details on this rule can be found in 40 CFR Part 98, which was published in the Federal Register ([www.regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov)) on October 30, 2009 under Docket ID No. EPA-HQ-OAR-2008-0508-2278.

### Reductions for Credit


There are several different ways to formally award credit for emission reductions. Emission reduction credits are used when the opportunity, desire, obligation, and the resources to implement reductions are not aligned. Sometimes an entity has the desire and opportunity to reduce emissions, but not the resources. Sometimes an entity is required to make reductions but has no viable project opportunities. Or funds may be available to implement project, but willing participants are needed. Systems are used to match up projects, proponents, funding, and, in some cases, compliance obligations, and the basis of the systems is emission reduction credits.

**Concurrent Offsite Mitigation Projects:** The simplest form of credit for emission reductions occurs when someone needs to reduce emissions to mitigate impacts (for example, under CEQA), but does not have a good opportunity within his or her own operation or project; but if a good opportunity is available at another operation the person who needs the reductions can fund that project in exchange for being able to take credit for the reduction. A variant of this can occur when a list of emission reduction projects that could be used for mitigation is maintained, and those projects are matched with people who need to implement mitigation. The key in this arrangement is that the project is directly funded by the person who needs mitigation, at whatever the cost the mitigation project ultimately has. The emission reductions occur, but are not traded as an independent commodity. The person who needs the mitigation remains obligated to ensure that the project is implemented and the emission reductions occur.

**Mitigation Funds:** Instead of matching the person needing mitigation with a project that is then directly funded by that person, it is also possible to collect the funding and then create the projects. In this case, funds are paid into a mitigation fund at a pre-established rate, and the operator of the fund is then obligated to find and implement emission reduction projects. The rate is typically set at a level (for example in dollars per ton needed) that is sufficient to implement an actual project to produce the emission reductions, based on data about actual project costs. As with concurrent offsite mitigation projects, the emission reductions here are not traded as an independent commodity, however a default rate is established. Under a mitigation fund, then, the person needing mitigation is considered to have provided it (that is, given “credit” for the reductions) at the point of paying into the mitigation fund. The obligation to ensure the emission reductions occur is transferred to the fund operator.

**Emissions Trading:** Emissions trading is a transaction that occurs between entities that make emission reductions which they don't need, and entities that desire emissions reductions but, for whatever reason, do not choose to make them. The emissions (or, more accurately, "credits" for the emission reductions) are treated as a commodity with independent value. The transaction occurs in some form of market, such as

transactions occur between the grower of produce and the consumer in a local farmers market. The transaction, or trade, happens when a consumer believes that the product is worth the price being asked for it.



The obligation to ensure the emission reductions occur generally rests with the person selling the credits, and (to the extent an independent review has occurred) with whomever grants certification to the reduction project.

As explained above, a cap-and-trade program is a type of GHG trading market, but there are other types of emissions trading markets. An open GHG credit-based trading market does not have a cap, and participation is on a voluntary basis. In a credit-based market, credits are awarded for emission reductions, and may be purchased and sold as a commodity on an exchange. The credits are sometimes referred to as offsets, and they are generally tracked as tons, or metric tons, of pollutant reduced; in the case of GHGs, this is typically in the form of CO<sub>2</sub>e. The important distinction between an open market and a cap-and-trade system is that the creation, buying, and selling of offsets is not restricted in an open market.

The following key terms and concepts are discussed to help the interested reader understand how credits are used in a trading market. It is not necessary to understand trading markets in order to use the quantification methods in this report, and the reader may proceed directly to Chapter 3.

**Regulators and Exchanges:** Some emissions trading markets are run by the government, while others are operated by independent, non-governmental entities. In government-run markets, such as the Regional Clean Air Incentives Market (RECLAIM) developed and administered by the South Coast Air Quality Management District, and U.S. EPA's Acid Rain program, a government agency establishes and implements the trading market. These markets are typically regulatory in nature, rather than voluntary, although some voluntary participation may be allowed. The Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative (RGGI) implemented by ten Northeast and Mid-Atlantic states, and the

European Union Emission Trading Scheme (EU ETS) are other examples of regulatory markets.

Independent exchanges, such as the California Climate Action Registry (CCAR) and the Climate Registry (TCR), were established as independent, non-governmental operations. They offer a forum for entities to have emission reductions certified for credit, and for those credits to be bought and sold. These bodies develop their own structure and rules for participation. The nature of those rules determines the quality of the credits available on the exchange. Participation in the exchange is voluntary.

Standards for Credits: In order to be acceptable for credit under the AB 32 program, GHG emission reductions must be real, permanent, quantifiable, verifiable, enforceable, and additional. Historically, the federal Clean Air Act (CAA, or Act) has required emission reduction credits to be: real, permanent, quantifiable, enforceable, and surplus<sup>7</sup>. In this context, surplus means the reductions are not required by any law, regulation, permit condition, or other enforceable mechanism under the Act. California continued this concept in AB 32, requiring that any regulation adopted pursuant to AB 32 ensure that GHG reductions are “real, permanent, quantifiable, verifiable, and enforceable.”<sup>8</sup>

The term “additional” comes from the Clean Development Mechanism in the Kyoto Protocol; it is essentially the same as “surplus” except that it is not restricted to any particular statute, and means that you cannot receive credit for any reductions that you were otherwise obligated to make. AB 32 requires its implementing regulations that include market-based compliance mechanisms to ensure that reductions are “in addition to any greenhouse gas emission reduction otherwise required by law or regulation, and any other greenhouse gas emission reduction that might otherwise occur.”<sup>9</sup>

Protocols: Transactions to purchase emission reductions depend on the confidence the purchaser has in the value of reductions being purchased. Price is part of the concept of value that we can easily understand. The other, less tangible part of the concept of value is the quality of the emission reductions themselves. This is harder to understand because, unlike the produce at the farmer’s market, we can’t examine the product to determine its value. Not only are emission reductions invisible, they actually *didn’t happen*. So to have confidence in their value, we need a reliable and accurate picture of what *would have happened*, as well as what *actually happened*.

Protocols are the formalized procedures for accounting for credits that ensure the credits are an accurate and reliable representation of emission reductions that actually occurred. Some protocols focus only on quantification of the reductions, while others also address documentation and verification. They can be developed and adopted by regulatory bodies, by the operators of exchanges, or by subject area experts. Some markets will require participants to use a specific protocol or set of protocols. Others

<sup>7</sup> 40 CFR Sections 51.493 and 51.852

<sup>8</sup> California HS&C: Section 35862(d)(1)

<sup>9</sup> Ibid, Section 35862(d)(2)

will allow participants to propose a protocol for developing and quantifying reductions. Failure to follow required protocols may prevent the project from receiving credit.

Holding and Using Credits: When credits are awarded for emission reduction projects, the owner of the credits is generally given a certificate of value. In this case, “value” means the corresponding emission reductions, not the price, which is determined by the market. The credits are registered with a bank where they are kept until the owner of the credits uses or sells them.

*Credit Banks:* Emission credit banks are similar to savings banks where money is deposited. The bank tracks credits, credit value, credit price, and transactions. It compiles data and issues reports. Banks are subject to accounting standards and requirements for transparency. It is important to note that not all credits can be banked. Credits or allowances that have a finite life do not retain their value beyond their life term.

*Credit Life:* Credits may have a specified life (for example, one year), or they may be permanent. The life of the credit may be dictated either by the nature of the reductions that generated it, or by the program in which it is being used. As discussed above, in California, AB 32 requires reductions for regulatory compliance to be permanent. In other markets, such as Kyoto’s Clean Development Mechanism, there are both long term and short term credits.

*Discounting Credit Value:* Some regulatory structures require that credits be discounted, that is, the emission reduction value of the credit (not the price) is reduced to account for certain factors, or to enhance the liquidity of the market. In some cases, a portion of the credit value is surrendered or retired in the interest of environmental policy goals.

*Offset Ratios:* Offset ratios are a way to ensure an adequate margin of safety when credits are provided to offset impacts. A program may require that the amount of credits provided is greater than the anticipated emissions increases. If the program requires 10% extra credits, then the offset ratio is said to be “1.1 to 1.”


The above discussion of emission reduction credits and trading is provided for information only, and should not be construed as endorsement of, or recommendation for, the use of credits or trading for the purposes of meeting GHG reduction obligations. CAPCOA does not make policy recommendations regarding credits or trading in this Report. Decisions about whether to allow the use of credits rests solely with the agency with jurisdiction over a project or program.

(page intentionally left blank)

This chapter provides an overview of some key concepts that arise in considering quantification of GHG emission reduction projects. This discussion is provided so the reader understands the context in which these terms are used throughout this document. Here again, this discussion is not intended to endorse any policy position, nor does it provide any recommendations on thresholds of significance for GHG emissions. Policy decisions are left to individual agencies and their governing boards.

## Baseline

An emissions baseline is the foundation of any estimate of the impacts of a project or of a mitigation measure. In its simplest form, it reflects the current level of emissions if those emissions do not vary. Usually, however, emissions do vary, typically because the activities or operations that cause the emissions change. Traffic patterns change with the time of day, ski areas are busiest in the winter, air conditioners run more in the summer, people drive less when fuel prices rise, and production of goods changes with the economy. To set a baseline, it is important to understand what factors affect the activity or operation in a way that will alter its emissions; then, the most appropriate scenario is selected and the emissions are adjusted to account for that scenario. Figure 3-1: Baseline illustrates the concept of baselines in project analysis.



Regulatory programs that require calculation of emissions baselines generally specify the basis for the calculation. For example, a baseline scenario could be a three year average of actual emissions, or the worst case, or, as in CEQA, the program may call for an analysis to identify a representative set of conditions based on historical data.

In its proposed draft regulation for cap-and-trade, ARB defines baseline to mean “the scenario that reflects a conservative estimate of the business-as-usual performance or activities for the relevant type of activity or practice such that the baseline provides an adequate margin of safety to reasonably calculate the amount of GHG reductions in reference to such baseline.”<sup>1</sup>

For this Quantification Report, CAPCOA selected a baseline period to correspond to the average GHG emissions from 2002 to 2004, inclusive. This is the emissions baseline period used by ARB in its Scoping Plan<sup>2</sup>. The baseline conditions used to quantify the

<sup>1</sup> ARB: “Preliminary Draft Regulation for a California Cap-and-Trade Program,” Section 95802 (a)(2), Dec., 2009; page 5.

<sup>2</sup> ARB: “Climate Change Scoping Plan: a framework for change,” Dec., 2008; page 11.

effectiveness of mitigation measures for this Quantification Report reflect the conditions that formed the basis for ARB’s 2007 inventory of economic activity and GHG emissions. Those conditions and the associated quantification methods are explained in Appendix B to this Report. A copy of ARB’s Scoping Plan may be downloaded at: <http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/scopingplan/document/scopingplandocument.htm>.


There may be circumstances in which a different set of baseline conditions is more appropriate. If a user wishes to adjust the baseline, CAPCOA recommends using the methods provided in the measure Fact Sheet, and in Appendix B, but substituting data inputs that better reflect the baseline conditions for the project under consideration. This ensures consistent methods are used so the comparison of baseline to project is an “apples-to-apples” comparison. So, for example, a user outside of California would substitute an emission factor for electricity generation that better represents the generation mix that is provided in the user’s region. This alternative factor would be used in the baseline methods where electricity generation is part of the calculation, and would also be used in the quantification of emissions associated with the project.

It may also be appropriate to adjust the baseline conditions on a temporal basis if needed to account for changes over time. The ARB revises its emissions inventory information on a periodic basis. The most current inventory information was published in May of 2010, and covers the time period from 2000 to 2008. The information is available by category, with trends analysis, and with full documentation of data sources and methods. The updated emissions inventory information is available at: <http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/inventory/data/data.htm>.

### Business-as-Usual Scenario

Not all baseline conditions occur in the present. In some cases, the baseline is a forecast of the conditions that are expected to exist at some time in the future, in the absence of interventions to change those future conditions. The forecasted baseline conditions are referred to as “business-as-usual” and are intended to reflect normal operation. For example, a town might currently have 20,000 residents, and be on a course to to add another 5,000 residents in

low-density, planned development at the perimeter of its existing footprint over the next 10 years. The town could add an urban growth boundary that would change that anticipated development. In order to quantify the effect of adding the urban growth boundary, the business-as-usual growth scenario must first be calculated; that will form



the baseline to compare to the growth scenario with the adopted boundary. Figure 3-2 illustrates the application of the “business-as-usual” concept to a project.

ARB defines business-as-usual to mean, “the normal course of business or activities for an entity or a project before the imposition of greenhouse gas emission reduction requirements or incentives.”<sup>3</sup>

## Mitigation Types

There are four general ways to create emission reductions for mitigation projects: (1) the operation or activity can be avoided so that emissions are not created in the first place; (2) the operation or activity can be changed so that it creates fewer emissions; (3) emission control technology can be added to the activity or operation that prevents the release of emissions that are created; and (4) emissions that have been released can be sequestered in the environment. Each of these is discussed below.

**Avoided Emissions:** When someone chooses to walk to the grocery store in lieu of driving, or turn off the lights, energy isn’t needed to power the car or lights, and the emissions associated with that energy don’t occur. In the case of walking instead of driving, the avoided emissions include the CO<sub>2</sub> and other pollutants that would have come from the tailpipe of the car. These are “direct” emissions that are being avoided, and they can be readily quantified to show the benefit associated with walking. When electricity isn’t needed, it isn’t generated; the avoided emissions are the CO<sub>2</sub> and other pollutants that are not emitted by the power plant. Because the emissions are not directly emitted where the light is being used, this type of emissions are referred to as “indirect” emissions; even though they are indirect, they can still be quantified to show the benefit of turning off the



lights. There can be other benefits associated with avoided emissions as well. When you consider the walking scenario in a lifecycle sense, the avoided emissions can also include the energy that would have been used to extract, refine, transport, and dispense the fuel. The same is true when you use a reusable cloth bag instead of a disposable plastic bag to carry your purchases; energy is needed to extract and refine the petroleum that goes into the bag, to make and transport the bag, and then to dispose of the bag after it is used. These kinds of avoided emissions are much more difficult to fully quantify, however, and will not be included in the quantification approaches in this document. Even if we aren’t quantifying the benefits, however, it is important to understand that avoided emissions can have positive effects both upstream and downstream, creating a ripple effect of further avoided emissions.

<sup>3</sup> ARB: “Preliminary Draft Regulation for a California Cap-and-Trade Program,” Section 95802 (a)(18), Dec., 2009; page 7.

**Fewer Created Emissions:** If the activity or operation can't be avoided, sometimes it can be accomplished in a way that creates fewer emissions. This is usually associated with increased efficiency. So, for example, if walking to the store isn't an option, someone could choose to drive there in a more efficient vehicle, like a gas-electric hybrid powered car. The engine in the hybrid is able to drive more miles with less fuel consumed. Less fuel consumed equates to fewer emissions at the tailpipe. In the lighting example, using a more efficient light bulb is one way to reduce the indirect emissions, but a more efficient power plant would also do this.



**Controlled Emissions:** Once emissions are created, they are either released to the environment, or they are controlled with technology that captures and stores or destroys them. In the car example, the addition of a catalytic converter allows the tailpipe emissions to be collected after they are created, and destroyed before they are released. Note that the efficiency of the engine (discussed above), and the control of emissions after they leave it, are two distinct ways to reduce emissions. There are also emissions control technologies for power plants.



**Sequestration of Emissions:** Carbon emissions are “sequestered” by embedding the carbon in structure that will hold the emissions and keep them out of the atmosphere. Sequestration happens through biological, chemical, or physical processes.

**Biological Sequestration:** Trees and other vegetation biologically absorb carbon from the atmosphere and incorporate it into their biomass; the carbon becomes the solid form of the growing tree or plant. Many sequestration projects involve the planting of trees or vegetation to improve the uptake of carbon from the atmosphere. Enhanced farming practices may also achieve some sequestration through the use of CO<sub>2</sub> absorbing cover crops, improved grazing practices, and restoration of depleted land. Increased peat production in peat bogs is also method to biologically sequester carbon.



**Chemical Sequestration:** Oceans absorb CO<sub>2</sub>, and it causes the oceans to become more acidic (which is detrimental to coral reefs and other sea life). Other chemical processes include reacting CO<sub>2</sub> through a process called mineral carbonation to form stable carbonate minerals that are normally found in the earth's crust.

**Physical Sequestration:** CO<sub>2</sub> can also be physically contained in a way that prevents its release to the atmosphere. This can involve injecting it deep into the ground, for example into depleted oil and gas reservoirs. It can also be injected into oil wells to push up the oil. Another approach is to embed it in cement through a newly developed process that causes cement to absorb CO<sub>2</sub> from the atmosphere while it is curing.

## Measure or Project Scope

Just as good quantification requires careful and transparent consideration of the baseline or business-as-usual scenario, it also requires a complete and detailed characterization of the measure or project being undertaken. This is important because considerations of what is included in, and what is excluded from, the analysis can have a significant impact on results of the quantification.

Determining the appropriate scope for the analysis of a project or measure is not always as simple as it might appear. Take for example the installation of solar panels in a remote desert region that receives a lot of sun. The panels generate electricity without releasing GHG emissions, which offset more traditional generation of electricity that does emit GHGs. But the desert region may be prone to dust or sand storms, which would quickly obscure the glass panels and decrease their effectiveness. This decrease could be minimized if the panels were cleaned regularly. But the cleaning will require vehicles to come to the site, which takes energy and releases GHGs, and the cleaning activity itself may do so as well. If the site is truly remote, the emissions from those vehicle trips could be large. But what if there is another installation nearby: can the trip-related emissions be considered only in addition to those for the other site? Do you have to know if the cleaning for both sites can be accomplished in one trip? And what about the energy and materials needed to make the solar panels?


The methods in this Report generally include those reductions over which a project proponent can exercise direct control, as well as indirect emissions associated with electrical generation and the use of natural gas. CAPCOA does not include analysis of full lifecycle emissions in this Report, because of the complexity of the analysis involved and the lack of general standards for incorporating such considerations.

## Lifecycle Analysis

Energy and materials are involved in the creation, processing, transport, and disposal of all of the products we use, from the tomatoes on our salads, to the computers we work with, the vehicles we drive (even if they are zero-emission vehicles), and the roadways we travel over. A lifecycle analysis attempts to identify and quantify the GHG emissions associated the energy and materials used at all stages of the product's life, from the gathering of raw materials, through the growing or fabrication, distribution, use, and the ultimate disposal at the end of the product's useful life.

This is a difficult and complicated undertaking; it is challenging to identify all of the inputs that are both necessary and meaningful for this sort of analysis. Even if the inputs can be identified, good data are not readily available to quantify emissions in most cases. Further, there is not yet agreement on methodological approaches to lifecycle analysis for most sectors (Figure 3-3: Lifecycle Analysis shows a basic schematic of some of these considerations.). For these reasons, as stated under the discussion of scope, above, CAPCOA does not include lifecycle analysis in this Report.

Figure 3-3: Lifecycle Analysis



Unfortunately, there are important mitigation projects or measures that cannot be quantified without a lifecycle analysis, and some of them are measures that are highly desirable or commonly encouraged. One example is the recycling and reuse of construction materials; it is intuitively obvious that recycling and reuse avoids both the embedded energy costs in the new material, as well as the energy and emissions associated with disposal. Another example is the push for reusable cloth grocery bags instead of disposable plastic ones, or reusable water bottles filled with tap water instead of disposable bottled water. For some of these measures, it is possible to do a limited lifecycle analysis, if the project scope is well defined and if the data are available. The Report provides a discussion of how to pursue an analysis in such cases, but otherwise identifies these kinds of measures as Best Management Practices.

It is important to note that Appendix F to the CEQA Guidelines Amendments approved in December of 2009 specifically state that a lead agency is not required to perform a project-level energy life-cycle analysis<sup>4</sup>. Because direct GHG emissions from electrical generation, and GHG emissions from electricity associated with water use (as well as other direct emissions associated with water treatment) are well defined and can be

<sup>4</sup> California Natural Resources Agency: Adopted Text of the CEQA Guidelines Amendments (Adopted December 30, 2009, Effective March 18, 2010), Appendix F.

accurately quantified, they are not considered to “lifecycle emissions” for the purposes of this Report, and they are included in these quantification methods.

### Accuracy and Reliability

In an effort to standardize the creation of GHG inventories, and improve the quality of the information, the IPCC defines “good practice” for GHG emissions quantifications as those that “contain neither over- nor under-estimates so far as can be judged, and in which uncertainties are reduced as far as practicable.”<sup>5</sup>

Part of the challenge in developing methods that meet this standard of good practice is assuring the accuracy of the methods. CAPCOA uses accuracy to mean the closeness of the agreement between the result of a measurement or calculation, and the true value, or a generally accepted reference value. When a method is accurate, it will, for a particular case, produce a quantification of emissions that is as close to the actual emissions as can practicably be done with information that is reasonably available.

To meet the good practice standard, the quantification methods must also be reliable, which is different from being accurate. A reliable method will yield accurate results across a range of different cases, not only in one particular case.

To some extent, the accuracy of the quantification is sacrificed to achieve reliability. This is because a method that can be applied across a range of scenarios must be generalized to some extent. So, for example, the transportation analyses do not, for the most part, differentiate between peak and off-peak vehicle trips, even though off-peak trips will have a lower emission impact because of the effects of congestion on travel time and engine performance. In order to fully address all of the factors that impact the emissions associated with vehicle trips in a specific project, a far more detailed and costly analysis would be needed, and it would not be readily applied to other situations. The methods contained in this Report have been developed to provide the best balance between accuracy and reliability, bearing in mind that ease of use is also important.

In order to ensure both the accuracy and the reliability of the quantification methods in this Report, each method is accompanied by a discussion of the assumptions and limitations of the method. Where either the assumptions are not met, or the limitations are exceeded, the method will not be accurate, and the error can be very large. Further, if the conditions of the project differ from the assumptions and limitations of the method, the quantification may no longer be applicable. It is possible to look at the underlying assumptions and calculation and make adjustments to the method so that it better reflects the conditions of a specific project. Doing this may preserve the accuracy to some extent, but the user is responsible for determining how best to accomplish this, and the reviewing agency will decide whether the results are still acceptable.

---

<sup>5</sup> IPCC 2006, “2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories,” Prepared by the National Greenhouse Gas Inventories Programme, Eggleston H.S., Buendia L., Miwa K., Ngara T. and Tanabe K. (eds).Published: IGES, Japan. Page 1.6.

## Additionality

In order for a project or measure that reduces emissions to count as mitigation of impacts, the reductions have to be “additional.” Greenhouse gas emission reductions that are otherwise required by law or regulation would appropriately be considered part of the existing baseline. Thus, any resulting emission reduction cannot be construed as appropriate (or additional) for purposes of mitigation under CEQA. For example, in the draft regulation for cap-and-trade, ARB specifies that in order to be eligible for offset credit, “emission reductions must be in addition to any greenhouse gas reduction, avoidance or sequestration otherwise required by law or regulation, or any greenhouse gas reduction, avoidance or sequestration that would otherwise occur.”<sup>6</sup> What this means in practice is that if there is a rule that requires, for example, increased energy efficiency in a new building, the project proponent cannot count that increased efficiency as a mitigation or credit unless the project goes beyond what the rule requires; and in that case, only the efficiency that is in excess of what is required can be counted. It also means that if there is a rule that requires a boiler to be replaced with one that releases fewer smog-forming pollutants, and the new boiler is more efficient and also releases less CO<sub>2</sub>, the reduced CO<sub>2</sub> can’t be counted as mitigation or credit, because the reductions were going to happen anyway. But if the boiler were replaced with a solar-powered water heater, the difference in emissions between a typical new boiler and the solar water heater could be counted.

From a practical standpoint, any reductions that are *not* additional have to be either included in the baseline or subtracted from the project, whichever is more appropriate. In preparing this Report, CAPCOA made determinations about requirements to include in or exclude from the baseline. A more complete discussion of those determinations is included in Appendix B.

## Verification

Verification is the process by which we demonstrate that the emission reductions we have quantified for a project actually occurred. While not important for purely voluntary projects, verification in some form is a necessary step in most other circumstances. Verification is an important component in establishing the value of reductions that are made. It allows others to have confidence in the quality of the reductions. If the reductions are being made to satisfy an obligation to mitigate impacts, the agency with jurisdiction should be consulted to determine what standard of verification is needed. In some cases, independent, third-party verification is required. Not all regulatory programs specify third-party verification, however. For example, the U.S. EPA’s Mandatory Reporting Rule relies instead on routine compliance verification through a permit system.

---

<sup>6</sup> ARB: “Preliminary Draft Regulation for a California Cap-and-Trade Program,” Section 95802 (a)(4), Dec., 2009; page 6.

This chapter of the Report provides an explanation of how the quantification methods were developed, and the limitations of the sources used. There is also an overview of the presentation of the quantification methods in the Report. Finally this section discusses the limitations of the methods themselves, and how these limitations should be considered when applying the methods to actual mitigation projects.

## General Emission Quantification Approach

The emission quantification methods in this Report are designed to provide GHG estimates using readily available, user-specified information for a source or activity. In general, GHG emissions associated with a given source or activity are estimated using data for a physical quantity or metric, on the underlying assumption that CO<sub>2</sub> emissions are directly proportional to that metric. For example, emissions related to vehicles are estimated using vehicle trips and mileage data. For sources of indirect emissions such as buildings, swimming pools, municipal lighting and water distribution, the metric is energy use as electricity or natural gas<sup>1</sup>. When site-specific energy use data are not available, energy use can be estimated using a physical metric such as the volume of water supplied, the size of building, and the number of lamps.

For each source metric there are emission factors that quantify the amount of emissions released as a result of the source or activity. These emission factors have been developed by various governmental agencies, public utilities and other entities through data analysis and numerical models. The factors are based on certain assumptions that define the typical or “baseline” emissions scenario. For example, emission factors for vehicles assume a particular type of fuel and driving speed, and emission factors for electricity use assume a certain mix of electricity generating methods.

Individual GHGs are converted to carbon dioxide equivalent units by multiplying values by their global warming potential (GWP). The GWP values used in this report are based on the IPCC Second Assessment Report (SAR, 1996), even though more recent (and slightly different) GWP values were developed in the IPCC’s Third Assessment Report (TAR, 2001) and Fourth Assessment Report (FAR, 2007). The values in the SAR were used in this Report because they are still used by international convention.

The general equation for emissions quantification is shown below for each GHG:

$$\text{GHG Emissions} = [\text{source metric}] \times [\text{emission factor}] \times [\text{GWP}]$$

Then, all GHGs are summed from an individual source.

$$\text{GHG Emissions}_{\text{total}} = \sum_{n=1}^i [\text{GHG Emissions}]_n$$

<sup>1</sup> Note that emissions from natural gas use are not always indirect in nature. For more discussion of direct and indirect emissions and types of mitigation, please see Chapter 3.

Where “source metric” and “emission factor” are defined as follows:

**Source Metric:** The “source metric” is the unit of measure of the source of the emissions. For example, for transportation sources, the metric is vehicle miles traveled; for building energy use, it is “energy intensity”, that is, the energy demand per square foot of building space. Mitigation measures that involve source reduction are measures that reduce the source metric. This can include for example, reducing the miles traveled by a vehicle because the reduction in miles traveled will reduce the emissions generated from vehicle travel. Similarly, a reduction in dwelling unit electricity use by installing energy efficient appliances and lighting will reduce the emissions associated with total electricity assigned to dwelling units.

Emissions associated with source reduction measures are generally avoided emissions. As discussed in Chapter 3, there are often additional benefits to these kinds of reductions. Source reduction promotes efficient use and management of resources and utilities, in addition to avoiding emissions. Thus, source reduction can also result in a decreased need for downstream emissions control. From a quantification standpoint, for this type of measure, it is the “source metric” in the basic emissions equation (above) that changes.

**Emission Factor:** The “emission factor” is the rate at which emissions are generated per unit of source metric (see above). Reductions in the emission factor happen when fewer emissions are generated per unit of source metric, for example, a decrease in the amount emissions that are released per kilowatt hour, per gallon of water, etc. Such a decrease may apply if a carbon-neutral electricity source (e.g. from photovoltaics) is used in place of grid electricity, which has higher associated emissions; or if electricity is used instead of combustion fuel, such as with electric cars. Reductions can also occur if a fuel with lower GHG emissions is used in the place of one with higher GHG emissions. From a quantification standpoint, for this type of measure, it is the “emission factor” in the equation that changes.

For both kinds of measures, mitigated emissions are calculated using the same general equation, but the emissions will change based on whether the values change for the source metric or the emission factor. Several mitigation measures may apply to the same source, changing both the source metric and the emission factor, and the estimation of the overall impact of simultaneous measures must be carefully evaluated. In some cases the reductions are additive, but in others they must be evaluated sequentially. Other sets of mitigation measures may require additional analysis to avoid double-counting. Furthermore, not all types of mitigation measures will be feasible in all situations. Chapter 6 provides a detailed discussion of considerations in quantifying the combination of mitigation measures, as well as a set of rules to guard against over-estimation of reductions.

## Quantification of Baseline Emissions

In order to ensure that similar assumptions and methodologies are being used to quantify both the baseline and project emissions, a consistent set of methodologies for determining the GHG emission baseline emissions was defined. This was the first step in establishing quantitative methods for assessing GHG mitigation reductions. The results of this effort are contained in Appendix B and should be utilized or considered when establishing baseline emission levels. This same set of methodologies was used to develop the quantification methods for each mitigation measure.

## Quantification of Emission Reductions for Mitigation Measures

There is a wide array of mitigation measures that could reduce direct or indirect GHG emissions for a project; however, not all of them can be readily quantified with the information and tools currently available. Other measures may be individually quantifiable, but the quantification cannot be reliably extrapolated to other similar projects. The goal in developing this Quantification Report was to provide accurate and reliable methods that can be easily applied across a range of projects and settings. This section explains how the list of measures included in this guidance was developed, and how the measures are presented.

**Screening of Mitigation Measures:** An initial list of candidate measures was developed with about 75 types of greenhouse gas mitigation measures related to site design, land use, building components, parking measures, energy, solid waste management, etc. These were identified because they were commonly seen in land use permit applications or were measures that air districts have been frequently asked for guidance on. A literature review was done to identify potential additional measures.

Measures from this compiled list were screened based on the following criteria:

- Relevance to project-level CEQA analysis;
- Availability of empirical evidence or reliable research to credibly establish baselines and level of effectiveness; and
- Non-negligible level of effectiveness determined by credible research.

Measures or grouped measures that did not meet all three of these criteria were evaluated for the possibility of grouping measures with synergistic effects or describing as a Best Management Practice (BMP). Where measures were determined to be BMPs, the Report describes the relevant literature and, where applicable, provides methods that could be used if substantial evidence is available to support the reduction effectiveness. In addition some measures had substantial evidence of reductions when implemented at a general Plan (GP) level rather than a project level. These measures were retained as applicable for General Plans, only. Local Agencies may decide to provide incentives or allocate the General Plan level reductions to specific projects by

weighting the overall effect by the number of projects to which the General Plan reduction would apply.

**Information Sources and Their Limitations:** The quantified effect that different mitigation measures have on source quantities or emission intensities must be based on substantial evidence and should be enforceable (to ensure that the commitments are adhered to) and verifiable (to confirm that the mitigation measures were implemented).

Examples of credible sources for supporting evidence include government agency-sponsored studies, peer-reviewed scientific literature, case studies, government-approved modeling software and widely adopted protocols. In order for the supporting evidence or data for a given mitigation measure to be deemed applicable, it must be based on similar or scalable assumptions and conditions in terms of period of study, physical scale, site-specific parameters, operating conditions, technology, population type, etc.

There are uncertainties associated with any type of estimation method. Some of these methods attempt to predict future behavior with respect to water and energy use using historical data and trends, which may not accurately reflect changes in behavior due to increasing awareness of resource conservation. Despite these uncertainties, the methods presented in Chapter 7 provide the best available estimations of GHG emissions and are therefore suitable for the project-level inventories.

**Enforceable Reductions:** As discussed in Chapter 2, emission reductions (whether as mitigation under CEQA, for regulatory purposes, or for trading) have to be enforceable. For that reason, in this Report the quantity of reductions or applicability of mitigation measures is limited to elements which the project proponent can control. Additional reductions in GHG emissions may be feasible in the broader sense and may occur; however, because the project proponent does not have control over these elements, those other reductions are not considered in the quantification methods here.

For instance, in the context of a building project, source reductions that rely on individual occupant behavior are generally not enforceable by the builder. A residential dwelling, when occupied, will contain a variety of electrical appliances. An individual occupant may decide to purchase energy efficient appliances and would therefore reduce energy use. This reduction in energy use is not enforceable, however, because the project proponent can't dictate individual occupants' purchases; these types of reductions are not counted in the methods in this Report. There may be some instances, however, where the project proponent is the occupant and would have the ability to enforce behavior. In these instances additional emission reductions not quantified in this document may be feasible and enforceable.

Some reductions in emissions are not enforceable when voluntary, but become enforceable when implemented as part of a regulatory scheme. Once regulations that result in emissions reductions are enacted, the project should be reviewed to determine

how the requirements affect the baseline, and the reductions that can be quantified for mitigation credit.

When the emission reductions from a project are not enforceable, and therefore not quantified under these protocols, they may still have value for mitigation purposes and a qualitative analysis should be considered. Decisions about whether such reductions will be considered, and what sort of qualitative analysis is appropriate, are the responsibility of the agency reviewing the project.

***Creation of Mitigation Measure Fact Sheets:*** Once the list of mitigation measures was determined, detailed Fact Sheets were developed for each mitigation measure. Each fact sheet presents a summary of the measure's applicability; the required calculation inputs from the actual project; the baseline emissions method; the mitigation calculation method and associated assumptions; a discussion of the calculation and an example calculation; and finally a summary of the preferred and alternative literature sources for measure efficacy. The fact sheets begin with a measure description. This description includes two critical components: (1) specific language regarding the measure implementation (which should be consistent with the implementation method for the actual project), and (2) a discussion of key support strategies that are assumed to also be in place for the reported range of effectiveness. Chapter 6 provides a discussion of the Fact Sheets and a brief description of their intended use. The Fact Sheets themselves are included in Chapter 7.

## Quantification Methods

In this Report, emissions reductions are presented in terms of percentage reductions. For mitigation measures where the source metric is reduced, reductions were generally assessed based on a ratio comparison of a common "denominator" source metric for each source category in order to assist in the quantification of strategy impacts:

- Building Energy Use will utilize natural gas and electricity use.
- Water will utilize outdoor and indoor water use.
- Solid waste will utilize waste disposed.
- Mobile sources will utilize changes in vehicle miles travelled (VMT).

For mitigation measures involving emission factor reductions, a ratio comparing the mitigated and baseline emissions factor is utilized to quantify the emission reductions.

Because a ratio comparison is utilized, in most cases the reductions quantified for GHGs will also be the same reduction assessed for criteria pollutants and toxic air contaminants provided the reduction in emission factors also occurs for the other types of pollutants. This is not always the case and in some cases a reduction for one pollutant may result in an increase for another pollutant.

There is one exception to the quantitative approach described above, for off-road and on-road vehicles that affects the quantification of the emissions of ROG. The

underlying data and methods available to quantify these emissions were limited to running emissions (that is, emissions from the tailpipe while the engine is running). There are also evaporative emissions, however, which occur when pollutants evaporate from the fuel in the fuel tank and escape to the atmosphere. The evaporative emissions of most pollutants are very small when compared to the running emissions, but evaporative emissions of ROG<sub>s</sub> are not small compared to the running emissions. Because the underlying data and methods available did not address evaporative emissions, they are not part of the emission factor ratio and must be accounted for separately. Accordingly, an estimate of the ratio of running to evaporative emissions for ROG<sub>s</sub> was determined and used to adjust the reductions for ROG<sub>s</sub> from vehicles.

### Limitations to Quantification of Emission Reductions for Mitigation Measures

In order to properly apply the quantification methods in this Report, it is important to understand the limitations of the methods. The following discusses the limitations of the underlying data and methods used to develop the quantification in this Report. A discussion of the limits on applying the methods in the Report is contained in Chapter 6. Further, the Fact Sheet for each individual measure identifies specific limitations and considerations that affect the application of that particular measure.

**Prediction of Future Behavior:** In order to assess the emissions associated with a project that does not yet exist, it is necessary to make assumptions regarding anticipated amounts of energy use, VMT, water use, etc, that will characterize the project once it occurs. These values may be based on estimates of source metrics from surveys of current values for those metrics, or from recent historical values. When such data are used, they are typically assumed to remain constant when applied to the project unless there is a specific action (such as the application of a mitigation measure) that would alter the value(s). Although this is a commonly accepted practice, in reality, current behavior is not likely to remain constant over time in the way it is assumed. For instance, the occupant of a building determines the set point of thermostats, the duration of showers, and the usage of air conditioning, among other things. The project proponent will have little, if any, influence over these choices made by the future occupants.

Understanding the limits of these predictions, they are still the best basis for estimating future behavior. For this Report, quantification was based on current median behavior attributes. The limitations of the predictions can be minimized, however. Information about what influences behavior in specific circumstances is often available. Where data are available to show the relationship between external factors and the source metrics used to quantify a particular measure (such as fuel prices and VMT, for example), and more specific information is available about those external factors to predict future trends, that information could be used to further refine the quantification presented here. Again, the quality of the data used will substantially affect the accuracy and reliability of the results. It is also important to be aware of, and to minimize if possible, the error that can result from combining data from different sources (see below).

**Combination of Data Sources:** The quantification of some of the measures in this Report required the use of multiple sources of data. Any time data are derived from different sources there may be slight discrepancies the underlying in methodologies and data set characteristics; when the information between two data sets is combined, the discrepancies may affect the ultimate quantification of emissions, either over- or underestimating them. For example, some energy efficient appliances were not directly called out in the study of primary energy use based on end use. To obtain information on specific end uses, a secondary source was consulted that quantified energy use by end uses, and the values from this study were used to provide the detail where the end use data were lacking in the first study. It is not possible to determine the precise magnitude of the error that combining these two data sets induced in the final quantification, however every effort was made to minimize potential errors through thorough review of available data and exclusion of incompatible data sets.

There may be data sets available when considering a specific project that address the particulars of the project but are not generally applicable. Such case-specific data could be substituted for the more general data used to develop the quantifications in this Report. If such a substitution is considered, it is important to understand that it can result in an error in the quantification of the mitigation measure reductions because the methods used to derive the case-specific data may contain different assumptions that are not considered in, or are not consistent with the mitigation measure as characterized in the Fact Sheet. Anyone proposing the use of alternative underlying data for source metrics or emission factors must have a good understanding of the assumptions used in estimating the metrics/factors used in the baseline methodology and measure quantification for this Report. The discussion of sources and methods in the measure Fact Sheets as well as the baseline methodology in Appendix B should provide sufficient information to make this assessment.

Understanding these caveats, use of source-specific data is generally an improvement over that of generalized data, and where good quality source-specific data are available, they should be used. CAPCOA will not be able to review case-specific changes to the methods in this Report; however, the local air district may be able to provide assistance or recommendations. The decision to allow alterations to methods, including substitution of underlying data sets, rests with the agency reviewing the project.

**Projects That Involve More Than One Mitigation Measure:** Each mitigation measure was quantified using a specific set of underlying data and assumptions, and will provide the most accurate and reliable results when the project precisely matches the description of the measure, with all of its assumptions and limitations. In reality, projects may differ from the described measures, or may involve the application of more than one measure. In order to ensure that the resulting quantification is appropriate and accurate, specific procedures are provided in Chapter 6 for combining mitigation measures.

**Lack of Detailed Information:** The quantification methods provided in this report have been developed to allow them to be applied to a range of project conditions and still yield accurate and reliable results. In order to do this, the methods require data inputs that reflect the specific conditions of the project. Because the project has not yet been completed, however, certain information about the project will not be known and must be either estimated or assumed based on standard procedures. For example, at the time of the CEQA process a project proponent might know the number of residential dwelling units that will be in the project, but not know the actual square footage individual units will have. Similarly, while the project proponent may know a general type of non-residential land uses planned, these are often generalized categories such as retail and do not reflect the true diversity and range of source category parameters that would occur between the specific types of retail that the project eventually has. Nor can a project proponent predict specific appliances that will be in buildings or frequency of use. Further, most projects rely on generalized trip rate and trip lengths information that are not specific to the project; these estimates may over or underestimate the actual trip rates and trip lengths generated by the project. In each of these cases, estimates of future conditions are made based on accepted procedures and available data. This Report does not provide, or in any way alter, guidance on the level of detail required for the review or approval of any project. For the purposes of CEQA documents, the current CEQA guidelines address the information that is needed.<sup>2</sup>

The lack of precise and accurate data inputs limits the quality of the quantified project baseline and mitigated emissions, however. This limitation can be minimized to the extent the project proponent is able to provide better predictive data, or establish incentives, agreements, covenants, deeds, or other means of defining and restricting future uses to allow more precise estimates of the emissions associated with them. Some of these means of refining the data may also be creditable as mitigation of the project. The approval of any such enhancements of the data, or credit as mitigation, is at the discretion of the agency reviewing the project.

**Use of Case Studies:** One method of enhancing the data available for a project is the use of case studies. Case studies generally have detailed information regarding a particular effect. However, there are limitations of using this information to quantify emissions in other situations since adequate controls may not have been studied to separate out combined effects. There may be features or characteristics in the case-study that do not translate to the project and therefore may over or underestimate the GHG emission reductions. For the most part, case studies were not used as the primary source in the development of the quantification methods in this report. Where case studies were used to enhance underlying data, the studies were carefully reviewed to ensure that appropriate controls were used and the data meet the quality requirements of this Report.

---

<sup>2</sup> See: California Natural Resources Agency: 2007 CEQA Guidelines – Title 14 California Code of Regulations, Sections 15125, 15126.2, 15144, and 15146.

**Extent Reductions Are Demonstrated in Practice:** Some of the GHG mitigation measures in this Report are open-ended with regards to the amount of reductions that are theoretically possible. There are, however, practical limitations to the amount of reductions that can actually be achieved. These limitations can include the cost to implement the measure, physical constraints (e.g., roof space for photovoltaic panels), mainstream availability of technology, regulatory constraints, and other practical considerations. In applying the quantification methods for these types of measures, it is important to evaluate the reasonableness and practicability of the assumptions regarding these parameters.

Over time, some of these limitations may change. Implementation costs decrease as advanced technology is reaches mass production scale, for example, technological innovation can address physical constraints, and regulations change. The determination of feasibility for project assumptions should therefore be reconsidered for future applications based on the best available information at the time.

**Biogenic CO<sub>2</sub> Emissions:** This document did not address biogenic CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. Biogenic CO<sub>2</sub> emissions result from materials that are derived from living cells, as opposed to CO<sub>2</sub> emissions derived from fossil fuels, limestone, and other materials that have been transformed by geological processes. Biogenic CO<sub>2</sub> contains carbon that is present in organic materials that include, but are not limited to, wood, paper, vegetable oils, animal fat, and waste from food, animals, and vegetation (such as yard or forest waste). Biogenic CO<sub>2</sub> emissions are excluded from these GHG emissions quantification methods because they are the result of materials in the biological/physical carbon cycle, rather than the geological carbon cycle.

(page intentionally left blank)

## Introduction

The mitigation measures quantified for this Report fall into general categories within which the quantification methods follow a common approach. The following sections summarize the select categories and subcategories of measures and discuss the quantification methods used for each one. In general, emission reductions are quantified (1) as a percentage of the baseline emissions; or (2) by calculating mitigated emissions and determining the change in emissions relative to the baseline case. More detailed explanation of the parameters and equations used to calculate the emission reductions for each individual measure are provided in the Fact Sheets in Chapter 7.

## Building Energy Use

The emissions associated with building energy use come from power generation that provides the energy used to operate the building. Power is typically generated by a remote, central electricity generating plant, or onsite generation by fuel combustion. These emissions can be reduced by lowering the amount of electricity and natural gas required for building operations. This can be achieved by designing a more energy-efficient building structure and/or installing energy-efficient appliances. Replacing high-emitting energy generation with clean energy will also reduce emissions, and that type of mitigation is discussed in “On-site Energy Generation” below.



NREL.gov

As discussed in Chapter 3, this Report does not include a lifecycle analysis for GHG emissions. However, if a project proposes mitigation in the form of improved building energy use, a limited analysis of indirect emissions will be needed to quantify the associated reductions in GHG emissions. Emissions associated with energy use to light and heat buildings are, as stated previously, well-defined and not considered to be “lifecycle emissions” for the purposes of this Report. The quantification methods in this Report that deal with building energy use provide a specific method for conducting that analysis.

Emission reductions in this category are quantified as percentage reductions in specific baseline energy end uses, such as Title 24-regulated energy or household appliance energy use. The baseline values are determined using California-specific energy end use databases such as California Commercial End-Use Survey (CEUS) and Residential Appliance Saturation Study (RASS). The percentage reduction in Title-24 regulated energy is a project-specific input, whereas the percentage reductions in energy use for

energy-efficient models of various household appliances can be obtained from literature sources (for example, through the Energy Star program).

## **Outdoor Water Use**

Energy use associated with pumping, treating and conveying water generates indirect GHG emissions. The amount of energy required depends on both the volume of water and energy intensity associated with the water source. For example, it generally takes less energy to pump and convey water from a local source than to transport water across long distances. As a result, the GHG emission factor associated with locally-sourced water will also be lower. Indirect GHG emissions associated with water use can be decreased by reducing the water demand and/or by using a less energy-intensive water source. As discussed in Chapter 3, these emissions are well-defined and are not considered to be “lifecycle emissions” for the purposes of this report.

Outdoor water use at mixed-use developments is associated with irrigation for landscaping. The volume of water required for landscaping will depend on the areal extent of landscaping; the specific watering needs for the type of vegetation; and the water efficiency of the irrigation system. A reduction in outdoor water demand can be achieved by designing water-efficient landscapes that include plants with relatively low watering needs; minimizing areas of water-intensive turf; and installing smart irrigation



systems to avoid excessive water use. Emission reductions associated with water-efficient design are quantified as the difference between mitigated and baseline values, which in turn are estimated using established models from government agencies or scientific literature. Emission reductions associated with smart irrigation systems and turf minimization are quantified as percentage reductions from the baseline. The implementation of gray water systems, where allowed, and the use of recycled water

can also reduce emissions; however, it is important to consider the energy used to operate the gray water or water recycling system. These percentages are either taken from literature or estimated using site-specific data. The quantification methods in this Report include estimates of electricity use for recycled water systems, but not for gray water systems, because those emissions are generally more site specific.

As described previously, the energy use intensity for water supply will depend on the water source and its associated treatment and conveyance requirements. The typical or baseline scenario water source for Southern California is the State Water Project; however, other less-energy intensive supplies such as locally-treated recycled wastewater may instead be used to satisfy some of the project’s non-potable water demand. Energy intensity values for different water sources can be obtained from California Energy Commission reports on water-related energy use, and are provided in Appendix E (Table E-2). Emissions associated with water use are estimated by

multiplying the volume of water by the energy intensity value for the water source. The associated emission reduction is quantified by calculating emissions associated with water supplied by the lower impact water source (which can include the gray water or recycled water systems mentioned above), and subtracting it from the emissions associated with the same volume of water using the typical or baseline scenario water source.

## Indoor Water Use

Similar to outdoor water use, indirect GHG emissions from indoor water use can be reduced by decreasing water demand or using a less energy-intensive water source. A project can reduce its indoor water demand relative to the baseline scenario by installing low-flow and high-efficiency water fixtures and appliances such as toilets, showerheads, faucets, clothes washers, and dishwashers.



Emission reductions associated with reduced water demand will be directly proportional to the decrease in demand. The total percentage reduction can be estimated by summing the reductions associated with each type of water-saving feature, which can be obtained from such sources as the California Green Building Standards Code or Energy Star standards. This total percentage would then be multiplied by the project's baseline demand, which should be available from the project's water assessment report. If the water assessment also has an estimate of mitigated water demand, which incorporates the reductions associated with water-saving features, then the reduction can be directly calculated as the difference between baseline and mitigated values.

Emission reductions associated with lower-impact water sources can be quantified as described above for outdoor water use.

## Municipal Solid Waste

Solid waste generated at a site can directly produce GHG emissions via decomposition or incineration; it also generates vehicle-based emissions from trucks required to transport waste from its source to the waste handling facility. A reduction in the mass of municipal solid waste sent to landfills would lower emissions associated with its transport and treatment. This can be achieved by reducing the rate at which waste is generated, or by diverting material away from the landfill via on-site composting, reuse,

or recycling operations (although direct and transport-related emissions associated with the alternate fates must be accounted for too).



Most methods to quantify municipal solid waste involve life-cycle assessments. The fact sheets describe the inventory emissions and the available tools that should be used if the Local Agency or project Applicant would like to quantify the benefits of a solid waste measure with respect to a reduction in life-cycle emissions.

### Public Area and Traffic Signal Lighting

Energy use for lighting generates indirect GHG emissions. The amount of energy required for lighting depends in part on the number and energy needs of the lamps. Indirect emissions from lighting energy use can be reduced by installing energy-efficient lamps that maintain the same efficacy beyond what is required to meet any government standards. The replacement of existing, incandescent traffic signal lamps with light-emitting diode (LED) versions will reduce traffic light energy use relative to the baseline. New public lighting fixtures outfitted with energy-efficiency lamps will also use less electricity than the existing baseline energy use. However, because regulations require all new traffic lights to be LED-based, the methods in this Report do not quantify a reduction associated with LED traffic lights for new traffic intersections. Emissions reductions for lighting-based mitigation measures are quantified as percentages of the baseline emissions. The percentage reductions for energy-efficiency lighting are based on a survey of literature data.



### Vegetation (including Trees)

As discussed in Chapter 3, vegetation incorporates carbon into its structure during its growth phase, and thereby can remove a finite amount of carbon from the atmosphere. The sequestration capacity of on-site vegetation is determined by the area available for vegetation, and the types of vegetation installed. A project can increase the area available for vegetation by converting previously developed land into vegetated open space. Conversions from one type of vegetated land to another may increase or decrease carbon sequestration, depending on the relative sequestration capacities of

the land types. A third way to increase sequestration is by planting new trees on either developed or undeveloped land.

The increase in carbon sequestration capacity is determined by calculating the total sequestration capacity of converted land, new vegetated land and trees; and then subtracting the combined capacity of vegetated land or trees that are removed. Carbon sequestration capacities for different land types (e.g. cropland, forest land) and for different tree species classes are available from IPCC guidelines, and summarized in Table E-2, in Appendix E.

## Construction Equipment

Construction equipment typically uses diesel fuel and releases emissions based on the amount of fuel combusted and emission factor of the equipment. Emissions can be reduced by using equipment that emits fewer pollutants for the same amount of work.



This is typically equipment powered through grid electricity or hybrid technology. The exclusive use of grid electricity eliminates the diesel emissions at the site but would increase indirect electricity emissions. However, grid-based emissions are typically small compared to the emissions from the diesel-fueled equipment (depending on the source of grid power). Hybrid-powered equipment would decrease but not completely eliminate fuel use. The electricity for hybrid

equipment is self-generated unless the equipment has plug-in capability, so it would not increase grid-based electrical generation and the associated emissions there.

The emissions reductions in this category are determined by finding the difference between the estimated mitigation emissions and the baseline emissions for construction equipment. Emissions for the mitigated scenario may consist of direct emissions from combustion fuel use, and/or indirect emissions from grid electricity. These would be calculated using resources described previously, such as the OFFROAD database and literature-based methodologies and values.

## Transportation **Transportation Mitigations**

Transportation emissions can be reduced by improving the emissions profile of the vehicle fleet that travels the roads, or by reducing the vehicle miles traveled by the fleet. The majority of the measures quantified for this report focus on the reduction of VMT. This can be accomplished by optimizing the location and types of land uses in the project and its immediate vicinity, and by site enhancements to roads, and to bike and pedestrian networks to encourage the use of alternative modes of transportation. Mode shifts are also encouraged by implementing parking policies, transit system improvements, and trip reduction coordination or incentive programs.

The emission reductions in this category are determined by evaluating the elasticity of a measure relative to the amount of vehicle miles traveled that may be reduced as a result of the mitigation measure.

A few transportation measures in this Report are aimed at improving the emissions profile of the vehicle fleet. These measures promote alternative fuel, hybrid or electrical vehicles. The emission reductions in these measures are based on the improved emission factors and on changes to the assumed vehicle fleet mix.

### **On-Site Energy Generation**

Different modes of energy generation have different GHG emission intensities. Fossil fuel-based generation emits GHG gases from combustion of the fuel, with the amount of emissions depending on the quantity and type of fuel used. Renewable energy generation, on the other hand, typically has significantly fewer emissions, and some types do not have any associated GHG emissions, such as photovoltaic systems and solar hot water heaters (excluding lifecycle emissions, as previously described in Chapter 3).



*Solar Array at Coronado Naval Base*

The emission reductions associated with using renewable non-emitting energy generated on-site are quantified as the emissions avoided because an equivalent amount of grid energy is not used. To calculate this, the energy generated by the on-site system(s) must be quantified, and then multiplied by the utility-specific emission factor for the type of energy (e.g. electricity, natural gas) being replaced. Energy generated on site is usually used for building operations; hence, it is generally considered a mitigation measure for building energy use.

### **Miscellaneous**

The following miscellaneous mitigation measures are also discussed:

Loading Docks: A project applicant may elect to limit idling of engines beyond what is required by regulation at loading docks, or provide electrified loading docks. Electrified loading docks reduce the need for diesel auxiliary engines to run in order to keep refrigerated transportation units temperature controlled. The emission reduction is a comparison of the GHG emissions associated with the electricity compared to the diesel fuel combustion.

Off-site Mitigation: At the discretion of the reviewing agency, emission reductions may be created with offsite mitigation projects, as described in Chapter 2. If an off-site

mitigation project is approved, the amount of emission reductions generated depends on the type of project implemented.

The numerical emission reductions would be quantified using the methods described for the different project categories above, with baseline values derived for the off-site location (instead of the project's baseline scenario). Once the numerical reductions have been estimated, they can be compared to the project's baseline emissions in order to determine the relative percentage reductions. Certain types of off-site projects may result in one-time emissions and others may result in a continuing stream of emissions reductions.

Carbon Sequestration: Emission reductions may be generated by implementing a carbon sequestration project. Carbon sequestration may be biological, chemical, or physical in nature, as described in Chapter 3. This Report does not address chemical or physical sequestration projects.

For biological sequestration, emission reductions are calculated as for vegetation projects (see above). The amount of the sequestration equals the amount of carbon removed by the vegetation.

(page intentionally left blank)

This chapter of the Report explains how the quantification of individual strategies is presented in Fact Sheets, how those fact sheets are designed and organized, and how to use them. This chapter also explains how and why mitigation measures have been grouped, and provides detailed discussion of how to apply the quantification methods when more than one strategy is being applied to the same project. A summary of the range of effectiveness for different measures is also provided for general information purposes, in table form, however it is very important that those generalized ranges NOT be used in place of the more specific quantification methods for the measure as detailed in the measure Fact Sheet. Finally, at the end of the Chapter there are step-by-step instructions on using the Fact Sheets, including an example.

## **Mitigation Strategies and Fact Sheets:**

Accurate and reliable quantification depends on properly identifying the important variables that affect the emissions from an activity or source, and from changes to that activity or source. In order to provide a clear summary of those variables and usable instructions on how to find and apply the data needed, we have designed a Fact Sheet format to present each strategy or measure.

***Types of Mitigation Strategies:*** There are three different types of mitigation strategies described in Chapter 7: Quantified measures, Best Management Practices, and General Plan strategies.

**Quantified Measures:** Quantified measures are fully quantified, project-level mitigation strategies. They are presented in categories where the nature of the underlying emissions sources are the same; the categories are discussed under “Organization of Fact Sheets” below. In addition, the measures may either stand alone, or be considered in connection with one or more other measures (that is, “grouped”). Groups of measures are always within a category; more detailed explanation is provided in “Grouping of Strategies” below. The majority of the strategies in this Report are fully Quantified Measures, and a strategy may be assumed to be of this type unless the Fact Sheet notes otherwise.

**Best Management Practices:** Several strategies are denoted as Best Management Practice (BMP). These measures are of two types. The first type of BMPs are quantifiable and describe methods that can be used to quantify the GHG mitigation reductions provided the project Applicant can provide substantial evidence supporting the values needed to quantify the reduction. These are listed as BMPs since there is not adequate literature at this time to generalize the mitigation measure reductions. However, the project Applicant may be able to provide the site specific information necessary to quantify a reduction. The second type of BMPs do not have methods for quantifying GHG mitigation reductions. These measures have preliminary evidence suggesting they will reduce GHG emissions if implemented, however, at this time adequate literature and methodologies are not available to quantify these reductions or

they involve life-cycle GHG emission benefits. The measures are encouraged to be implemented nonetheless. Local Agencies may decide to provide incentives to encourage implementation of these measures.

**General Plan Strategies:** The measures listed under the General Plan category are measures that will have the most benefit when implemented at a General Plan level, but are not quantifiable or applicable at the project specific level. While on a project basis some of these measures may not be quantifiable, at the General Plan level they may be quantified under the assumption that this will be implemented on a widespread basis. Local Agencies may decide to provide incentives or allocate the General Plan level reductions to specific projects by weighting the overall effect by the number of projects the General Plan reduction would apply to.

**Introduction to the Fact Sheets:** This Report presents the quantification of each mitigation measure in a Fact Sheet format. Each Fact Sheet includes: a detailed summary of each measure's applicability; the calculation inputs for the specific project; the baseline emissions method; the mitigation calculation method and associated assumptions; a discussion of the calculation and an example calculation; and finally a summary of the preferred and alternative literature sources for measure efficacy. The Fact Sheets are found in Chapter 7.

**Layout of the Fact Sheets:** Each Fact Sheet describes one mitigation measure. The mitigation measure has a unique number and is provided at the bottom of each page in that measure's Fact Sheet. This will assist the end user in determining where a mitigation measure fact sheet begins and ends while still preserving consecutive page numbers in the overall Report.

At the top of each Fact Sheet, the name of the measure category appears on the left, and the subcategory on the right. Cross-references to prior CAPCOA documents appear at the top left, below the category name. Specifically, measures labeled CEQA #: are from the *CAPCOA 2008 CEQA & Climate Change*<sup>1</sup> and measures labeled MP#: are from the *CAPCOA 2009 Model Policies for Greenhouse Gases in General Plans*<sup>2</sup>. This cross-referencing is also included in the list of measures at the beginning of Chapter 7, and is intended to allow the user to move easily between the documents. The measure number is at the bottom of the page, on the right-hand side.

The fact sheets begin with a measure description. This description includes two critical components:

- (1) Specific language regarding the measure implementation – which should be consistent with the implementation method suggested by the project Applicant; and

---

<sup>1</sup> Available online at <http://www.capcoa.org/wp-content/uploads/downloads/2010/05/CAPCOA-White-Paper.pdf>

<sup>2</sup> Available online at <http://www.capcoa.org/wp-content/uploads/downloads/2010/05/CAPCOA-ModelPolicies-6-12-09-915am.pdf>

- (2) A discussion of key support strategies that are required for the reported range of effectiveness.

Appendices with additional calculations and assumptions for some of the fact sheets are provided at the end of this document. Default assumptions should be carefully reviewed for project applicability. Appendix B details the methodologies that should be used to calculate baseline GHG emissions for a project.

**Organization of the Fact Sheets – Categories and Subcategories:** The Fact Sheets are organized by general emission category types as follows:

- Energy
- Transportation
- Water
- Landscape Equipment
- Solid Waste
- Vegetation
- Construction
- Miscellaneous Categories
- General Plans

Several of these main categories are split into subcategories, for ease of understanding how to properly address the effects of combining the measures. Strategies are organized into categories and subcategories where they affect similar types of emissions sources. As an example, the category of “Energy” includes measures that reduce emissions associated with energy generation and use. Within that category, there are subcategories of measures that address “Building Energy Use,” “Alternative Energy,” and “Lighting,” each with one or more measures in it. The measures in the subcategory are closely related to each other.

Categories and subcategories for the measures are illustrated in Charts 6-1 and 6-2, below. Chart 6-1 shows all of the measure categories EXCEPT the Transportation category, including their subcategories; note that not all categories have subcategories. Measures in the Transportation category are shown in Chart 6-2. There are a number of subcategories associated with the Transportation category. As shown in Chart 6-2, the primary measures in each subcategory are indicated in bold type, and the measures shown in normal type are either support measures, or they are explicitly “grouped” measures.

It is important to note that subcategories are NOT the same as “grouped” measures / strategies. The grouping of strategies connotes a specific relationship, and is explained in the next section, below.

## Chart 6-1: Non-Transportation Strategies Organization

| Energy  |                               |   | Water                                      |  | Area Landscaping  | Solid Waste   | Vegetation                      | Construction   | Miscellaneous                                    | General Plans   |
|---|-------------------------------|---|--|--|---|---|---------------------------------|--|--|---|
| BE  | AE                            | LE  | WSW  | WUW  | A   | SW  | V                               | C  | Misc   | GP  |
| Building Energy                                     | Alternative Energy            | Lighting  | Water Supply                               | Water Use                                    | Landscaping Equipment                                   | Solid Waste   | Vegetation                      | Construction   | Miscellaneous                                    | General Plans   |
| Exceed Title 24                                     | Onsite Renewable Energy       | Install High Efficacy Lighting                        | <b>Adopt a Water Conservation Strategy</b> |  | Prohibit gas Powered Landscape Equipment                | Institute or Extend Recycling & Composting Services | <b>Plant Urban Trees</b>        | Use Alternative Fuels for Construction Equipment           | Establish Carbon Sequestration                   | Fund Incentives for Energy Efficiency                   |
| OR  |                               |   |  |  |   |   |                                 |  |  |   |
| Install Energy Efficient Appliances                 | Utilize Combined Heat & Power | Limit Outdoor Lighting                                | Use Reclaimed Water                        | Install Low-Flow Fixtures                    | Implement Lawnmower Exchange Program Reduction: Grouped | Recycle Demolished Construction Material            | <b>New Vegetated Open Space</b> | Use Electric or Hybrid Construction Equipment              | Establish Off-site Mitigation                    | Establish a Local Farmer's Market                       |
| Install Programmable Thermostats Reduction: Grouped | Establish Methane Recovery    | Replace Traffic Lights with LED Reduction: Additional | Use Graywater                              | Design Water-Efficient Landscapes            | Electric Yard Equipment Compatibility Reduction Grouped |   |                                 | Limit Construction Equipment Idling                        | Implement an Innovative Strategy                 | Establish Community Gardens                             |
| Obtain 3rd Party Commissioning Reduction: Grouped   |                               |   | Use Locally Sourced Water                  | Use Water-Efficient Irrigation               |   |   |                                 | Institute a Heavy-Duty Off-Road Vehicle Plan               | Use Local and Sustainable Building Materials     | Plant Urban Shade Trees                                 |
|   |                               |   |  | Reduce Turf                                  |   |   |                                 | Implement a Construction Vehicle Inventory Tracking System | Require BMP in Agriculture and Animal Operations | Implement Strategies to Reduce Urban Heat-Island Effect |
|   |                               |   |  | Plant Native or Drought-Resistant Vegetation |   |   |                                 |  | Require Environmentally Responsible Purchasing   |   |

*Note: Strategies in bold text are primary strategies with reported VMT reductions; non-bolded strategies are support or grouped strategies.*



**Chart 6-2: Transportation Strategies Organization**

|  |  |   |  |  |  |
|--|--|---|--|--|--|
| Transportation Measures (Five Subcategories) Global Maximum Reduction (all VMT):<br>urban = 75%; compact infill = 40%; suburban center or suburban with NEV = 20%; suburban = 15%  |  |   |  | Global Cap for Road Pricing needs further study                |  |
| Transportation Measures (Four Categories) Cross-Category Max Reduction (all VMT):<br>urban = 70%; compact infill = 35%; suburban center or suburban with NEV = 15%; suburban = 10% |  |   |  | Max Reduction = 15% overall; work VMT = 25%; school VMT = 65%; |  |
| <b>Land Use / Location</b><br>Max Reduction: urban = 65%; compact infill = 30%; suburban center = 10%; suburban = 5%   |  | <b>Neighborhood / Site Enhancement</b><br>Max Reduction: without NEV = 5%; with NEV = 15% |  | <b>Parking Policy / Pricing</b><br>Max Reduction = 20%         |  |
| <b>Transit System Improvements</b><br>Max Reduction = 10%  |  | <b>Commuter Trip Reduction (assumes mixed use)</b><br>Max Reduction = 25% (work VMT)      |  | <b>Road Pricing Management</b><br>Max Reduction = 25%          |  |
| <b>Vehicles</b>  |  | Density (30%)   |  | Pedestrian Network (2%)  |  |
| Design (21.3%)   |  | Traffic Calming (1%)  |  | Parking Supply Limits (12.5%)                                  |  |
| Location Efficiency (65%)  |  | NEV Network (14.4) <NEV Parking>  |  | Network Expansion (8.2%)                                       |  |
| Diversity (30%)  |  | Car Share Program (0.7%)  |  | Service Frequency / Speed (2.5%)                               |  |
| Destination Accessibility (20%)  |  | Bicycle Network <Lanes> <Parking> <Land Dedication for Trails>                            |  | Transit Fare Subsidy (20% work VMT)                            |  |
| Transit Accessibility (25%)  |  | Urban Non-Motorized Zones   |  | Employee Parking Cash-out (7.7% work VMT)                      |  |
| BMR Housing (1.2%)   |  | Residential Area Parking Permits  |  | Workplace Parking Pricing (19.7% work VMT)                     |  |
| Orientation Toward Non-Auto Corridor   |  | Access Improvements   |  | Alternative Work Schedules & Telecommute (5.5% work VMT)       |  |
| Proximity to Bike Path   |  | Station Bike Parking  |  | CTR Marketing (5.5% work VMT)                                  |  |
|  |  | Local Shuttles  |  | Employer-Sponsored Vanpool/Shuttle (13.4% work VMT)            |  |
|  |  | Park & Ride Lots*   |  | Ride Share Program (15% work VMT)                              |  |
|  |  |   |  | Bike Share Program   |  |
|  |  |   |  | End of Trip Facilities   |  |
|  |  |   |  | Preferential Parking Permit                                    |  |
|  |  |   |  | School Pool (15.8% school VMT)                                 |  |
|  |  |   |  | School Bus (6.3% school VMT)                                   |  |
|  |  |   |  | Electrify Loading Docks  |  |
|  |  |   |  | Traffic Flow Improvements (45% CO2)                            |  |
|  |  |   |  | Required Contributions by Project                              |  |
|  |  |   |  | Utilize Alternative Fueled Vehicles                            |  |
|  |  |   |  | Utilize Electric or Hybrid Vehicles                            |  |

*Note: Strategies in bold text are primary strategies with reported VMT reductions; non-bolded strategies are support or grouped strategies.*

### Grouping of Strategies

Strategies noted as “grouped” are separately documented in individual Fact Sheets but must be paired with other strategies within the category. When these “grouped” strategies are implemented together, the combination will result in either an enhancement to the primary strategy by improving its effectiveness or a non-negligible reduction in effectiveness that would not occur without the combination.

### Rules for Combining Strategies or Measures

Mitigation measures or strategies are frequently implemented together with other measures. Often, combining measures can lead to better emission reductions than implementing a single measure by itself. Unfortunately, the effects of combining the measures are not always as straightforward as they might at first appear. When more and more measures are implemented to mitigate a particular source of emissions, the benefit of each additional measure diminishes. If it didn’t, some odd results would occur. For example, if there were a series of measures that each, independently, was predicted to reduce emissions from a source by 10%, and if the effect of each measure was independent of the others, then implementing ten measures would reduce all of the emissions; and what would happen with the eleventh measure? Would the combination reduce 110% of the emissions? No. In fact, each successive measure is slightly less effective than predicted when implemented on its own.

On the other hand, some measures enhance the performance of a primary measure when they are combined. This Report includes a set of rules that govern different ways of combining measures. The rules depend on whether the measures are in the *same* category, or different categories. Remember, the categories include: Energy, Transportation, Water, Landscape Equipment, Solid Waste, Vegetation, Construction, Miscellaneous Categories, and General Plans.

***Combinations Between Categories:*** The following procedures must be followed when combining mitigation measures that fall in separate categories. In order to determine the overall reduction in GHG emissions compared to the baseline emissions, the relative magnitude of emissions between the source categories needs to be considered. To do this, the user should determine the percent contribution made by each individual category to the overall baseline GHG emissions. This percent contribution by a category should be multiplied by the reduction percentages from mitigation measures in that category to determine the scaled GHG emission reductions from the measures in that category. This is done for each category to be combined. The scaled GHG emissions for each category can then be added together to give a total GHG reduction for the combined measures in all of the categories.

For example, consider a project whose total GHG emissions come from the following categories: transportation (50%), building energy use (40%), water (6%), and other (4%). This project implements a transportation mitigation measure that results in a 10% reduction in VMT. The project also implements mitigation measures that result in a 30% reduction in water usage. The overall reduction in GHG emissions is as follows:

Reduction from Transportation:  $0.50 \times 0.10 = 0.05$  or 5%

Reduction from Water:  $0.06 \times 0.30 = 0.018$  or 1.8%

Total Reduction:  $5\% + 1.8\% = 6.8\%$

This example illustrates the importance of the magnitude of a source category and its influence on the overall GHG emission reductions.

The percent contributions from source categories will vary from project to project. In a commercial-only project it may not be unusual for transportation emissions to represent greater than 75% of all GHG emissions whereas for a residential or mixed use project, transportation emissions would be below 50%.

***Combinations Within Categories:*** The following procedures must be followed when combining mitigation measures that fall within the same category.

***Non-Transportation Combinations:*** When combining non-transportation subcategories, the total amount of reductions for that category should not exceed 100% except for categories that would result in additional excess capacity that can be used by others, but which the project wants to take credit for (subject to approval of the reviewing agency). This may include alternative energy generation systems tied into the grid, vegetation measures, and excess graywater or recycled water generated by the project and used by others. These excess emission reductions may be used to offset other categories of emissions, with approval of the agency reviewing the project. In these cases of excess capacity, the quantified amounts of excess emissions must be carefully verified to ensure that any credit allowed for these additional reductions is truly surplus.

***Category Maximum-*** Each category has a maximum allowable reduction for the combination of measures in that category. It is intended to ensure that emissions are not double counted when measures within the category are combined. Effectiveness levels for multiple strategies within a subcategory (as denoted by a column in the appropriate chart, above) may be multiplied to determine a combined effectiveness level up to a maximum level. This should be done first to mitigation measures that are a source reduction followed by those that are a reduction to emission factors. Since the combination of mitigation measures and independence of mitigation measures are both complicated, this Report recommends that mitigation measure reductions within a category be multiplied unless a project applicant can provide substantial evidence indicating that emission reductions are independent of one another. This will take the following form:

$$\text{GHG emission reduction for category} = 1 - [(1-A) \times (1-B) \times (1-C)]$$

Where:

A, B and C = Individual mitigation measure reduction percentages for the strategies to be combined in a given category.

*Global Maximum-* A separate maximum, referred to as a global maximum level, is also provided for a combination across subcategories. Effectiveness levels for multiple strategies across categories may also be multiplied to determine a combined effectiveness level up to global maximum level.

For example, consider a project that is combining 3 mitigation strategies from the water category. This project will install low-flow fixtures (measure WUW-1), use water-efficient irrigation (measure WUW-4, and reduce turf (measure WUW-5). Reductions from these measures will be:

- low-flow fixtures                      20% or 0.20 (A)
- water efficient irrigation            10% or 0.10 (B)
- turf reductions                         20% or 0.20 (C)

To combine measures within a category, the reductions would be

$$\begin{aligned}
 &= 1-[(1-A) \times (1-B) \times (1-C)] \\
 &= 1-[(1-.20) \times (1-.10) \times (1-.20)] \\
 &= 1-[(0.8) \times (0.9) \times (.8)] \\
 &= 1-0.576 = 0.424 \\
 &= 42.4\%
 \end{aligned}$$

**Transportation Combinations:** The interactions between the various categories of transportation-related mitigation measures is complex and sometimes counter-intuitive. Combining these measures can have a substantive impact on the quantification of the associated emission reductions. In order to safeguard the accuracy and reliability of the methods, while maintaining their ease of use, the following rules have been developed and should be followed when combining transportation-related mitigation measures. The rules are presented by sub-category, and reference Chart 6-2 Transportation Strategies Organization. The maximum reduction values also reflect the highest reduction levels justified by the literature. The chart indicates maximum reductions for individual mitigation measures just below the measure name.

*Cross-Category Maximum-* A cross-category maximum is provided for any combination of land use, neighborhood enhancements, parking, and transit strategies (columns A-D in Chart 6-1, with the maximum shown in the top row). The total project VMT reduction across these categories should be capped at these levels based on empirical evidence.<sup>3</sup> Caps are provided for the location/development type of the project. VMT reductions may be multiplied across the four categories up to this maximum. These include:

- Urban: 70% VMT
- Compact Infill: 35%
- Suburban Center (or Suburban with NEV): 15%
- Suburban: 10% (note that projects with this level of reduction must include a diverse land use mix, workforce housing, and project-specific transit; limited empirical evidence is available)

(See blue box, pp. 58-59.)

<sup>3</sup> As reported by Holtzclaw, et al for the State of California.

**As used in this Report, location settings are defined as follows:**

**Urban:** A project located within the central city and may be characterized by multi-family housing, located near office and retail. Downtown Oakland and the Nob Hill neighborhood in San Francisco are examples of the typical urban area represented in this category. The urban maximum reduction is derived from the average of the percentage difference in per capita VMT versus the California statewide average (assumed analogous to an ITE baseline) for the following locations:

| Location              | Percent Reduction from Statewide VMT/Capita |
|-----------------------|---|
| Central Berkeley      | -48%  |
| San Francisco         | -49%  |
| Pacific Heights (SF)  | -79%  |
| North Beach (SF)      | -82%  |
| Mission District (SF) | -75%  |
| Nob Hill (SF)         | -63%  |
| Downtown Oakland      | -61%  |

The average reflects a range of 48% less VMT/capita (Central Berkeley) to 82% less VMT/capita (North Beach, San Francisco) compared to the statewide average. The urban locations listed above have the following characteristics:

- o Location relative to the regional core: these locations are within the CBD or less than five miles from the CBD (downtown Oakland and downtown San Francisco).
- o Ratio or relationship between jobs and housing: jobs-rich (jobs/housing ratio greater than 1.5)
- o Density character
  - typical building heights in stories: six stories or (much) higher
  - typical street pattern: grid
  - typical setbacks: minimal
  - parking supply: constrained on and off street
  - parking prices: high to the highest in the region
- o Transit availability: high quality rail service and/or comprehensive bus service at 10 minute headways or less in peak hours

**Compact infill:** A project located on an existing site within the central city or inner-ring suburb with high-frequency transit service. Examples may be community redevelopment areas, reusing abandoned sites, intensification of land use at established transit stations, or converting underutilized or older industrial buildings. Albany and the Fairfax area of Los Angeles are examples of typical compact infill area as used here. The compact infill maximum reduction is derived from the average of the percentage difference in per capita VMT versus the California statewide average for the following locations:

| Location                  | Percent Reduction from Statewide VMT/Capita |
|---------------------------|---|
| Franklin Park, Hollywood  | -22%  |
| Albany                    | -25%  |
| Fairfax Area, Los Angeles | -29%  |
| Hayward                   | -42%  |

The average reflects a range of 22% less VMT/capita (Franklin Park, Hollywood) to 42% less VMT/capita (Hayward) compared to the statewide average. The compact infill locations listed above have the following characteristics:

- o Location relative to the regional core: these locations are typically 5 to 15 miles outside a regional CBD
- o Ratio or relationship between jobs and housing: balanced (jobs/housing ratio ranging from 0.9 to 1.2)
- o Density character
  - typical building heights in stories: two to four stories
  - typical street pattern: grid
  - typical setbacks: 0 to 20 feet
  - parking supply: constrained
  - parking prices: low to moderate
- o Transit availability: rail service within two miles, or bus service at 15 minute peak headways or less

As used in this Report, additional location settings are defined as follows:

**Suburban Center:** A project typically involving a cluster of multi-use development within dispersed, low-density, automobile dependent land use patterns (a suburb). The center may be an historic downtown of a smaller community that has become surrounded by its region's suburban growth pattern in the latter half of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century. The suburban center serves the population of the suburb with office, retail and housing which is denser than the surrounding suburb. The suburban center maximum reduction is derived from the average of the percentage difference in per capita VMT versus the California statewide average for the following locations:

| Location              | Percent Reduction from Statewide VMT/Capita |
|-----------------------|---|
| Sebastopol            | 0%  |
| San Rafael (Downtown) | -10%  |
| San Mateo             | -17%  |

The average reflects a range of 0% less VMT/capita (Sebastopol) to 17% less VMT/capita (San Mateo) compared to the statewide average. The suburban center locations listed above have the following characteristics:

- Location relative to the regional core: these locations are typically 20 miles or more from a regional CBD
- Ratio or relationship between jobs and housing: balanced
- Density character
  - typical building heights in stories: two stories
  - typical street pattern: grid
  - typical setbacks: 0 to 20 feet
  - parking supply: somewhat constrained on street; typically ample off-street
  - parking prices: low (if priced at all)
- Transit availability: bus service at 20-30 minute headways and/or a commuter rail station

While all three locations in this category reflect a suburban "downtown," San Mateo is served by regional rail (Caltrain) and the other locations are served by bus transit only. Sebastopol is located more than 50 miles from downtown San Francisco, the nearest urban center. San Rafael and San Mateo are located 20 miles from downtown San Francisco.

**Suburban:** A project characterized by dispersed, low-density, single-use, automobile dependent land use patterns, usually outside of the central city (a suburb). Suburbs typically have the following characteristics:

- Location relative to the regional core: these locations are typically 20 miles or more from a regional CBD
- Ratio or relationship between jobs and housing: jobs poor
- Density character
  - typical building heights in stories: one to two stories
  - typical street pattern: curvilinear (cul-de-sac based)
  - typical setbacks: parking is generally placed between the street and office or retail buildings; large-lot residential is common
  - parking supply: ample, largely surface lot-based
  - parking prices: none
- Transit availability: limited bus service, with peak headways 30 minutes or more

The maximum reduction provided for this category assumes that regardless of the measures implemented, the project's distance from transit, density, design, and lack of mixed use destinations will keep the effect of any strategies to a minimum.

**Global Maximum-** A global maximum is provided for any combination of land use, neighborhood enhancements, parking, transit, and commute trip reduction strategies (the first five columns in the organization chart). This excludes reductions from road-pricing measurements which are discussed separately below. The total project VMT reduction across these categories, which can be combined through multiplication, should be capped

at these levels based on empirical evidence.<sup>4</sup> Maximums are provided for the location/development type of the project. The Global Maximum values can be found in the top row of Chart 6-2.

These include:

- Urban: 75% VMT
- Compact Infill: 40% VMT
- Suburban Center (or Suburban with NEV): 20%
- Suburban: 15% (limited empirical evidence available)

*Specific Rules for Subcategories within Transportation-* Because of the unique interactions of measures within the Transportation Category, each subcategory has additional rules or criteria for combining measures.

❖ **Land Use/Location Strategies – Maximum Reduction Factors:** Land use measures apply to a project area with a radius of ½ mile. If the project area under review is greater than this, the study area should be divided into subareas of radii of ½ mile, with subarea boundaries determined by natural “clusters” of integrated land uses within a common watershed. If the project study area is smaller than ½ mile in radius, other land uses within a ½ mile radius of the key destination point in the study area (i.e. train station or employment center) should be included in design, density, and diversity calculations. Land use measures are capped based on empirical evidence for location setting types as follows:<sup>5</sup>


- Urban: 65% VMT
  - Compact Infill: 30% VMT
  - Suburban Center: 10% VMT
  - Suburban: 5% VMT
- ❖ **Neighborhood/Site Enhancements Strategies – Maximum Reduction Factors:** The neighborhood/site enhancements category is capped at 12.7% VMT reduction (with Neighborhood Electric Vehicles (NEVs)) and 5% without NEVs based on empirical evidence (for NEVs) and the multiplied combination of the non-NEV measures.
- ❖ **Parking Strategies – Maximum Reduction Factors:** Parking strategies should be implemented in one of two combinations:
- Limited (reduced) off-street supply ratios plus residential permit parking and priced on-street parking (to limit spillover), or
  - Unbundled parking plus residential permit parking and priced on-street parking (to limit spillover).

<sup>4</sup> As reported by Holtzclaw, et al for the State of California. Note that CTR strategies must be converted to overall VMT reductions (from work-trip VMT reductions) before being combined with strategies in other categories.

<sup>5</sup> As reported for California locations in Holtzclaw, et al. “Location Efficiency: Neighborhood and Socioeconomic Characteristics Determine Auto Ownership and Use – Studies in Chicago, Los Angeles, and San Francisco.” *Transportation Planning and Technology*, 2002, Vol. 25, pp. 1–27.

*Note:* The reduction maximum of 20% VMT reflects the combined (multiplied) effect of unbundled parking and priced on-street parking.

- ❖ **Transit System Strategies – Maximum Reduction Factors:** The 10% VMT reduction maximum for transit system improvements reflects the combined (multiplied) effect of network expansion and service frequency/speed enhancements. A comprehensive transit improvement would receive this type of reduction, as shown in the center overlap in the Venn diagram, below.



- ❖ **Commuter Trip Reductions (CTR) Strategies – Maximum Reduction Factors:** The most effective commute trip reduction measures combine incentives, disincentives, and mandatory monitoring, often through a transportation demand management (TDM) ordinance. Incentives encourage a particular action, for example parking cash-out, where the employee receives a monetary incentive for not driving to work, but is not punished for maintaining status quo. Disincentives establish a penalty for a status quo action. An example is workplace parking pricing, where the employee is now monetarily penalized for driving to work. The 25% maximum for work-related VMT applies to comprehensive CTR programs. TDM strategies that include only incentives, only disincentives, and/or no mandatory monitoring, should have a lower total VMT reduction than those with a comprehensive approach. Support strategies to strengthen CTR programs include guaranteed-ride-home, taxi vouchers, and message boards/marketing materials. A 25% reduction in work-related VMT is assumed equivalent to a 15% reduction in overall project VMT for the purpose of the global maximum; this can be adjusted for project-specific land use mixes.

Two school-related VMT reduction measures are also provided in this category. The maximum reduction for these measures should be 65% of school-related VMT based on the literature.

- ❖ Road Pricing/Management Strategies – Maximum Reduction Factors: Cordon pricing is the only strategy in this category with an expected VMT reduction potential. Other forms of road pricing would be applied at a corridor or region-wide level rather than as mitigation applied to an individual development project. No domestic case studies are available for cordon pricing, but international studies suggest a VMT reduction maximum of 25%. A separate, detailed, and project-specific study should be conducted for any project where road pricing is proposed as a VMT reduction measure.

*Additional Rules for Transportation Measures-* There are also restrictions on the application of measures in rural applications, and application to baseline, as follows:

- ❖ Rural Application: Few empirical studies are available to suggest appropriate VMT reduction caps for strategies implemented in rural areas. Strategies likely to have the largest VMT reduction in rural areas include vanpools, telecommute or alternative work schedules, and master planned communities (with design and land use diversity to encourage intra-community travel). NEV networks may also be appropriate for larger scale developments. Because of the limited empirical data in the rural context, project-specific VMT reduction estimates should be calculated.
- ❖ Baseline Application: As discussed in previous sections of this report, VMT reductions should be applied to a baseline VMT expected for the project, based on the Institute of Transportation Engineers' 8<sup>th</sup> Edition *Trip Generation Manual* and associated typical trip distance for each land use type. Where trip generation rates and project VMT provided by the project Applicant are derived from another source, the VMT reductions must be adjusted to reflect any "discounts" already applied.

## Range of Effectiveness of Mitigation Measures

The following charts provide the range of effectiveness for the quantified mitigation measures. Each chart shows one category of measures, with subcategories identified. The charts also show the basis for the quantification, and indicate applicable groupings. IMPORTANT: these ranges are approximate and should NOT be used in lieu of the specific quantification method provided in the fact sheet for each measure. Restrictions on combining measures must be observed.

Table 6-1: Energy Category

| Energy                        |                |   |     |                |  |                                  |
|-------------------------------|----------------|---|-----|----------------|--|----------------------------------|
| Category                      | Measure Number | Strategy  | BMP | Grouped With # | Range of Effectiveness   |                                  |
|                               |                |   |     |                | Percent Reduction in GHG Emissions   | Basis                            |
| Building Energy Use           | BE-1           | Buildings exceed Title 24 Building Envelope Energy Efficiency Standards by X% (X is equal to the percentage improvement selected for the project) |     |                | For a 10% improvement over 2008 Title 24: Non-Residential electricity use: 0.2-5.5%; natural gas use: 0.7-10% Residential electricity use: 0.3-2.6%; natural gas use: 7.5-9.1% |                                  |
|                               | BE-2           | Install Programmable Thermostat Timers  | X   |                | BMP  |                                  |
|                               | BE-3           | Obtain Third-party HVAC Commissioning and Verification of Energy Savings  | X   | BE-1           | BMP  |                                  |
|                               | BE-4           | Install Energy Efficient Appliances   |     |                | Residential building: 2-4% Grocery Stores: 17-22%  | Appliance Electricity Use        |
|                               | BE-5           | Install Energy Efficient Boilers  |     |                | 1.2-18.4%  | Fuel Use                         |
| Alternative Energy Generation | AE-1           | Establish Onsite Renewable Energy Systems-Generic   |     |                | 0-100%   |                                  |
|                               | AE-2           | Establish Onsite Renewable Energy Systems-Solar Power   |     |                | 0-100%   |                                  |
|                               | AE-3           | Establish Onsite Renewable Energy Systems-Wind Power  |     |                | 0-100%   |                                  |
|                               | AE-4           | Utilize a Combined Heat and Power System  |     |                | 0-46%  |                                  |
|                               | AE-5           | Establish Methane Recovery in Landfills   |     |                | 73-77%   |                                  |
|                               | AE-6           | Establish Methane Recovery in Wastewater Treatment Plants   |     |                | 95-97%   |                                  |
| Lighting                      | LE-1           | Install Higher Efficacy Public Street and Area Lighting   |     |                | 16-40%   | Outdoor Lighting Electricity Use |
|                               | LE-2           | Limit Outdoor Lighting Requirements   | X   |                | BMP  |                                  |
|                               | LE-3           | Replace Traffic Lights with LED Traffic Lights  |     |                | 90%  | Traffic Light Electricity Use    |

Table 6-2: Transportation Category

| Transportation             |                |   |     |                |                                    |       |
|----------------------------|----------------|---|-----|----------------|------------------------------------|-------|
| Category                   | Measure Number | Strategy  | BMP | Grouped With # | Range of Effectiveness             |       |
|                            |                |   |     |                | Percent Reduction in GHG Emissions | Basis |
| Land Use / Location        | LUT-1          | Increase Density  |     |                | 1.5-30.0%                          | VMT   |
|                            | LUT-2          | Increase Location Efficiency                                      |     |                | 10-65%                             | VMT   |
|                            | LUT-3          | Increase Diversity of Urban and Suburban Developments (Mixed Use) |     |                | 9-30%                              | VMT   |
|                            | LUT-4          | Incr. Destination Accessibility                                   |     |                | 6.7-20%                            | VMT   |
|                            | LUT-5          | Increase Transit Accessibility                                    |     |                | 0.5-24.6%                          | VMT   |
|                            | LUT-6          | Integrate Affordable and Below Market Rate Housing                |     |                | 0.04-1.20%                         | VMT   |
|                            | LUT-7          | Orient Project Toward Non-Auto Corridor                           |     |                | NA                                 |       |
|                            | LUT-8          | Locate Project near Bike Path/Bike Lane                           |     |                | NA                                 |       |
|                            | LUT-9          | Improve Design of Development                                     |     |                | 3.0-21.3%                          | VMT   |
| Neighborhood / Site Design | SDT-1          | Provide Pedestrian Network Improvements                           |     |                | 0-2%                               | VMT   |
|                            | SDT-2          | Traffic Calming Measures  |     |                | 0.25-1.00%                         | VMT   |
|                            | SDT-3          | Implement a Neighborhood Electric Vehicle (NEV) Network           |     |                | 0.5-12.7%                          | VMT   |
|                            | SDT-4          | Urban Non-Motorized Zones   |     | SDT-1          | NA                                 |       |
|                            | SDT-5          | Incorporate Bike Lane Street Design (on-site)                     |     | LUT-9          | NA                                 |       |
|                            | SDT-6          | Provide Bike Parking in Non-Residential Projects                  |     | LUT-9          | NA                                 |       |
|                            | SDT-7          | Provide Bike Parking in Multi-Unit Residential Projects           |     | LUT-9          | NA                                 |       |
|                            | SDT-8          | Provide EV Parking  |     | SDT-3          | NA                                 |       |
|                            | SDT-9          | Dedicate Land for Bike Trails                                     |     | LUT-9          | NA                                 |       |
| Parking Policy / Pricing   | PDT-1          | Limit Parking Supply  |     |                | 5-12.5%                            |       |
|                            | PDT-2          | Unbundle Parking Costs from Property Cost                         |     |                | 2.6-13%                            |       |
|                            | PDT-3          | Implement Market Price Public Parking (On-Street)                 |     |                | 2.8-5.5%                           |       |
|                            | PDT-4          | Require Residential Area Parking Permits                          |     | PDT-1, 2 & 3   | NA                                 |       |

Transportation - continued

| Category                | Measure Number | Strategy  | BMP | Grouped With # | Range of Effectiveness             |             |
|-------------------------|----------------|---|-----|----------------|------------------------------------|-------------|
|                         |                |   |     |                | Percent Reduction in GHG Emissions | Basis       |
| Trip Reduction Programs | TRT-1          | Implement Voluntary CTR Programs                                      |     |                | 1.0-6.2%                           | Commute VMT |
|                         | TRT-2          | Implement Mandatory CTR Programs – Required Implementation/Monitoring |     |                | 4.2-21.0%                          | Commute VMT |
|                         | TRT-3          | Provide Ride-Sharing Programs   |     |                | 1-15%                              | Commute VMT |
|                         | TRT-4          | Implement Subsidized or Discounted Transit Prog.                      |     |                | 0.3-20.0%                          | Commute VMT |
|                         | TRT-5          | Provide End of Trip Facilities  |     | TRT-1, 2 & 3   | NA                                 |             |
|                         | TRT-6          | Telecommuting and Alternative Work Schedules                          |     |                | 0.07-5.50%                         | Commute VMT |
|                         | TRT-7          | Implement Commute Trip Reduction Marketing                            |     |                | 0.8-4.0%                           | Commute VMT |
|                         | TRT-8          | Implement Preferential Parking Permit Program                         |     | TRT-1, 2 & 3   | NA                                 |             |
|                         | TRT-9          | Implement Car-Sharing Program   |     |                | 0.4-0.7%                           | VMT         |
|                         | TRT-10         | Implement School Pool Program   |     |                | 7.2-15.8%                          | School VMT  |
|                         | TRT-11         | Provide Employer-Sponsored Vanpool/Shuttle                            |     |                | 0.3-13.4%                          | Commute VMT |
|                         | TRT-12         | Implement Bike-Sharing Program  |     | SDT-5, LUT-9   | NA                                 |             |
|                         | TRT-13         | Implement School Bus Program  |     |                | 38-63%                             | School VMT  |
|                         | TRT-14         | Price Workplace Parking   |     |                | 0.1-19.7%                          | Commute VMT |
|                         | TRT-15         | Implement Employee Parking “Cash-Out”                                 |     |                | 0.6-7.7%                           | Commute VMT |

## Transportation - continued

| Category                    | Measure Number | Strategy  | BMP | Grouped With #                   | Range of Effectiveness             |                   |
|-----------------------------|----------------|---|-----|----------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------|
|                             |                |   |     |                                  | Percent Reduction in GHG Emissions | Basis             |
| Transit System Improvements | TST-1          | Provide a Bus Rapid Transit System  |     |                                  | 0.02-3.2%                          | VMT               |
|                             | TST-2          | Implement Transit Access Improvements   |     | TST-3, TST-4                     | NA                                 |                   |
|                             | TST-3          | Expand Transit Network  |     |                                  | 0.1-8.2%                           | VMT               |
|                             | TST-4          | Increase Transit Service Frequency/Speed  |     |                                  | 0.02-2.5%                          | VMT               |
|                             | TST-5          | Provide Bike Parking Near Transit   |     | TST-3, TST-4                     | NA                                 |                   |
|                             | TST-6          | Provide Local Shuttles  |     | TST-3, TST-4                     | NA                                 |                   |
| Road Pricing / Management   | RPT-1          | Implement Area or Cordon Pricing  |     |                                  | 7.9-22.0%                          | VMT               |
|                             | RPT-2          | Improve Traffic Flow  |     |                                  | 0-45%                              | VMT               |
|                             | RPT-3          | Require Project Contributions to Transportation Infrastructure Improvement Projects |     | RPT-2, TST-1 to 6                | NA                                 |                   |
|                             | RPT-4          | Install Park-and-Ride Lots  |     | RPT-1, TRT-11, TRT-3, TST-1 to 6 | NA                                 |                   |
| Vehicles                    | VT-1           | Electrify Loading Docks and/or Require Idling-Reduction Systems                     |     |                                  | 26-71%                             | Truck Idling Time |
|                             | VT-2           | Utilize Alternative Fueled Vehicles   |     |                                  | Varies                             |                   |
|                             | VT-3           | Utilize Electric or Hybrid Vehicles   |     |                                  | 0.4-20.3%                          | Fuel Use          |

**Table 6-3: Water Category**

| Water        |                |  |     |                |   |                              |
|--------------|----------------|--|-----|----------------|---|------------------------------|
| Category     | Measure Number | Strategy   | BMP | Grouped With # | Range of Effectiveness  |                              |
|              |                |  |     |                | Percent Reduction in GHG Emissions  | Basis                        |
| Water Supply | WSW-1          | Use Reclaimed Water                                    |     |                | up to 40% for Northern California up to 81% for Southern California       | Outdoor Water Use            |
|              | WSW-2          | Use Gray Water   |     |                | 0-100%  | Outdoor Water Use            |
|              | WSW-3          | Use Locally-Sourced Water Supply                       |     |                | 0-60% for Northern and Central California; 11-75% for Southern California | Indoor and Outdoor Water Use |
| Water Use    | WUW-1          | Install Low-Flow Water Fixtures.                       |     |                | Residential: 20%<br>Non-Residential: 17-31%                               | Indoor Water Use             |
|              | WUW-2          | Adopt a Water Conservation Strategy.                   |     |                | varies  |                              |
|              | WUW-3          | Design Water-Efficient Landscapes                      |     |                | 0-70%   | Outdoor Water Use            |
|              | WUW-4          | Use Water-Efficient Landscape Irrigation Systems       |     |                | 6.1%  | Outdoor Water Use            |
|              | WUW-5          | Reduce Turf in Landscapes and Lawns                    |     |                | varies  |                              |
|              | WUW-6          | Plant Native or Drought-Resistant Trees and Vegetation |     |                | BMP   |                              |

**Table 6-4: Area Landscaping**

| Area Landscaping |                |   |     |                |   |          |
|------------------|----------------|---|-----|----------------|---|----------|
| Category         | Measure Number | Strategy                                  | BMP | Grouped With # | Range of Effectiveness  |          |
|                  |                |   |     |                | Percent Reduction in GHG Emissions  | Basis    |
| Area Landscaping | A-1            | Prohibit Gas Powered Landscape Equipment. |     |                | LADWP: 2.5-46.5%<br>PG&E: 64.1-80.3%<br>SCE: 49.5-72.0%<br>SDGE: 38.5-66.3%<br>SMUD: 56.3-76.0% | Fuel Use |
|                  | A-2            | Implement Lawnmower Exchange Program      |     |                | BMP   |          |
|                  | A-3            | Electric Yard Equipment Compatibility     |     | A-1 or A-2     | BMP   |          |

**Table 6-5: Solid Waste Category**

| Solid Waste |                |   |     |                |                                    |       |
|-------------|----------------|---|-----|----------------|------------------------------------|-------|
| Category    | Measure Number | Strategy  | BMP | Grouped With # | Range of Effectiveness             |       |
|             |                |   |     |                | Percent Reduction in GHG Emissions | Basis |
| Solid Waste | SW-1           | Institute or Extend Recycling and Composting Services |     |                | BMP                                |       |
|             | SW-2           | Recycle Demolished Construction Material              |     |                | BMP                                |       |

**Table 6-6: Vegetation Category**

| Vegetation |                |                                  |     |                |                                    |       |
|------------|----------------|----------------------------------|-----|----------------|------------------------------------|-------|
| Category   | Measure Number | Strategy                         | BMP | Grouped With # | Range of Effectiveness             |       |
|            |                |                                  |     |                | Percent Reduction in GHG Emissions | Basis |
| Vegetation | V-1            | Urban Tree Planting              |     | GP-4           | varies                             |       |
|            | V-2            | Create new vegetated open space. |     |                | varies                             |       |

**Table 6-7: Construction Category**

| Construction |                |  |     |                |                                    |          |
|--------------|----------------|--|-----|----------------|------------------------------------|----------|
| Category     | Measure Number | Strategy   | BMP | Grouped With # | Range of Effectiveness             |          |
|              |                |  |     |                | Percent Reduction in GHG Emissions | Basis    |
| Construction | C-1            | Use Alternative Fuels for Construction Equipment                   |     |                | 0-22%                              | Fuel Use |
|              | C-2            | Use Electric and Hybrid Construction Equipment                     |     |                | 2.5-80%                            | Fuel Use |
|              | C-3            | Limit Construction Equipment Idling beyond Regulation Requirements |     |                | varies                             |          |
|              | C-4            | Institute a Heavy-Duty Off-Road Vehicle Plan                       |     | Any C          | BMP                                |          |
|              | C-5            | Implement a Vehicle Inventory Tracking System                      |     | Any C          | BMP                                |          |

**Table 6-8: Miscellaneous Category**

| Miscellaneous |                |  |     |                |                                    |       |
|---------------|----------------|--|-----|----------------|------------------------------------|-------|
| Category      | Measure Number | Strategy   | BMP | Grouped With # | Range of Effectiveness             |       |
|               |                |  |     |                | Percent Reduction in GHG Emissions | Basis |
| Miscellaneous | Misc-1         | Establish a Carbon Sequestration Project                               |     |                | varies                             |       |
|               | Misc-2         | Establish Off-Site Mitigation  |     |                | varies                             |       |
|               | Misc-3         | Use Local and Sustainable Building Materials                           | x   |                | BMP                                |       |
|               | Misc-4         | Require Best Management Practices in Agriculture and Animal Operations | x   |                | BMP                                |       |
|               | Misc-5         | Require Environmentally Responsible Purchasing                         | x   |                | BMP                                |       |
|               | Misc-6         | Implement an Innovative Strategy for GHG Mitigation                    | x   |                | BMP                                |       |

**Table 6-9: General Plans**

| General Plan Strategies |                |   |     |                |                                    |       |
|-------------------------|----------------|---|-----|----------------|------------------------------------|-------|
| Category                | Measure Number | Strategy  | BMP | Grouped With # | Range of Effectiveness             |       |
|                         |                |   |     |                | Percent Reduction in GHG Emissions | Basis |
| General Plans           | GP-1           | Fund Incentives for Energy Efficiency                   | x   |                | BMP                                |       |
|                         | GP-2           | Establish a Local Farmer's Market                       | x   |                | BMP                                |       |
|                         | GP-3           | Establish Community Gardens                             | x   |                | BMP                                |       |
|                         | GP-4           | Plant Urban Shade Trees                                 | x   | V-1            | BMP                                |       |
|                         | GP-5           | Implement Strategies to Reduce Urban Heat-Island Effect | x   |                | BMP                                |       |

### Applicability of Quantification Fact Sheets Outside of California

In order to apply the quantification methods in this Report to projects located outside of California, the assumptions and methods in the baseline methodology and in the Fact Sheets should be reviewed prior to applying them. First, evaluate the basis for use metrics and emission factors for applicability outside of California. The Report references various sources for use metrics and emission factors; if these are California-specific, the method should be evaluated to determine if these same use metrics and emission factors are applicable to the project area. If they are not applicable, factors appropriate for the project area should be substituted in the baseline and project methods. Key factors to consider are climate zone<sup>6</sup>, precipitation, building standards, end-user behavior, and transportation environment (land use and transportation characteristics). Use metrics likely to vary outside of California include:

- Building Energy Use
- Water Use
- Vehicle Trip Lengths and Vehicle Miles Traveled
- Building Standards
- Waste Disposal Rates
- Landscape Equipment Annual Usage

Emission factors relate the use metric to carbon intensity to estimate GHG emissions. Depending on the type of emission factor, these values may or may not change based on location. For instance, the emission factor for combustion of a specific amount of fuel does not typically change; however the engine mix may change by location, and fuel use by those engines may be different. Other emission factors are regionally dependent and alternative sources should be investigated. Emission factors likely to vary outside of California include:

- Electricity associated with water and wastewater supply and treatment
- Carbon intensity of electricity supplied
- Fleet and model year distribution of vehicles which influences emission factors

The user should be able to adjust the methodologies to: (1) calculate the baseline for a given mitigation measure; and then (2) incorporate the appropriate data and assumptions into the calculations for the emission mitigation associated with the measure.

There is at least one mitigation measure that will not be applicable outside of California unless adjustments are made by substituting location-specific factors in the baseline methodology: the improvement beyond Title 24 (BE-1) is not applicable outside of California since buildings outside California would be subject to different building codes. The project Applicant may be able to estimate a baseline energy use for building envelope systems under other building standards and estimate the change in energy use for improvements to building envelope systems using building energy software or literature surveys.

---

<sup>6</sup> Climate zones are specific geographic areas of similar climatic characteristics, including temperature, weather, and other factors which affect building energy use. The California Energy Commission identified 16 Forecasting Climate Zones (FCZs) within California.

### How to Use a Fact Sheet to Quantify a Project

This section provides step-by-step instructions and an example regarding how a fact sheet can be used. After choosing the appropriate fact sheet(s), follow these general steps. Steps may need to be adjusted for different types of fact sheets.

**Step 1: Does this fact sheet apply?**

Carefully read the measure's description and applicability to ensure that you are using the correct fact sheet.

**Step 2: Is the measure "grouped"?**

Check Tables 6-1 to 6-9 to see if the measure is "grouped" with other measures. If it is, then all measures in the group must be implemented together.

**Step 3: Review defaults**

Review the default assumptions in the fact sheet.

**Step 4: Data inputs**

Determine the type of data and data sources necessary. Refer to Appendix B and other suggested documents.

**Step 5: Calculate baseline emissions**

Calculate baseline emissions using formulas provided in the fact sheet.

**Step 6: Percent reductions**

If applicable, calculate the percent reduction for the specific action in the measure.

**Step 7: Quantify reductions**

Quantify emission reductions for a particular mitigation measure using the provided formula.

**Step 8: Grouped measures**

If you are using a mitigation measure that is grouped with another measure, refer to Tables 6-1 to 6-9 and complete the calculations for all measures that are grouped together for a particular mitigation strategy.

**Step 9: Multiple measures**

See Chapter 6 for how to combine reductions from multiple measures.

**IMPORTANT:** Clearly document information such as data sources, data used, and calculations.

**Example:**

The following is an example calculation for a building project that will use Fact Sheet 2.1.1 - *Exceed Title 24 Building Envelope Energy Efficiency Standards by X%*. In this example, a large office building is being built, and it will be designed to do 10% more than Title 24 standards for both electricity and natural gas.

➤ **Step 1 – Does this fact sheet apply?**

The project and fact sheet have been reviewed, and YES, this fact sheet is appropriate to use to estimate reductions from the project.

➤ **Step 2 - Is the measure “grouped”?**

NO, this is a measure that does not have to be done with other measures.

➤ **Step 3 – Review defaults**

Default assumptions and emission factors have been reviewed and used, as appropriate.

➤ **Steps 4 – Data inputs**

The table below shows the data needed for the example, the sample data input, and the source of the sample data. Make sure the data use the units specified in the equation. \*

| Data for Fact Sheet 2.1.1 Example         |                                    |                       |
|---|------------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Data Needed                               | Input                              | Source of Data        |
| Project type                              | Commercial land use = Large Office | User Input            |
| Size                                      | 100,000 sq. ft                     | User Input            |
| Climate Zone                              | 1                                  | From Figure BE 1.1    |
| Electricity Intensity <sub>baseline</sub> | 8.32 kWh/SF/yr                     | From Fact Sheet 2.1.1 |
| Utility Provider                          | PG&E                               | User Input            |
| Emission Factor <sub>Electricity</sub>    | 2.08E-4 MT CO <sub>2</sub> e/kWh   | Fact Sheet 2.1.1      |
| Natural Gas Intensity <sub>baseline</sub> | 18.16 kBtu/SF/yr                   | From Fact Sheet 2.1.1 |
| Emission Factor <sub>NaturalGas</sub>     | 5.32E-5 MT CO <sub>2</sub> e/therm | From Fact Sheet 2.1.1 |
| % Reduction Commitment                    | 10% over 2008 Title 24 Standards   | User Input            |

➤ **Step 5 – Calculate baseline emissions**

Once all necessary information has been obtained, use the equation provided to determine the baseline emissions. Round results to the nearest MT.

$$\Rightarrow \text{GHG Emissions Baseline}_{\text{Electricity}} = \text{Electricity Intensity}_{\text{Baseline}} \times \text{Size} \times \text{Emission Factor}_{\text{Electricity}}$$

$$= 8.32 \text{ kWh/SF/yr} \times 100,000 \text{ SF} \times (2.08\text{E-}4 \text{ MT CO}_2\text{e/kWh})$$

$$= \mathbf{173 \text{ MT CO}_2\text{e/yr [Baseline GHG Emissions for Electricity]}$$

$$\Rightarrow \text{GHG Emissions Baseline}_{\text{Natural Gas}} = \text{Natural Gas Intensity}_{\text{Baseline}} \times \text{Size} \times \text{Emission Factor}_{\text{Natural Gas}}$$

$$= 18.16 \text{ kBtu/SF/yr} \times 100,000 \text{ SF} \times (5.32\text{E-}5 \text{ MT CO}_2\text{e/kBtu})$$

$$= \mathbf{97 \text{ MT CO}_2\text{e/yr [Baseline GHG Emissions for Natural Gas]}$$

$$\Rightarrow \text{GHG Emissions}_{\text{Baseline}} = \text{GHG Emissions Baseline}_{\text{Electricity}} + \text{GHG Emissions Baseline}_{\text{Natural Gas}}$$

$$= 173 \text{ MT CO}_2\text{e/yr} + 97 \text{ MT CO}_2\text{e/yr}$$

$$= \mathbf{270 \text{ MT CO}_2\text{e/yr}}$$

➤ **Step 6 – Percent reductions**

Now calculate the percent GHG emission reduction based on the stated improvement goal. In this example the goal is a 10% reduction over Title 24 Energy Efficiency Standards. See Table BE-1.1 for data used for this step.

- ⇒ Reduction<sub>Electricity</sub> from 1% over 2008 Title 24 Standards = 0.20%
- Reduction<sub>NaturalGas</sub> from 1% over 2008 Title 24 Standards = 1.00%

From Table BE-1.1

- ⇒ Multiply the Percent Factor from Table BE-1.1 by the Percent Reduction Commitment (10% for this example)

Reduction in GHG emissions from electricity generation:

$$\begin{aligned}
 &= 0.20\% \times 10 \\
 &= 2\%
 \end{aligned}
 \left. \vphantom{\begin{aligned} &= 0.20\% \times 10 \\ &= 2\% \end{aligned}} \right\} \text{Reduction Percentage} \\
 &\hspace{10em} \text{X 10\% goal}$$

Reduction in GHG emissions from natural gas combustion:

$$\begin{aligned}
 &= 1\% \times 10 \\
 &= 10\%
 \end{aligned}
 \left. \vphantom{\begin{aligned} &= 1\% \times 10 \\ &= 10\% \end{aligned}} \right\} \text{Reduction Percentage} \\
 &\hspace{10em} \text{X 10\% goal}$$

### ➤ Step 7 – Quantify reductions

Using the percent reductions, the emission reductions can be calculated, as shown below.

- ⇒ Total Building GHG emissions = GHG Emissions Baseline<sub>Electricity</sub> x (Reduction<sub>Electricity</sub>) + GHG Emissions Baseline<sub>NaturalGas</sub> x (Reduction<sub>NaturalGas</sub>)

$$\begin{aligned}
 &= 173 \text{ MT CO}_2\text{e/yr} \times \left(\frac{100\% - 2\%}{100}\right) + 97 \text{ MT CO}_2\text{e/yr} \times \left(\frac{100\% - 10\%}{100}\right) \\
 &= \mathbf{257 \text{ MT CO}_2\text{e/yr}}
 \end{aligned}$$

Net reductions are the difference between the baseline emissions and the emissions calculated above for what will occur with this strategy implemented.

- ⇒ Net reductions = Baseline – Total Building GHG Emissions

$$\begin{aligned}
 &= 270 \text{ MT CO}_2\text{e/yr} - 257 \text{ MT CO}_2\text{e/yr} \\
 &= \mathbf{13 \text{ MT CO}_2\text{e/yr}}
 \end{aligned}$$

This shows that a 10% improvement in energy consumption over 2008 Title 24 Standards from electricity and natural gas will result in a GHG reduction of 13 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e/yr.

➤ **Step 8 – Grouped measures**

In this example, the measure is not grouped. For grouped measures, refer to Tables 6-1 to 6-9 in Chapter 6 for how to combine reductions.

➤ **Step 9 – Multiple measures**

See “Rules for Combining Strategies or Measures” section in Chapter 6 for how to add reductions from multiple measures

(page intentionally left blank)

### 1.0 Introduction

Chapter 7 is made up of a series of Fact Sheets. Each sheet summarizes the quantification methodology for a specific mitigation measure. As described in Chapter 6, the measures are grouped into Categories, and, in some cases, into subcategories. For information about the development of the Fact Sheets, please see Chapter 4. For a discussion of specific quantification issues in select measure categories or subcategories, please refer to Chapter 5. Chapter 6 provides a detailed explanation of the organization and layout of the Fact Sheets, including rules that govern the quantification of measures that have been, or will be, implemented in combination.

In order to facilitate navigation through, and the use of, the Fact Sheets, they have been color coded to reflect the Category the measure is in, and if applicable, the subcategory. The color scheme is shown in Charts 6-1 and 6-2, and also in Table 7-1 (below).

The colored bar at the top of each Fact Sheet corresponds to the Category color as shown in Charts 6-1 and 6-2, and in Table 7-1; the Category name is shown in the colored bar at the left hand margin. The second colored bar, immediately below the first one, shows the name of the subcategory, if any, and corresponds to subcategory color in those charts and tables. The subcategory name appears at the right hand margin.

At the left hand margin, below the Category name, is a cross-reference to the corresponding measure in the previous two CAPCOA reports (*CEQA and GHG*; and *Model Policies for GHG in General Plans*). The term “MP#” refers to a measure in the Model Policies document. The term CEQA# refers to a measure in the CEQA and GHG report.

At the bottom of the page is a colored bar that corresponds to the Category, and, where applicable, there is a colored box at the right hand margin, contiguous with the colored bar. This color of the box corresponds to the subcategory, where applicable. The box contains the measure number.

The layout of information in each Fact Sheet is covered in detail in Chapter 6.

Table 7-1, below, provides an index and cross-reference for the measure Fact Sheets. It is color-coded, as explained above, and may be used as a key to more quickly and easily navigate through the Fact Sheets

**Table 7-1: Measure Index & Cross Reference**

| Section    | Category  | Page #     | Measure # | BMP | MP #                | CEQA #              |
|------------|---|------------|-----------|-----|---------------------|---------------------|
| <b>2.0</b> | <b>Energy</b>   | <b>85</b>  |           |     |                     |                     |
| <b>2.1</b> | <b>Building Energy Use</b>  | <b>85</b>  |           |     |                     |                     |
| 2.1.1      | Buildings Exceed Title 24 Building Envelope Energy Efficiency Standards By X% | 85         | BE-1      |     | EE-2                | MM-E6               |
| 2.1.2      | Install Programmable Thermostat Timers  | 99         | BE-2      | x   | EE-2                | -                   |
| 2.1.3      | Obtain Third-party HVAC Commissioning and Verification of Energy Savings      | 101        | BE-3      | x   | EE-2                | -                   |
| 2.1.4      | Install Energy Efficient Appliances   | 103        | BE-4      |     | EE-2.1.6            | MM E-19             |
| 2.1.5      | Install Energy Efficient Boilers  | 111        | BE-5      |     | -                   | -                   |
| <b>2.2</b> | <b>Lighting</b>   | <b>115</b> |           |     |                     |                     |
| 2.2.1      | Install Higher Efficacy Public Street and Area Lighting                       | 115        | LE-1      |     | EE-2.1.5            | -                   |
| 2.2.2      | Limit Outdoor Lighting Requirements   | 119        | LE-2      | x   | EE-2.3              | -                   |
| 2.2.3      | Replace Traffic Lights with LED Traffic Lights                                | 122        | LE-3      |     | EE-2.1.5            | -                   |
| <b>2.3</b> | <b>Alternative Energy Generation</b>  | <b>125</b> |           |     |                     |                     |
| 2.3.1      | Establish Onsite Renewable Energy Systems-Generic                             | 125        | AE-1      |     | AE-2.1              | MM E-5              |
| 2.3.2      | Establish Onsite Renewable Energy Systems-Solar Power                         | 128        | AE-2      |     | AE-2.1              | MM E-5              |
| 2.3.3      | Establish Onsite Renewable Energy Systems-Wind Power                          | 132        | AE-3      |     | AE-2.1              | MM E-5              |
| 2.3.4      | Utilize a Combined Heat and Power System                                      | 135        | AE-4      |     | AE-2                | -                   |
| 2.3.5      | Establish Methane Recovery in Landfills                                       | 143        | AE-5      |     | WRD-1               | -                   |
| 2.3.6      | Establish Methane Recovery in Wastewater Treatment Plants                     | 149        | AE-6      |     |                     |                     |
| <b>3.0</b> | <b>Transportation</b>   | <b>155</b> |           |     |                     |                     |
| <b>3.1</b> | <b>Land Use/Location</b>  | <b>155</b> |           |     |                     |                     |
| 3.1.1      | Increase Density  | 155        | LUT-1     |     | LU-1.5 & LU-2.1.8   | MM D-1 & D-4        |
| 3.1.2      | Increase Location Efficiency  | 159        | LUT-2     |     | LU-3.3              | -                   |
| 3.1.3      | Increase Diversity of Urban and Suburban Developments (Mixed Use)             | 162        | LUT-3     |     | LU-2                | MM D-9 & D-4        |
| 3.1.4      | Increase Destination Accessibility  | 167        | LUT-4     |     | LU-2.1.4            | MM D-3              |
| 3.1.5      | Increase Transit Accessibility  | 171        | LUT-5     |     | LU-1,LU-4           | MM D-2              |
| 3.1.6      | Integrate Affordable and Below Market Rate Housing                            | 176        | LUT-6     |     | LU-2.1.8            | MM D-7              |
| 3.1.7      | Orient Project Toward Non-Auto Corridor                                       | 179        | LUT-7     |     | LU-4.2              | LUT-3               |
| 3.1.8      | Locate Project near Bike Path/Bike Lane                                       | 181        | LUT-8     |     | -                   | LUT-4               |
| 3.1.9      | Improve Design of Development   | 182        | LUT-9     |     | -                   | -                   |
| <b>3.2</b> | <b>Neighborhood/Site Enhancements</b>   | <b>186</b> |           |     |                     |                     |
| 3.2.1      | Provide Pedestrian Network Improvements                                       | 186        | SDT-1     |     | LU-4                | MM-T-6              |
| 3.2.2      | Provide Traffic Calming Measures  | 190        | SDT-2     |     | LU-1.6              | MM-T-8              |
| 3.2.3      | Implement a Neighborhood Electric Vehicle (NEV) Network                       | 194        | SDT-3     |     | TR-6                | MM-D-6              |
| 3.2.4      | Create Urban Non-Motorized Zones  | 198        | SDT-4     |     | LU-3.2.1 & 4.1.4    | SDT-1               |
| 3.2.5      | Incorporate Bike Lane Street Design (on-site)                                 | 200        | SDT-5     |     | TR-4.1              | LUT-9               |
| 3.2.6      | Provide Bike Parking in Non-Residential Projects                              | 202        | SDT-6     |     | TR-4.1              | MM T-1              |
| 3.2.7      | Provide Bike Parking with Multi-Unit Residential Projects                     | 204        | SDT-7     |     | TR-4.1.2            | MM T-3              |
| 3.2.8      | Provide Electric Vehicle Parking  | 205        | SDT-8     |     | TR-5.4              | MM T-17 & E-11      |
| 3.2.9      | Dedicate Land for Bike Trails   | 206        | SDT-9     |     | TR-4.1              | LUT-9               |
| <b>3.3</b> | <b>Parking Policy/Pricing</b>   | <b>207</b> |           |     |                     |                     |
| 3.3.1      | Limit Parking Supply  | 207        | PDT-1     |     | LU-1.7 & LU-2.1.1.4 | -                   |
| 3.3.2      | Unbundle Parking Costs from Property Cost                                     | 210        | PDT-2     |     | LU-1.7              | -                   |
| 3.3.3      | Implement Market Price Public Parking (On-Street)                             | 213        | PDT-3     |     | -                   | -                   |
| 3.3.4      | Require Residential Area Parking Permits                                      | 217        | PDT-4     |     | -                   | PDT-1, PDT-2, PDT-3 |

## Fact Sheets

| Section    | Category  | Page #     | Measure # | BMP | MP #                 | CEQA #          |
|------------|---|------------|-----------|-----|----------------------|-----------------|
| <b>3.4</b> | <b>Commute Trip Reduction Programs</b>                                      | <b>218</b> |           |     |                      |                 |
| 3.4.1      | Implement Commute Trip Reduction Program - Voluntary                        | 218        | TRT-1     |     | -                    | -               |
|            | Implement Commute Trip Reduction Program – Required                         |            |           |     |                      |                 |
| 3.4.2      | Implementation/Monitoring   | 223        | TRT-2     |     | MO-3.1               | T-19            |
| 3.4.3      | Provide Ride-Sharing Programs   | 227        | TRT-3     |     | MO-3.1               | -               |
| 3.4.4      | Implement Subsidized or Discounted Transit Program                          | 230        | TRT-4     |     | MO-3.1               | -               |
|            |   |            |           |     |                      | TRT-1, TRT-2,   |
| 3.4.5      | Provide End of Trip Facilities  | 234        | TRT-5     |     | MO-3.2               | TRT-3           |
| 3.4.6      | Encourage Telecommuting and Alternative Work Schedules                      | 236        | TRT-6     |     | TR-3.5               | -               |
| 3.4.7      | Implement Commute Trip Reduction Marketing                                  | 240        | TRT-7     |     | -                    | -               |
|            |   |            |           |     |                      | TRT-1, TRT-2,   |
| 3.4.8      | Implement Preferential Parking Permit Program                               | 244        | TRT-8     |     | TR-3.1               | TRT-3           |
| 3.4.9      | Implement Car-Sharing Program   | 245        | TRT-9     |     | -                    | -               |
| 3.4.10     | Implement a School Pool Program   | 250        | TRT-10    |     | -                    | -               |
| 3.4.11     | Provide Employer-Sponsored Vanpool/Shuttle                                  | 253        | TRT-11    |     | MO-3.1               | -               |
| 3.4.12     | Implement Bike-Sharing Programs   | 256        | TRT-12    |     | -                    | SDT-5, LUT-9    |
| 3.4.13     | Implement School Bus Program  | 258        | TRT-13    |     | TR-3.4               | -               |
| 3.4.14     | Price Workplace Parking   | 261        | TRT-14    |     | -                    | -               |
| 3.4.15     | Implement Employee Parking “Cash-Out”                                       | 266        | TRT-15    |     | TR-5.3               | MM T-9          |
| <b>3.5</b> | <b>Transit System Improvements</b>  | <b>270</b> |           |     |                      |                 |
| 3.5.1      | Provide a Bus Rapid Transit System  | 270        | TST-1     |     | -                    | MS-G3           |
| 3.5.2      | Implement Transit Access Improvements                                       | 275        | TST-2     |     | LU-3.4.3             | TST-3, TST-4    |
| 3.5.3      | Expand Transit Network  | 276        | TST-3     |     | -                    | MS-G3           |
| 3.5.4      | Increase Transit Service Frequency/Speed                                    | 280        | TST-4     |     | -                    | MS-G3           |
| 3.5.5      | Provide Bike Parking Near Transit   | 285        | TST-5     |     | TR-4.1.4             | TST-3, TST-4    |
| 3.5.6      | Provide Local Shuttles  | 286        | TST-6     |     |                      | TST-3, TST-4    |
| <b>3.6</b> | <b>Road Pricing/Management</b>  | <b>287</b> |           |     |                      |                 |
| 3.6.1      | Implement Area or Cordon Pricing  | 287        | RPT-1     |     | TR-3.6               | -               |
|            |   |            |           |     | TR-2.1,              |                 |
| 3.6.2      | Improve Traffic Flow  | 291        | RPT-2     |     | TR-2.2               | -               |
|            | Required Project Contributions to Transportation Infrastructure Improvement |            |           |     |                      | RPT-2, TST-1 to |
| 3.6.3      | Projects  | 297        | RPT-3     |     | -                    | 6               |
| 3.6.4      |   | 298        |           |     |                      | RPT-1, TRT-11,  |
|            | Install Park-and-Ride Lots  |            | RPT-4     |     | TR-1                 | 6               |
| <b>3.7</b> | <b>Vehicles</b>   | <b>300</b> |           |     |                      |                 |
| 3.7.1      | Electrify Loading Docks and/or Require Idling-Reduction Systems             | 300        | VT-1      |     | TR-6                 | -               |
| 3.7.2      | Utilize Alternative Fueled Vehicles   | 304        | VT-2      |     | -                    | MM T-21         |
| 3.7.3      | Utilize Electric or Hybrid Vehicles   | 309        | VT-3      |     | -                    | MM T-20         |
| <b>4.0</b> | <b>Water</b>  | <b>332</b> |           |     |                      |                 |
| <b>4.1</b> | <b>Water Supply</b>   | <b>332</b> |           |     |                      |                 |
| 4.1.1      | Use Reclaimed Water   | 332        | WSW-1     |     | COS-1.3              | MS-G-8          |
| 4.1.2      | Use Gray Water  | 336        | WSW-2     |     | COS-2.3              | -               |
| 4.1.3      | Use Locally Sourced Water Supply  | 341        | WSW-3     |     | -                    | -               |
| <b>4.2</b> | <b>Water Use</b>  | <b>347</b> |           |     |                      |                 |
| 4.2.1      | Install Low-Flow Water Fixtures   | 347        | WUW-1     |     | EE-2.1.6;<br>COS 2.2 | MM-E23          |
| 4.2.2      | Adopt a Water Conservation Strategy   | 362        | WUW-2     |     | COS-1.               | MS-G-8          |
| 4.2.3      | Design Water-Efficient Landscapes   | 365        | WUW-3     |     | COS-2.1              | -               |
| 4.2.4      | Use Water-Efficient Landscape Irrigation Systems                            | 372        | WUW-4     |     | COS-3.1              | MS-G-8          |
| 4.2.5      | Reduce Turf in Landscapes and Lawns   | 376        | WUW-5     |     | -                    | -               |
| 4.2.6      | Plant Native or Drought-Resistant Trees and Vegetation                      | 381        | WUW-6     | x   | COS-3.1              | MM D-16         |

| Section     | Category   | Page #     | Measure # | BMP | MP #                | CEQA #                            |
|-------------|--|------------|-----------|-----|---------------------|-----------------------------------|
| <b>5.0</b>  | <b>Area Landscaping</b>  | <b>384</b> |           |     |                     |                                   |
| 5.1         | Landscaping Equipment  | 384        |           |     |                     |                                   |
| 5.1.1       | Prohibit Gas Powered Landscape Equipment.                              | 384        | A-1       |     | -                   | -                                 |
| 5.1.2       | Implement Lawnmower Exchange Program                                   | 389        | A-2       | x   | EE-4.2              | MM D-13<br>A-1 or A-2; MM<br>D-14 |
| 5.1.3       | Electric Yard Equipment Compatibility                                  | 391        | A-3       | x   | MO-2.4              | D-14                              |
| <b>6.0</b>  | <b>Solid Waste</b>   | <b>392</b> |           |     |                     |                                   |
| 6.1         | Solid Waste  | 392        |           |     |                     |                                   |
| 6.1.1       | Institute or Extend Recycling and Composting Services                  | 401        | SW-1      | x   | WRD-2               | MM D-14                           |
| 6.1.2       | Recycle Demolished Construction Material                               | 402        | SW-2      | x   | WRD-2.3             | MM C-4                            |
| <b>7.0</b>  | <b>Vegetation</b>  | <b>402</b> |           |     |                     |                                   |
| 7.1         | Vegetation   | 402        |           |     |                     |                                   |
| 7.1.1       | Urban Tree Planting  | 402        | V-1       |     | COS-3.3,<br>COS 3.2 | GP-4, MM T-14                     |
| 7.1.2       | Create New Vegetated Open Space  | 406        | V-2       |     | COS-4.1             | -                                 |
| <b>8.0</b>  | <b>Construction</b>  | <b>410</b> |           |     |                     |                                   |
| 8.1         | Construction   | 410        |           |     |                     |                                   |
| 8.1.1       | Use Alternative Fuels for Construction Equipment                       | 410        | C-1       |     | TR-6, EE-1          | MM C-2                            |
| 8.1.2       | Use Electric and Hybrid Construction Equipment                         | 420        | C-2       |     | TR-6, EE-1          | -                                 |
| 8.1.3       | Limit Construction Equipment Idling beyond Regulation Requirements     | 428        | C-3       |     | TR-6.2              | -                                 |
| 8.1.4       | Institute a Heavy-Duty Off-Road Vehicle Plan                           | 431        | C-4       | x   | TR-6.2,<br>EE-1     | Any C                             |
| 8.1.5       | Implement a Construction Vehicle Inventory Tracking System             | 432        | C-5       | x   | -                   | -                                 |
| <b>9.0</b>  | <b>Miscellaneous</b>   | <b>433</b> |           |     |                     |                                   |
| 9.1         | Miscellaneous  | 433        |           |     |                     |                                   |
| 9.1.1       | Establish a Carbon Sequestration Project                               | 433        | Misc-1    |     | LU-5                | -                                 |
| 9.1.2       | Establish Off-Site Mitigation  | 435        | Misc-2    |     | -                   | -                                 |
| 9.1.3       | Use Local and Sustainable Building Materials                           | 437        | Misc-3    | x   | EE-1                | MM C-3, E-17                      |
| 9.1.4       | Require Best Management Practices in Agriculture and Animal Operations | 439        | Misc-4    | x   | -                   | -                                 |
| 9.1.5       | Require Environmentally Responsible Purchasing                         | 440        | Misc-5    | x   | MO-6.1              | -                                 |
| 9.1.6       | Implement an Innovative Strategy for GHG Mitigation                    | 442        | Misc-6    | x   | -                   | -                                 |
| <b>10.0</b> | <b>General Plans</b>   | <b>444</b> |           |     |                     |                                   |
| 10.1        | General Plans  | 444        |           |     |                     |                                   |
| 10.1.1      | Fund Incentives for Energy Efficiency                                  | 444        | GP-1      | x   | -                   | -                                 |
| 10.1.2      | Establish a Local Farmer's Market                                      | 446        | GP-2      | x   | LU-2.1.4            | MM D-18                           |
| 10.1.3      | Establish Community Gardens  | 448        | GP-3      | x   | LU-2.1.4            | MM D-19                           |
| 10.1.4      | Plant Urban Shade Trees  | 450        | GP-4      | x   | COS-3.2             | V-1, MM T-14                      |
| 10.1.5      | Implement Strategies to Reduce Urban Heat-Island Effect                | 455        | GP-5      | x   | LU-6.1              | MM E-8, E-12                      |

| Section    | Category  | Page #     | Measure # |
|------------|---|------------|-----------|
| <b>2.0</b> | <b>Energy</b>   | <b>85</b>  |           |
| <b>2.1</b> | <b>Building Energy Use</b>  | <b>85</b>  |           |
| 2.1.1      | Buildings Exceed Title 24 Building Envelope Energy Efficiency Standards By X% | 85         | BE-1      |
| 2.1.2      | Install Programmable Thermostat Timers  | 99         | BE-2      |
| 2.1.3      | Obtain Third-party HVAC Commissioning and Verification of Energy Savings      | 101        | BE-3      |
| 2.1.4      | Install Energy Efficient Appliances   | 103        | BE-4      |
| 2.1.5      | Install Energy Efficient Boilers  | 111        | BE-5      |
| <b>2.2</b> | <b>Lighting</b>   | <b>115</b> |           |
| 2.2.1      | Install Higher Efficacy Public Street and Area Lighting                       | 115        | LE-1      |
| 2.2.2      | Limit Outdoor Lighting Requirements   | 119        | LE-2      |
| 2.2.3      | Replace Traffic Lights with LED Traffic Lights                                | 122        | LE-3      |
| <b>2.3</b> | <b>Alternative Energy Generation</b>  | <b>125</b> |           |
| 2.3.1      | Establish Onsite Renewable or Carbon-Neutral Energy Systems-Generic           | 125        | AE-1      |
| 2.3.2      | Establish Onsite Renewable Energy Systems-Solar Power                         | 128        | AE-2      |
| 2.3.3      | Establish Onsite Renewable Energy Systems-Wind Power                          | 132        | AE-3      |
| 2.3.4      | Utilize a Combined Heat and Power System                                      | 135        | AE-4      |
| 2.3.5      | Establish Methane Recovery in Landfills                                       | 143        | AE-5      |
| 2.3.6      | Establish Methane Recovery in Wastewater Treatment Plants                     | 149        | AE-6      |



# Energy

CEQA# MM-E6  
MP# EE-2

## BE-1

## Building Energy

## 2.0 Energy

### 2.1 Building Energy Use

To determine overall reductions, the ratio of building energy associated GHG emissions to the other project categories needs to be determined. This percent contribution to the total is multiplied by the percentage reduction.

#### 2.1.1 Buildings Exceed Title 24 Building Envelope Energy Efficiency Standards By X%<sup>1</sup>

(X is equal to the percentage improvement selected by Applicant such as 5%, 10%, or 20%)

#### Range of Effectiveness:

For a 10% improvement beyond Title 24 the range of effectiveness is:

|                 | Electricity | Natural Gas |
|-----------------|-------------|-------------|
| Non-residential | 0.2 – 5.5%  | 0.7 – 10%   |
| Residential     | 0.3 – 2.6%  | 7.5 – 9.1%  |

This is dependent on building type and climate zones.

#### Measure Description:

Greenhouse gases (GHGs) are emitted as a result of activities in residential and commercial buildings when electricity and natural gas are used as energy sources. New California buildings must be designed to meet the building energy efficiency standards of Title 24, also known as the California Building Standards Code. Title 24 Part 6 regulates energy uses including space heating and cooling, hot water heating, and ventilation<sup>2</sup>. By committing to a percent improvement over Title 24, a development reduces its energy use and resulting GHG emissions.

<sup>1</sup> Compliance with Title 24 is determined from the total daily valuation (TDV) of energy use in the built-environment (on a per square foot per year basis). TDV energy use is a parameter that reflects the burden that a building imposes on an electricity supply system. In general, there is a larger electricity demand and, hence, stress on the supply system during the day (peak times) than at night (off peak). Since a TDV analysis requires significant knowledge about the actual building which is not typically available during the CEQA process, the estimate of the energy and GHG savings from an improvement over Title 24 energy use from a TDV basis is proportional to the actual energy use.

<sup>2</sup> Hardwired lighting is part of Title 24 part 6. However, it is not part of the building envelope energy use and therefore not considered as part of this mitigation measure.

# Energy

CEQA# MM-E6  
MP# EE-2

## BE-1

## Building Energy

The energy use of a building is dependent on the building type, size and climate zone it is located in.

The *California Commercial Energy Use Survey (CEUS)* and *Residential Appliance Saturation Survey (RASS)* datasets can be used for these calculations since the data is scalable size and available for several land use categories in different climate zones in California.

The Title 24 standards have been updated twice (in 2005 and 2008) since some of these data were compiled. The California Energy Commission (CEC) has published reports estimating the percentage deductions in energy use resulting from these new standards. Based on CEC's discussion on average savings for Title 24 improvements, these CEC savings percentages by end user can be used to account for reductions in electricity and natural gas use due to updates to Title 24. Since energy use for each different system type (i.e., heating, cooling, water heating, and ventilation) as well as appliances is defined, this method will also easily allow for application of mitigation measures aimed at reducing the energy use of these devices in a prescriptive manner.

### Measure Applicability:

- Electricity and natural gas use in residential and commercial buildings subject to California's Title 24 building requirements.
- This measure is part of a grouped measure. To ensure the measure effectiveness, this measure also requires third-party HVAC commissioning and verification of energy savings such as including the results from an alternative compliance model indicating the energy savings.

### Inputs:

The following information needs to be provided by the Project Applicant:

- Square footage of non-residential buildings
- Number of dwelling units
- Building/Housing Type
- Climate Zone<sup>3</sup>
- Total electricity demand (KWh) per dwelling unit or per square feet
- % reduction commitment (over 2008 Title 24 standards)

### Baseline Method:

The baseline GHG emissions from electricity and natural gas usage (reflecting 2008 Title 24 standards with no energy-efficient appliances) are calculated as follows:

---

<sup>3</sup> See Figure BE-1.1.

# Energy

CEQA# MM-E6  
MP# EE-2

## BE-1

## Building Energy

$$\text{GHG Emissions Baseline}_{\text{Electricity}} = \text{Electricity Intensity}_{\text{baseline}} \times \text{Size} \times \text{Emission Factor}_{\text{Electricity}}$$

$$\text{GHG Emissions Baseline}_{\text{NaturalGas}} = \text{Natural Gas Intensity}_{\text{baseline}} \times \text{Size} \times \text{Emission Factor}_{\text{NaturalGas}}$$

Where:

$$\text{Electricity Intensity}_{\text{baseline}} = \text{Total electricity demand (kWh) per dwelling unit or per square foot; provided by applicant and adjusted for 2008 Title 24 standards (calculated based on CEUS and RASS)}^4$$

$$\text{Natural Gas Intensity}_{\text{baseline}} = \text{Total natural gas demand (kBTU or therms) per dwelling unit or per square foot; provided by applicant and adjusted for 2008 Title 24 standards (calculated based on CEUS and RASS)}^5$$

$$\text{Emission Factor}_{\text{Electricity}} = \text{Carbon intensity of local utility (CO}_2\text{e/kWh)}^6$$

$$\text{Emission Factor}_{\text{NaturalGas}} = \text{Carbon intensity of natural gas use (CO}_2\text{e/kBTU or CO}_2\text{e/therm)}^7$$

$$\text{Size} = \text{Number of dwelling units or square footage of commercial land uses}$$

### Mitigation Method:

$$\text{GHG reduction \%}_{\text{Mitigated\_Electricity}} = \text{Reduction}_{\text{Electricity}} \times \text{Reduction Commitment}$$

$$\text{GHG reduction \%}_{\text{Mitigated\_NaturalGas}} = \text{Reduction}_{\text{NaturalGas}} \times \text{Reduction Commitment}$$

Where:

$$\text{Reduction} = \text{Applicable reduction based on climate zone, building type, and energy type from Tables BE-1.1 and BE-1.2}$$

$$\text{Reduction Commitment} = \text{Project's reduction commitment beyond 2008 Title 24 standards (expressed as a whole number)}$$

This should be done for each individual building type. If the project involves multiple building types or only a percentage of buildings will have reductions the total for all buildings needs to be determined. This percentage should be applied as follows and summed over all buildings types:

<sup>4</sup> See Appendix B for baseline inventory calculation methodologies to assist in determining these values.

<sup>5</sup> See Appendix B for baseline inventory calculation methodologies to assist in determining these values.

<sup>6</sup> Ibid.

<sup>7</sup> Ibid.

# Energy

CEQA# MM-E6  
MP# EE-2

## BE-1

## Building Energy

$$\sum_i (Reduction \times Commitment) \left( \frac{buildingGHG_i}{TotalGHG_i} \right) (\%BuildingType)$$

- buildingGHG<sub>i</sub>* = GHG emissions for specific building type for either electricity or natural gas
- TotalGHG<sub>i</sub>* = Total GHG emissions for all buildings for either electricity or natural gas
- i* = electricity or natural gas
- %BuildingType* = portion of building(s) of this type

Tables BE-1.1 and BE-1.2 tabulate the percent reductions from building energy use for each land use type in the various climate zones in California. There is one table for residential land uses and another for non-residential land uses. There is a column for electricity reductions and another for natural gas reductions.

### Assumptions:

See Figure BE-1.1 below for a map showing the 16 Climate Zones. Data for some Climate Zones is not presented in the CEUS and RASS studies. However, data from similar Climate Zones is representative and can be used as follows:

For non-residential building types:

- Climate Zone 9 should be used for Climate Zone 11.
- Climate Zone 9 should be used for Climate Zone 12.
- Climate Zone 1 should be used for Climate Zone 14.
- Climate Zone 10 should be used for Climate Zone 15.

For residential building types:

- Climate Zone 2 should be used for Climate Zone 6.
- Climate Zone 1 should be used for Climate Zone 14.
- Climate Zone 10 should be used for Climate Zone 15.

Data based upon the following references:

- CEC. 2009. Residential Compliance Manual for California's 2008 Energy Efficiency Standards. Available online at: [http://www.energy.ca.gov/title24/2008standards/residential\\_manual.html](http://www.energy.ca.gov/title24/2008standards/residential_manual.html)
- CEC. 2009. Nonresidential Compliance Manual for California's 2008 Energy Efficiency Standards. Available online at: [http://www.energy.ca.gov/title24/2008standards/nonresidential\\_manual.html](http://www.energy.ca.gov/title24/2008standards/nonresidential_manual.html)
- CEC. 2004. Residential Appliance Saturation Survey. Available online at: <http://www.energy.ca.gov/appliances/rass/>

# Energy

CEQA# MM-E6  
MP# EE-2

## BE-1

## Building Energy

- CEC. 2006. Commercial End-Use Survey. Available online at: <http://www.energy.ca.gov/ceus/>

### Emission Reduction Ranges and Variables:

[Refer to Attached Tables BE-1.1 and BE-1.2 for climate zone and land use specific percentages]

This information uses 2008 Title 24 information. To adjust to 2005 Title 24, see Table BE-1.3.

| Pollutant         | Category Emissions Reductions  |
|-------------------|--|
| CO <sub>2</sub> e | See Tables BE-1.1 and BE-1.2 for percentage reductions for every 1% improvement over 2008 Title 24.            |
| PM                | See Tables BE-1.1 and BE-1.2 for percentage reduction from natural gas. There is no reduction for electricity. |
| CO                | See Tables BE-1.1 and BE-1.2 for percentage reduction from natural gas. There is no reduction for electricity. |
| SO <sub>2</sub>   | See Tables BE-1.1 and BE-1.2 for percentage reduction from natural gas. There is no reduction for electricity. |
| NOx               | See Tables BE-1.1 and BE-1.2 for percentage reduction from natural gas. There is no reduction for electricity. |

### Discussion:

If the applicant selects to commit beyond requirements for 2008 Title 24 standards, the applicant would reduce the amount of GHG emissions associated with electricity generation and natural gas combustion.

### Example:

Commercial land use = Large Office

Square footage = 100,000 sq. ft.

Climate Zone = 1

Utility Provider = PG&E

% Reduction Commitment = 10% over 2008 Title 24 Standards

Electricity Intensity<sub>baseline</sub> = 8.32 kWh/SF/yr (adjusted to reflect 2008 Title 24 standards)

Emission Factor<sub>Electricity</sub> = 2.08E-4 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e/kWh

# Energy

CEQA# MM-E6  
MP# EE-2

## BE-1

## Building Energy

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Electricity Emissions}_{\text{baseline}} &= 8.32 \text{ kWh/SF/yr} \times 100,000 \text{ SF} \times (2.08\text{E-}4 \text{ MT CO}_2\text{e/kWh}) \\ &= 173 \text{ MT CO}_2\text{e/yr} \end{aligned}$$

$$\text{Natural Gas Intensity}_{\text{baseline}} = 18.16 \text{ kBtu/SF/yr (adjusted to reflect 2008 Title 24 standards)}$$

$$\text{Emission Factor}_{\text{NaturalGas}} = 5.32\text{E-}5 \text{ MT CO}_2\text{e/therm}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Natural Gas Emissions}_{\text{baseline}} &= 18.16 \text{ kBtu/SF/yr} \times 100,000 \text{ SF} \times (5.32\text{E-}5 \text{ MT CO}_2\text{e/kBtu}) \\ &= 97 \text{ MT CO}_2\text{e/yr} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{GHG emissions}_{\text{baseline}} &= 173 \text{ MT CO}_2\text{e/yr} + 97 \text{ MT CO}_2\text{e/yr} \\ &= 270 \text{ MT CO}_2\text{e/yr} \end{aligned}$$

From Table BE-1.1:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Reduction}_{\text{Electricity}} \text{ from 1\% over 2008 Title 24 Standards} &= 0.20\% \\ \text{Reduction}_{\text{NaturalGas}} \text{ from 1\% over 2008 Title 24 Standards} &= 1.00\% \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Reduction in GHG emissions from electricity generation} &: 0.20\% \times 10 = 2\% \\ \text{Reduction in GHG emissions from natural gas combustion} &: 1\% \times 10 = 10\% \\ \text{Mitigated Building GHG emissions} &= 173 \text{ MT CO}_2\text{e/yr} \times (100\% - 2\%) + \\ &97 \text{ MT CO}_2\text{e/yr} \times (100\% - 10\%) = 257 \text{ CO}_2\text{e/yr} \end{aligned}$$

### Preferred Literature:

GHG reductions from a percent improvement over Title 24 can be quantified by calculating baseline energy usage using methodologies based on the California Energy Commission (CEC)'s Residential Appliance Saturation Survey (RASS) and Commercial End-Use Survey (CEUS), or an applicable Alternative Calculation Method (ACM). RASS and CEUS data are based on CEC Forecasting Climate Zones (FCZs); therefore, differences in project energy usage due to different climates are accounted for. The percent improvement is applied to Title 24 built environment energy uses, and overall GHG emissions are calculated using local utility emission factors. This methodology allows the Project Applicant flexibility in choosing which specific measures it will pursue to achieve the percent reductions (for example, installing higher quality building insulation, or installing a more efficient water heating system), while still making the mitigation commitment at the time of California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) analysis.

### Alternative Literature:

# Energy

CEQA# MM-E6  
MP# EE-2

## BE-1

## Building Energy

Alternatively, a Project Applicant could use the “prescriptive package” approach to demonstrate compliance with Title 24. Using this approach, the Project Applicant would commit to specific design elements above Title 24 prescriptive package requirements at the time of CEQA analysis, such as using solar water heating or improved insulation. Rather than calculating an overall percent reduction in GHG emissions based on an overall baseline value as presented above, the prescriptive approach requires the Project Applicant to break down building energy use by end-use. The Project Applicant would need to provide substantial evidence supporting the GHG reductions attributable to mitigation measures for each end-use. There are several references for quantifying GHG reductions from prescriptive measures. One example of a prescriptive measure is installing tankless or on-demand water heaters. These systems use a gas burner or electric element to heat water as needed and therefore do not use energy to store heated water. According to the U.S. Department of Energy (USDOE), typical tankless water heaters can be 24-34% more energy efficient than conventional storage tank water heaters [1]. Another example of a prescriptive measure is installing geothermal (ground-source or water-source) heat pumps. This measure takes advantage of the fact that the temperature beneath the ground surface is relatively constant. Fluid circulating through underground pipe loops is either heated or cooled and the heat is either upgraded or reduced in the heat pump depending on whether the building requires heating or cooling [2]. United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) reports that ENERGY STAR - qualified geothermal heat pump systems are 30-45% more efficient than conventional heat pumps [3].

### Alternative Literature References:

- [1] USDOE. Energy Savers: Demand (Tankless or Instantaneous) Water Heaters. Accessed February 2010. Available online at:  
[http://www.energysavers.gov/your\\_home/water\\_heating/index.cfm/mytopic=12820](http://www.energysavers.gov/your_home/water_heating/index.cfm/mytopic=12820)
- [2] CEC. Consumer Energy Center: Geothermal or Ground Source Heat Pumps. Accessed February 2010. Available online at:  
[http://www.consumerenergycenter.org/home/heating\\_cooling/geothermal.html](http://www.consumerenergycenter.org/home/heating_cooling/geothermal.html)
- [3] USEPA. ENERGY STAR: Heat Pumps, Geothermal. Accessed February 2010. Available online at:  
[http://www.energystar.gov/index.cfm?fuseaction=find\\_a\\_product.showProductGroup&pgw\\_code=HP](http://www.energystar.gov/index.cfm?fuseaction=find_a_product.showProductGroup&pgw_code=HP)

### Other Literature Reviewed:

None


# Energy

CEQA# MM-E6  
MP# EE-2

## BE-1

## Building Energy

**Figure BE-1.1**  
**CEC Forecast Climate Zones<sup>8,9</sup>**



<sup>8</sup> Adapted from Figure 2 of CEC. 2004. Residential Appliance Saturation Survey. Available online at: <http://www.energy.ca.gov/appliances/rass/>

<sup>9</sup> White spaces represent national parks and forests.

# Energy

CEQA# MM-E6  
MP# EE-2

## BE-1

## Building Energy

**Table BE-1.1**  
**Non-Residential**  
**Reduction for 1% Improvement over 2008 Title 24**

| Climate Zone             | Building Types         | Reduction   |             |
|--------------------------|------------------------|-------------|-------------|
|                          |                        | Electricity | Natural Gas |
| 1                        | All Commercial         | 0.22%       | 0.76%       |
|                          | All Office             | 0.36%       | 1.00%       |
|                          | All Warehouses         | 0.02%       | 0.00%       |
|                          | College                | 0.28%       | 1.00%       |
|                          | Grocery                | 0.08%       | 0.96%       |
|                          | Health                 | 0.33%       | 1.00%       |
|                          | Large Office           | 0.20%       | 1.00%       |
|                          | Lodging                | 0.30%       | 1.00%       |
|                          | Miscellaneous          | 0.16%       | 0.91%       |
|                          | Refrigerated Warehouse | 0.02%       | 0.00%       |
|                          | Restaurant             | 0.19%       | 0.25%       |
|                          | Retail                 | 0.40%       | 1.00%       |
|                          | School                 | 0.26%       | 0.94%       |
|                          | Small Office           | 0.37%       | 1.00%       |
| Unrefrigerated Warehouse | 0.00%                  | 0.00%       |             |
| 2                        | All Commercial         | 0.24%       | 0.86%       |
|                          | All Office             | 0.35%       | 0.97%       |
|                          | All Warehouses         | 0.07%       | 1.00%       |
|                          | College                | 0.45%       | 1.00%       |
|                          | Grocery                | 0.17%       | 1.00%       |
|                          | Health                 | 0.35%       | 0.72%       |
|                          | Large Office           | 0.31%       | 1.00%       |
|                          | Lodging                | 0.30%       | 0.99%       |
|                          | Miscellaneous          | 0.22%       | 1.00%       |
|                          | Refrigerated Warehouse | 0.02%       | 1.00%       |
|                          | Restaurant             | 0.22%       | 0.38%       |
|                          | Retail                 | 0.36%       | 0.97%       |
|                          | School                 | 0.36%       | 0.96%       |
|                          | Small Office           | 0.38%       | 0.96%       |
| Unrefrigerated Warehouse | 0.12%                  | 1.00%       |             |
| 3                        | All Commercial         | 0.26%       | 0.66%       |
|                          | All Office             | 0.32%       | 0.98%       |
|                          | All Warehouses         | 0.03%       | 0.95%       |
|                          | College                | 0.28%       | 0.94%       |
|                          | Grocery                | 0.14%       | 0.53%       |
|                          | Health                 | 0.43%       | 0.82%       |
|                          | Large Office           | 0.34%       | 0.97%       |
|                          | Lodging                | 0.55%       | 0.73%       |

# Energy

CEQA# MM-E6  
MP# EE-2

## BE-1

## Building Energy

| Climate Zone             | Building Types           | Reduction   |             |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------|-------------|
|                          |                          | Electricity | Natural Gas |
|                          | Miscellaneous            | 0.25%       | 0.82%       |
|                          | Refrigerated Warehouse   | 0.02%       | 1.00%       |
|                          | Restaurant               | 0.26%       | 0.18%       |
|                          | Retail                   | 0.29%       | 0.81%       |
|                          | School                   | 0.33%       | 0.93%       |
|                          | Small Office             | 0.30%       | 1.00%       |
|                          | Unrefrigerated Warehouse | 0.13%       | 0.94%       |
| 4                        | All Commercial           | 0.27%       | 0.71%       |
|                          | All Office               | 0.38%       | 1.00%       |
|                          | All Warehouses           | 0.06%       | 0.77%       |
|                          | College                  | 0.37%       | 0.87%       |
|                          | Grocery                  | 0.12%       | 0.75%       |
|                          | Health                   | 0.45%       | 0.85%       |
|                          | Large Office             | 0.41%       | 1.00%       |
|                          | Lodging                  | 0.30%       | 0.90%       |
|                          | Miscellaneous            | 0.20%       | 0.76%       |
|                          | Refrigerated Warehouse   | 0.02%       | 0.20%       |
|                          | Restaurant               | 0.18%       | 0.30%       |
|                          | Retail                   | 0.29%       | 1.00%       |
|                          | School                   | 0.32%       | 0.95%       |
|                          | Small Office             | 0.30%       | 1.00%       |
| Unrefrigerated Warehouse | 0.10%                    | 0.98%       |             |
| 5                        | All Commercial           | 0.26%       | 0.72%       |
|                          | All Office               | 0.36%       | 0.95%       |
|                          | All Warehouses           | 0.06%       | 0.46%       |
|                          | College                  | 0.44%       | 0.98%       |
|                          | Grocery                  | 0.09%       | 0.67%       |
|                          | Health                   | 0.40%       | 0.84%       |
|                          | Large Office             | 0.37%       | 0.94%       |
|                          | Lodging                  | 0.29%       | 0.81%       |
|                          | Miscellaneous            | 0.18%       | 0.73%       |
|                          | Refrigerated Warehouse   | 0.04%       | 0.29%       |
|                          | Restaurant               | 0.11%       | 0.25%       |
|                          | Retail                   | 0.24%       | 0.85%       |
|                          | School                   | 0.16%       | 0.91%       |
|                          | Small Office             | 0.29%       | 1.00%       |
| Unrefrigerated Warehouse | 0.07%                    | 0.85%       |             |
| 6                        | All Commercial           | 0.31%       | 0.73%       |
|                          | All Office               | 0.38%       | 0.95%       |
|                          | All Warehouses           | 0.07%       | 0.86%       |
|                          | College                  | 0.43%       | 0.99%       |

# Energy

CEQA# MM-E6  
MP# EE-2

## BE-1

## Building Energy

| Climate Zone             | Building Types           | Reduction   |             |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------|-------------|
|                          |                          | Electricity | Natural Gas |
|                          | Grocery                  | 0.16%       | 0.64%       |
|                          | Health                   | 0.46%       | 0.86%       |
|                          | Large Office             | 0.39%       | 0.94%       |
|                          | Lodging                  | 0.40%       | 0.86%       |
|                          | Miscellaneous            | 0.25%       | 0.66%       |
|                          | Refrigerated Warehouse   | 0.03%       | 0.58%       |
|                          | Restaurant               | 0.24%       | 0.35%       |
|                          | Retail                   | 0.31%       | 0.83%       |
|                          | School                   | 0.31%       | 0.96%       |
|                          | Small Office             | 0.34%       | 1.00%       |
|                          | Unrefrigerated Warehouse | 0.09%       | 1.00%       |
| 7                        | All Commercial           | 0.25%       | 0.88%       |
|                          | All Office               | 0.32%       | 0.94%       |
|                          | All Warehouses           | 0.02%       | 0.64%       |
|                          | College                  | 0.25%       | 0.99%       |
|                          | Grocery                  | 0.12%       | 0.90%       |
|                          | Health                   | 0.32%       | 0.93%       |
|                          | Large Office             | 0.34%       | 1.00%       |
|                          | Lodging                  | 0.41%       | 0.94%       |
|                          | Miscellaneous            | 0.18%       | 0.99%       |
|                          | Refrigerated Warehouse   | 0.02%       | 0.64%       |
|                          | Restaurant               | 0.27%       | 0.19%       |
|                          | Retail                   | 0.34%       | 0.99%       |
|                          | School                   | 0.29%       | 0.96%       |
|                          | Small Office             | 0.31%       | 0.91%       |
| Unrefrigerated Warehouse | 0.00%                    | 0.00%       |             |
| 8                        | All Commercial           | 0.30%       | 0.62%       |
|                          | All Office               | 0.37%       | 0.94%       |
|                          | All Warehouses           | 0.12%       | 0.99%       |
|                          | College                  | 0.43%       | 0.67%       |
|                          | Grocery                  | 0.14%       | 0.50%       |
|                          | Health                   | 0.45%       | 0.85%       |
|                          | Large Office             | 0.38%       | 0.94%       |
|                          | Lodging                  | 0.34%       | 0.86%       |
|                          | Miscellaneous            | 0.22%       | 0.68%       |
|                          | Refrigerated Warehouse   | 0.02%       | 0.93%       |
|                          | Restaurant               | 0.27%       | 0.31%       |
|                          | Retail                   | 0.28%       | 0.49%       |
|                          | School                   | 0.33%       | 0.92%       |
|                          | Small Office             | 0.33%       | 0.96%       |
| Unrefrigerated Warehouse | 0.16%                    | 0.99%       |             |

# Energy

CEQA# MM-E6  
MP# EE-2

## BE-1

## Building Energy

| Climate Zone             | Building Types         | Reduction   |             |
|--------------------------|------------------------|-------------|-------------|
|                          |                        | Electricity | Natural Gas |
| 9                        | All Commercial         | 0.28%       | 0.60%       |
|                          | All Office             | 0.39%       | 0.96%       |
|                          | All Warehouses         | 0.13%       | 0.95%       |
|                          | College                | 0.33%       | 0.98%       |
|                          | Grocery                | 0.14%       | 0.46%       |
|                          | Health                 | 0.44%       | 0.85%       |
|                          | Large Office           | 0.43%       | 0.98%       |
|                          | Lodging                | 0.37%       | 0.84%       |
|                          | Miscellaneous          | 0.23%       | 0.76%       |
|                          | Refrigerated Warehouse | 0.03%       | 0.91%       |
|                          | Restaurant             | 0.21%       | 0.19%       |
|                          | Retail                 | 0.32%       | 0.71%       |
|                          | School                 | 0.32%       | 0.90%       |
|                          | Small Office           | 0.31%       | 0.94%       |
| Unrefrigerated Warehouse | 0.18%                  | 0.96%       |             |
| 10                       | All Commercial         | 0.30%       | 0.61%       |
|                          | All Office             | 0.35%       | 1.00%       |
|                          | All Warehouses         | 0.11%       | 0.58%       |
|                          | College                | 0.27%       | 1.00%       |
|                          | Grocery                | 0.19%       | 0.67%       |
|                          | Health                 | 0.46%       | 0.92%       |
|                          | Large Office           | 0.34%       | 1.00%       |
|                          | Lodging                | 0.39%       | 0.92%       |
|                          | Miscellaneous          | 0.24%       | 0.49%       |
|                          | Refrigerated Warehouse | 0.03%       | 0.07%       |
|                          | Restaurant             | 0.29%       | 0.29%       |
|                          | Retail                 | 0.36%       | 0.87%       |
|                          | School                 | 0.37%       | 0.80%       |
|                          | Small Office           | 0.36%       | 1.00%       |
| Unrefrigerated Warehouse | 0.15%                  | 0.98%       |             |
| 13                       | All Commercial         | 0.29%       | 0.66%       |
|                          | All Office             | 0.38%       | 0.80%       |
|                          | All Warehouses         | 0.19%       | 0.95%       |
|                          | College                | 0.33%       | 0.86%       |
|                          | Grocery                | 0.11%       | 0.40%       |
|                          | Health                 | 0.39%       | 0.88%       |
|                          | Large Office           | 0.41%       | 0.80%       |
|                          | Lodging                | 0.40%       | 0.82%       |
|                          | Miscellaneous          | 0.17%       | 0.39%       |

# Energy

CEQA# MM-E6  
MP# EE-2

## BE-1

## Building Energy

| Climate Zone | Building Types           | Reduction   |             |
|--------------|--------------------------|-------------|-------------|
|              |                          | Electricity | Natural Gas |
|              | Refrigerated Warehouse   | 0.07%       | 1.00%       |
|              | Restaurant               | 0.24%       | 0.21%       |
|              | Retail                   | 0.28%       | 0.53%       |
|              | School                   | 0.31%       | 0.92%       |
|              | Small Office             | 0.32%       | 0.76%       |
|              | Unrefrigerated Warehouse | 0.26%       | 0.93%       |

**Table BE-1.2**  
**Residential**  
**Reduction for 1% Improvement over 2008 Title 24**

| Climate Zone | Housing  | Reduction   |             |
|--------------|----------|-------------|-------------|
|              |          | Electricity | Natural Gas |
| 1            | Multi    | 0.24%       | 0.86%       |
|              | Single   | 0.17%       | 0.87%       |
|              | Townhome | 0.22%       | 0.87%       |
| 2            | Multi    | 0.15%       | 0.89%       |
|              | Single   | 0.14%       | 0.91%       |
|              | Townhome | 0.11%       | 0.89%       |
| 3            | Multi    | 0.23%       | 0.90%       |
|              | Single   | 0.18%       | 0.91%       |
|              | Townhome | 0.16%       | 0.90%       |
| 4            | Multi    | 0.12%       | 0.88%       |
|              | Single   | 0.09%       | 0.91%       |
|              | Townhome | 0.09%       | 0.90%       |
| 5            | Multi    | 0.09%       | 0.88%       |
|              | Single   | 0.04%       | 0.91%       |
|              | Townhome | 0.05%       | 0.90%       |
| 7            | Multi    | 0.25%       | 0.87%       |
|              | Single   | 0.16%       | 0.88%       |
|              | Townhome | 0.18%       | 0.85%       |
| 8            | Multi    | 0.09%       | 0.77%       |
|              | Single   | 0.07%       | 0.82%       |
|              | Townhome | 0.07%       | 0.80%       |
| 9            | Multi    | 0.08%       | 0.77%       |
|              | Single   | 0.11%       | 0.82%       |
|              | Townhome | 0.09%       | 0.80%       |
| 10           | Multi    | 0.26%       | 0.80%       |
|              | Single   | 0.18%       | 0.83%       |
|              | Townhome | 0.22%       | 0.81%       |

# Energy

CEQA# MM-E6  
MP# EE-2

## BE-1

## Building Energy

|    |          |       |       |
|----|----------|-------|-------|
| 11 | Multi    | 0.05% | 0.77% |
|    | Single   | 0.05% | 0.83% |
|    | Townhome | 0.03% | 0.81% |
| 12 | Multi    | 0.15% | 0.75% |
|    | Single   | 0.15% | 0.83% |
|    | Townhome | 0.13% | 0.80% |
| 13 | Multi    | 0.09% | 0.79% |
|    | Single   | 0.06% | 0.83% |
|    | Townhome | 0.05% | 0.81% |

# Energy

MP# EE-2

**BE-2**

**Building Energy**

## 2.1.2 Install Programmable Thermostat Timers

### Range of Effectiveness:

Best Management Practice influences building energy use for heating and cooling.

### Measure Description:

Programmable thermostat timers allow users to easily control when the HVAC system will heat or cool a certain space, thereby saving energy. Because most commercial buildings already have timed HVAC systems, this mitigation measure focuses on residential programmable thermostats.

The DOE reports [1] that residents can save around 10% on heating and cooling bills per year by lowering the thermostat by 10-15 degrees for eight hours<sup>10</sup>. This can be accomplished using an automatic timer or programmable thermostat, such that the heat is reduced while the residents are at work or otherwise out of the house. The energy savings from a programmable thermostat, however, depend on the user. Some users preset the thermostat to heat the house before they come home, thereby increasing energy usage, while others use it to avoid heating the house when they are not home or asleep. Because of the large variability in individual occupant behavior and because it is unclear whether programmable thermostats systematically reduce energy use, this measure cannot be reasonably quantified. This mitigation measure should be incorporated as a Best Management Practice to allow for educated occupants to have the most efficient means at controlling their heating and cooling energy use. In order to take quantitative credit for this mitigation measure, the Project Applicant would need to provide detailed and substantial evidence supporting a reduction in energy use and associated GHG emissions.

### Measure Applicability:

- Electricity use in residential dwellings.
- Best Management Practice only.

### Assumptions:

Data based upon the following references:

[1] USDOE. Energy Savers: Thermostats and Control Systems. Available online at: [http://www.energysavers.gov/your\\_home/space\\_heating\\_cooling/index.cfm/mytopic=12720](http://www.energysavers.gov/your_home/space_heating_cooling/index.cfm/mytopic=12720)

---

<sup>10</sup> Such a large drop in thermostat temperatures may not be applicable in parts of California; more applicable may be the raising of the thermostat for airconditioned spaces.

# Energy

MP# EE-2

**BE-2**

**Building Energy**

## Emission Reduction Ranges and Variables:

This is a best management practice and therefore at this time there is no quantifiable reduction. Check with local agencies for guidance on any allowed reductions associated with implementation of best management practices.

If substantial evidence was provided, the GHG reductions would equal the percent savings in total electricity or natural gas. The total reduction would be:

$$\text{GHG reduction} = (\% \text{ thermostat reduce heat/cool energy use}) \times (\% \text{ end use heat/cool of total energy use})$$

## Preferred Literature:

The DOE reports [1] that residents can save approximately 10% on heating and cooling bills per year by lowering the thermostat by 10-15 degrees for eight hours. This can be accomplished using an automatic timer or programmable thermostat, such that the heat is reduced while the residents are at work or otherwise out of the house. The energy savings from a programmable thermostat, however, depend on the user. Some users preset the thermostat to heat the house before they come home, thereby increasing energy usage, while others use it to avoid heating the house when they are not home or asleep.

## Alternative Literature:

None

## Other Literature Reviewed:

Pacific Northwest National Laboratory. 2007. GridWise Demonstration Project Fast Facts. Available online at: [http://gridwise.pnl.gov/docs/pnnl\\_gridwiseoverview.pdf](http://gridwise.pnl.gov/docs/pnnl_gridwiseoverview.pdf).

# Energy

MP# EE-2

**BE-3**

**Building Energy**

## 2.1.3 Obtain Third-party HVAC Commissioning and Verification of Energy Savings

### Range of Effectiveness:

Not applicable on its own. This measure enhances effectiveness of BE-1.

### Measure Description:

Ensuring the proper installation and construction of energy reduction features is essential to achieving high thermal efficiency in a house. In practice, HVAC systems commonly do not operate at the designed efficiency due to errors in installation or adjustments. A Project Applicant can obtain HVAC commissioning and third-party verification of energy savings in thermal efficiency components including HVAC systems, insulation, windows, and water heating.

This measure is required to be grouped with measure “Exceed Title 24 Energy Efficiency Standards by X% (BE-1).

### Measure Applicability:

- This measure is part of a grouped measure. This measure also requires third-party HVAC commissioning and verification of energy savings.
- Buildings subject to California’s Title 24 building requirements.

### Preferred Literature:

While Title 24 requires that a home’s ducts be tested for leaks whenever the central air conditioner or furnace is installed or replaced, a third-party verifier such as the California Home Energy Efficiency Rating Service (CHEERS) and ENERGY STAR Home Energy Rating Service (HERS) can ensure that ducts were properly sealed [1-3]. These certified raters can also verify other energy efficiency measures, such as HVAC controls, insulation performance, and the air-tightness of the building envelope. Furthermore, these raters can analyze a home and make climate-specific recommendations for further improving the home’s energy efficiency. Since this mitigation measure ensures that the building envelope systems are properly installed and sealed, there is no quantifiable reduction for this measure. It is recommended as a Best Management Practice grouped with the Title 24 improvement mitigation measure.

### Alternative Literature:

None

### Literature References:

[1] California Home Energy Efficiency Rating Services. What is CHEERS? Available online at: <http://www.cheers.org/Home/Overview/tabid/124/Default.aspx>. Accessed March 2010.

# Energy

MP# EE-2

**BE-3****Building Energy**

- [2] USEPA. ENERGY STAR: Features of ENERGY STAR Qualified New Homes. Available online at: [http://www.energystar.gov/index.cfm?c=new\\_homes.nh\\_features](http://www.energystar.gov/index.cfm?c=new_homes.nh_features). Accessed March 2010.
- [3] USEPA. ENERGY STAR: Independent Inspection and Testing. Available online at: [http://www.energystar.gov/ia/new\\_homes/features/HERSrater\\_062906.pdf](http://www.energystar.gov/ia/new_homes/features/HERSrater_062906.pdf). Accessed March 2010.

# Energy

CEQA# MM E-19  
MP# EE-2.1.6

**BE-4**

**Building Energy**

## 2.1.4 Install Energy Efficient Appliances

### Range of Effectiveness:

Residential 2-4% GHG emissions from electricity use. Grocery Stores: 17-22% of GHG emissions from electricity use.

### Measure Description:

Using energy-efficient appliances reduces a building's energy consumption as well as the associated GHG emissions from natural gas combustion and electricity production. To take credit for this mitigation measure, the Project Applicant (or contracted builder) would need to ensure that energy efficient appliances are installed. For residential dwellings, typical builder-supplied appliances include refrigerators and dishwashers. Clothes washers and ceiling fans would be applicable if the builder supplied them. For commercial land uses, energy-efficient refrigerators have been evaluated for grocery stores. See Mitigation Method section on how project applicant may quantify additional building types and appliances.

The energy use of a building is dependent on the building type, size and climate zone it is located in. The *California Commercial Energy Use Survey (CEUS)* and *Residential Appliance Saturation Survey (RASS)* datasets for this calculation since the data is scalable by size and available for several land use categories in different climate zones in California. Typical reductions for energy-efficient appliances can be found in the *Energy Star and Other Climate Protection Partnerships 2008 Annual Report* or subsequent Annual Reports. ENERGY STAR refrigerators, clothes washers, dishwashers, and ceiling fans use 15%, 25%, 40%, and 50% less electricity than standard appliances, respectively.

RASS does not specify a ceiling fan end-use; rather, electricity use from ceiling fans is accounted for in the Miscellaneous category which includes interior lighting, attic fans, and other miscellaneous plug-in loads. Since the electricity usage of ceiling fans alone is not specified, a value from the National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL) Building American Research Benchmark Definition (BARBD) is used. BARBD reports that the average energy use per ceiling fan is 84.1 kWh per year. In this mitigation measure, it is assumed that each multi-family, single-family, and townhome residence has one ceiling fan. The electricity savings shown here is based on installing an ENERGY STAR ceiling fan and does not account for an occupant's decreased use of cooling devices such as air conditioners. For ceiling fans, the 50% reduction was applied to 84.1 kWh of the electricity attributed to the Miscellaneous RASS category.

### Measure Applicability:

- Electricity use in residential dwellings and commercial grocery stores.
- This mitigation measure applies only when appliance installation can be specified as part of the Project.

# Energy

CEQA# MM E-19  
MP# EE-2.1.6

## BE-4

## Building Energy

### Inputs:

The following information needs to be provided by the Project Applicant:

- Number of dwelling units and/or size of grocery store
- Climate Zone
- Housing Type (if residential)
- Utility provider
- Total natural gas demand (kBTU or therms) per dwelling unit or per square foot
- Types of energy efficient appliances to be installed (refrigerator, dishwasher, or clothes washer for residential land uses and refrigerators for grocery stores)

### Baseline Method:

$$\text{GHG emissions} = \text{Electricity Intensity}_{\text{baseline}} \times \text{Size} \times \text{Emission Factor}_{\text{Electricity}} + \text{Natural Gas Intensity}_{\text{baseline}} \times \text{Size} \times \text{Emission Factor}_{\text{NaturalGas}}$$

Where:

GHG emissions = MT CO<sub>2</sub>e (reflecting 2008 Title 24 standards with no energy-efficient appliances)

Electricity Intensity<sub>baseline</sub> = Total electricity demand (kWh) per dwelling unit or per square foot; provided by applicant and adjusted for 2008 Title 24 standards<sup>11</sup>

Natural Gas Intensity<sub>baseline</sub> = Total natural gas demand (kBTU or therms) per dwelling unit or per square foot; provided by applicant and adjusted for 2008 Title 24 standards<sup>12</sup>

Emission Factor<sub>Electricity</sub> = Carbon intensity of local utility (CO<sub>2</sub>e/kWh)<sup>13</sup>

Emission Factor<sub>NaturalGas</sub> = Carbon intensity of natural gas use (CO<sub>2</sub>e/kBTU or CO<sub>2</sub>e/therm)<sup>14</sup>

Size = Number of dwelling units or square footage of commercial land uses

### Mitigation Method:

$$\text{GHG emissions}_{\text{mitigated}} = \text{Electricity Emissions}_{\text{baseline}} \times (1 - (\text{Sum of Reductions})) +$$

<sup>11</sup> See Appendix B for baseline inventory calculation methodologies to assist in determining these values.

<sup>12</sup> Ibid

<sup>13</sup> Ibid.

<sup>14</sup> Ibid.

# Energy

CEQA# MM E-19  
MP# EE-2.1.6

## BE-4

### Building Energy

Natural Gas Emissions<sub>baseline</sub>

Where:

Electricity Emissions<sub>baseline</sub> = Emissions due to electricity generation, adjusted for 2008 Title 24 Standards (calculated based on CEUS and RASS)

Sum of Reductions = Applicable reduction based on energy efficient appliances installed (expressed as a decimal)

Natural Gas Emissions<sub>baseline</sub> = Emissions due to natural gas combustion, adjusted for 2008 Title 24 Standards (calculated based on CEUS and RASS)

Building GHG reduction Percentage =  $\frac{\text{[GHG emissions mitigated]}}{\text{[GHG emissions baseline]}}$

Tables BE-4.1 and BE-4.2 tabulate the percent reductions from installing specific ENERGY STAR appliances for each land use type in the various climate zones in California. There is one table for residential land uses and another for non-residential land uses. This will only result in reductions associated with electricity use and does not apply to natural gas since there are no major Energy Star appliances that use natural gas. The energy efficient heating, cooling, and water heating systems that may use natural gas are included in improvements over Title 24 (see measure BE-1).

For other building types and energy efficient appliances, the reductions similar to those in the tables can be quantified as follows:

$$\text{Reduction} = (\text{Appliance End Use \%}) \times (1 - \text{efficiency})$$

Where:

Appliance End Use % = portion of energy for this appliance compared to total electricity use

Efficiency = percent reduction in energy use for efficient appliance compared to standard.

#### Assumptions:

Data for some Climate Zones is not presented in the CEUS and RASS studies. However, data from similar Climate Zones is representative and can be used as follows:

For non-residential building types:

Climate Zone 9 should be used for Climate Zone 11.

Climate Zone 9 should be used for Climate Zone 12.

# Energy

CEQA# MM E-19  
MP# EE-2.1.6

## BE-4

### Building Energy

Climate Zone 1 should be used for Climate Zone 14.  
Climate Zone 10 should be used for Climate Zone 15.  
For residential building types:  
Climate Zone 2 should be used for Climate Zone 6.  
Climate Zone 1 should be used for Climate Zone 14.  
Climate Zone 10 should be used for Climate Zone 15.

Data based upon the following references:

- [1] USEPA. 2008. ENERGY STAR 2008 Annual Report. Available online at: <http://www.epa.gov/cpd/annualreports/annualreports.htm>
- [2] CEC. 2004. Residential Appliance Saturation Survey. Available online at: <http://www.energy.ca.gov/appliances/rass/>
- [3] CEC. 2006. Commercial End-Use Survey. Available online at: <http://www.energy.ca.gov/ceus/>
- [4] NREL. 2010. Building America Research Benchmark Definition. Available online at: <http://www.nrel.gov/docs/fy10osti/47246.pdf>

### Emission Reduction Ranges and Variables:

[Refer to Attached Tables BE-4.1 and BE-4.2 for climate zone and land use specific percentages]

If more than one type of appliance is considered the percentage for each appliance should be added together.

| Pollutant         | Category Emissions Reductions                           |
|-------------------|---|
| CO <sub>2</sub> e | See Tables BE-4.1 and BE-4.2 for percentage reductions. |
| PM                | Not Quantified <sup>15</sup>                            |
| CO                | Not Quantified  |
| SO <sub>2</sub>   | Not Quantified  |
| NOx               | Not Quantified  |

### Discussion:

If the applicant commits to installing energy efficient appliances, the applicant would reduce the amount of GHG emissions associated with electricity generation because

<sup>15</sup> Criteria air pollutant emissions may also be reduced due to the reduction in energy use; however, the reduction may not be in the same air basin as the project.

# Energy

CEQA# MM E-19  
MP# EE-2.1.6

## BE-4

### Building Energy

more energy efficient appliances will require less electricity to run. This reduces GHG emissions from power plants.

#### Example:

Housing Type = Single Family Home

Number of Dwelling Units = 100

Climate Zone = 1

Utility Provider = PG&E

Energy efficient appliances to be installed = refrigerator and dishwasher

Electricity Intensity<sub>baseline</sub> = 7,196 kWh/DU/yr (adjusted to reflect 2008 Title 24 standards)

Emission Factor<sub>Electricity</sub> = 2.08E-4 MT /kWh

Electricity Emissions<sub>baseline</sub> = 7,196 kWh/DU/yr x 100 DU x (2.08E-4 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e/kWh)  
= 150 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e/yr

Natural Gas Intensity<sub>baseline</sub> = 365 therms/DU/yr (adjusted to reflect 2008 Title 24 standards)

Emission Factor<sub>NaturalGas</sub> = 5.32E-3 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e/kBTU

Natural Gas Emissions<sub>baseline</sub> = 365 therm/DU/yr x 100 DU x (5.32E-3 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e/therm)  
= 194 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e/yr

GHG emissions<sub>baseline</sub> = 150 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e/yr + 194 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e/yr  
= 344 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e/yr

Sum of Reductions associated with electricity generation from Table BE-4.2 = 2.05%  
Reductions associated with natural gas combustion = 0%

GHG emissions<sub>mitigated</sub> = 150\*(1-.0205) + 194  
= 341

Building GHG reduction = 1 - 341 / 344 = 0.9%

# Energy

CEQA# MM E-19  
MP# EE-2.1.6

## BE-4

### Building Energy

#### Preferred Literature:

The USEPA ENERGY STAR Program has identified energy efficient residential and consumer appliances including air conditioners, refrigerators, freezers, clothes washers, dishwashers, fryers, steamers, and vending machines. The ENERGY STAR Annual Report presents the average percent energy savings from using an ENERGY STAR-qualified appliance instead of a standard appliance. GHG emissions reductions are calculated based on local utility emission factors and the baseline appliance energy use derived from the CEC RASS and CEUS methodologies. RASS and CEUS data are climate-specific; therefore, differences in project energy usage due to different climates are accounted for.

#### Alternative Literature:

None

#### Other Literature Reviewed:

None

**Table BE-4.1**  
**Non-Residential**  
**Reduction for ENERGY STAR Refrigerators in Grocery Stores**

| Climate Zone | Electricity Reduction |
|--------------|-----------------------|
| 1            | 20%                   |
| 2            | 17%                   |
| 3            | 18%                   |
| 4            | 21%                   |
| 5            | 22%                   |
| 6            | 19%                   |
| 7            | 18%                   |
| 8            | 19%                   |
| 9            | 20%                   |
| 10           | 18%                   |
| 13           | 21%                   |

# Energy

CEQA# MM E-19

MP# EE-2.1.6

## BE-4

## Building Energy

**Table BE-4.2**  
**Residential**  
**Reduction for ENERGY STAR Appliances**

| Climate Zone | Housing  | Refrigerator <sup>1,3</sup> | Clothes Washer <sup>1,3</sup> | Dishwasher <sup>1,3</sup> | Ceiling Fan <sup>2,3</sup> |
|--------------|----------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|
|              |          | Total Electricity Reduction |                               |                           |                            |
| 1            | Multi    | 2.59%                       | 0.03%                         | 0.10%                     | 1.01%                      |
|              | Single   | 1.72%                       | 0.50%                         | 0.12%                     | 0.58%                      |
|              | Townhome | 2.28%                       | 0.28%                         | 0.11%                     | 0.83%                      |
| 2            | Multi    | 2.86%                       | 0.03%                         | 0.11%                     | 1.12%                      |
|              | Single   | 1.79%                       | 0.53%                         | 0.13%                     | 0.61%                      |
|              | Townhome | 2.61%                       | 0.32%                         | 0.13%                     | 0.96%                      |
| 3            | Multi    | 2.62%                       | 0.03%                         | 0.10%                     | 1.02%                      |
|              | Single   | 1.69%                       | 0.50%                         | 0.12%                     | 0.58%                      |
|              | Townhome | 2.44%                       | 0.30%                         | 0.12%                     | 0.89%                      |
| 4            | Multi    | 2.97%                       | 0.03%                         | 0.12%                     | 1.16%                      |
|              | Single   | 1.90%                       | 0.56%                         | 0.14%                     | 0.65%                      |
|              | Townhome | 2.64%                       | 0.33%                         | 0.13%                     | 0.97%                      |
| 5            | Multi    | 3.07%                       | 0.03%                         | 0.12%                     | 1.20%                      |
|              | Single   | 1.99%                       | 0.58%                         | 0.14%                     | 0.68%                      |
|              | Townhome | 2.78%                       | 0.35%                         | 0.14%                     | 1.02%                      |
| 7            | Multi    | 2.54%                       | 0.03%                         | 0.10%                     | 0.99%                      |
|              | Single   | 1.74%                       | 0.51%                         | 0.12%                     | 0.59%                      |
|              | Townhome | 2.39%                       | 0.30%                         | 0.12%                     | 0.88%                      |
| 8            | Multi    | 3.08%                       | 0.03%                         | 0.12%                     | 1.20%                      |
|              | Single   | 1.94%                       | 0.57%                         | 0.14%                     | 0.66%                      |
|              | Townhome | 2.71%                       | 0.34%                         | 0.14%                     | 0.99%                      |
| 9            | Multi    | 3.13%                       | 0.03%                         | 0.12%                     | 1.22%                      |
|              | Single   | 1.85%                       | 0.54%                         | 0.13%                     | 0.63%                      |
|              | Townhome | 2.65%                       | 0.33%                         | 0.13%                     | 0.97%                      |
| 10           | Multi    | 2.52%                       | 0.03%                         | 0.10%                     | 0.98%                      |
|              | Single   | 1.71%                       | 0.50%                         | 0.12%                     | 0.58%                      |
|              | Townhome | 2.27%                       | 0.28%                         | 0.11%                     | 0.83%                      |
| 11           | Multi    | 3.21%                       | 0.03%                         | 0.13%                     | 1.25%                      |
|              | Single   | 1.97%                       | 0.58%                         | 0.14%                     | 0.67%                      |
|              | Townhome | 2.83%                       | 0.35%                         | 0.14%                     | 1.04%                      |
| 12           | Multi    | 2.89%                       | 0.03%                         | 0.11%                     | 1.13%                      |
|              | Single   | 1.76%                       | 0.51%                         | 0.13%                     | 0.60%                      |
|              | Townhome | 2.53%                       | 0.32%                         | 0.13%                     | 0.93%                      |
| 13           | Multi    | 3.09%                       | 0.03%                         | 0.12%                     | 1.21%                      |
|              | Single   | 1.95%                       | 0.57%                         | 0.14%                     | 0.66%                      |
|              | Townhome | 2.76%                       | 0.34%                         | 0.14%                     | 1.01%                      |

**Notes:**

# Energy

CEQA# MM E-19  
MP# EE-2.1.6

**BE-4**

**Building Energy**

1. Percent reductions are based on the saturation values presented in RASS. The Project Applicant may use project-specific saturation values (i.e. if 100% of homes have clothes washers, then saturation = 1).

**Notes:**

2. CEC's RASS does not specify a ceiling fan end-use; rather, electricity use from ceiling fans is accounted for in the Miscellaneous category, which includes interior lighting, attic fans, and other miscellaneous plug-in loads. Since the electricity usage of ceiling fans alone is not specified, a value from NREL's BARBD was used. BARBD reports that the average energy use per ceiling fan is 84.1 kWh per year. In this table, it is assumed that each multi-family, single-family, and townhome residence has one ceiling fan. The electricity savings shown here is based on installing an ENERGY STAR ceiling fan and does not account for an occupant's decreased use of cooling devices such as air conditioners.

3. Total electricity reduction is based on installing ENERGY STAR appliances instead of standard appliances. ENERGY STAR refrigerators, clothes washers, dishwashers, and ceiling fans use 15%, 25%, 40%, and 50% less electricity than standard appliances, respectively. For ceiling fans, the 50% reduction was applied to 84.1 kWh of the electricity attributed to the Miscellaneous RASS category.

**Abbreviations:**

- BARBD - Building America Research Benchmark Definition
- CEC - California Energy Commission
- NREL - National Renewable Energy Laboratory
- RASS - Residential Appliance Saturation Survey
- USEPA - United States Environmental Protection Agency

**Sources:**

- CEC. 2004. Residential Appliance Saturation Survey. Available online at: <http://www.energy.ca.gov/appliances/rass/>
- NREL. 2010. Building America Research Benchmark Definition. Available online at: <http://www.nrel.gov/docs/fy10osti/47246.pdf>
- USEPA. 2008. ENERGY STAR 2008 Annual Report. Available online at: <http://www.epa.gov/cpd/annualreports/annualreports.htm>

# Energy

## BE-5

## Building Energy

### 2.1.5 Install Energy Efficient Boilers

**Range of Effectiveness:** 1.2-18.4% of boiler GHG emissions

**Measure Description:**

Boilers are used in many non-residential and multi-family housing buildings to provide space heating or steam or facility operations. Boilers combust natural gas to produce steam which can be used directly or as a method to heat a building space. Boilers represent 12% of installed building heating equipment for commercial and other buildings. Boiler efficiencies are regulated and commonly presented as annualized fuel utilization efficiency (AFUE), a ratio of the total useful heat delivered to the heat value from the annual amount of fuel consumed. Improving boiler efficiency decreases natural gas consumption for the same amount of energy output, thus reducing GHG emissions.

Only natural gas boilers are considered under this mitigation measure. The Project Applicant would only need to provide the annual natural gas consumptions to calculate the baseline emissions using heat content and carbon intensity factors from CCAR [3]. To determine the emission reduction, boiler efficiency is also needed, and should be obtainable from manufacturer specifications. The Consortium for Energy Efficiency (CEE) reports that the rate of high efficiency boilers ( $\geq 85\%$ ) has gone from 5-15% of sales in 2002 to 50%-60% of sales in 2007 [2]. The CEE study also noted that technical improvements can be made to existing boiler types to improve efficiency to 88%. Efficiency can be further enhanced to up to 98% using the condensing boiler.

A range of efficiencies from the CEE study has been presented for reference, but to take credit for this mitigation measure, the Project Applicant would also need to provide evidence from manufacturers supporting the higher efficiency from a retrofit or new boiler.

**Measure Applicability:**

- Natural Gas Boilers

**Inputs:**

The following information needs to be provided by the Project Applicant:

- Natural gas consumption of boiler
- Original or baseline efficiency of boiler
- Improved efficiency of boiler

**Baseline Method:**

$$\text{Emission} = \text{Consumption} \times \text{HC} \times \text{EF} \times \text{C}$$

Where:

# Energy

## BE-5

## Building Energy

Emission = MT CO<sub>2</sub>e

Consumption = Natural gas consumption (ft<sup>3</sup>)

HC = Natural gas heat content = 1,029 BTU/ft<sup>3</sup> (CCAR 2009)

EF = Natural gas carbon intensity factor = 0.1173 lbs CO<sub>2</sub>e/kBTU (CCAR 2009)

C = Unit conversion factor

In this case, C = 4.54x10<sup>-7</sup> kBTU x MT/BTU/lbs

### Mitigation Method:

The GHG emission from a boiler with improved efficiency is:

$$\text{Mitigated GHG Emission} = \text{Consumption} \times \frac{E_o}{E_i} \times \text{HC} \times \text{EF} \times \text{C}$$

Where:

Emission = MT CO<sub>2</sub>e

Consumption = Natural gas consumption (ft<sup>3</sup>)

E<sub>o</sub> = Original efficiency of boiler

E<sub>i</sub> = Improved efficiency of boiler

HC = Natural gas heat content = 1,029 BTU/ft<sup>3</sup> (CCAR 2009)

EF = Natural gas carbon intensity factor = 0.1173 lbs CO<sub>2</sub>e/kBTU (CCAR 2009)

C = Unit conversion factor

### Emission Reduction Ranges and Variables:

Percentage of emissions reduction using a boiler with improved efficiency for all pollutants are the same and is calculated as follows:

$$\text{Reduction} = 1 - \frac{E_o}{E_i}$$

Where:

E<sub>o</sub> = Original efficiency of boiler

E<sub>i</sub> = Improved efficiency of boiler

| Technology                   | Range of Efficiencies | Range of Emission Reduction |
|------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------------|
| Atmospheric                  | 80 – 84%              | -                           |
| Fan assisted, non-condensing | 85 – 88%              | 1.2% – 9.1%                 |
| Fan assisted, condensing     | 88 – 98%              | 4.5% – 18.4%                |

## Energy

### BE-5

### Building Energy

#### Discussion:

Boiler efficiency is included in product specification from manufacturer. ENERGY STAR boilers require minimum efficiency of 85%. The Consortium for Energy Efficiency (CEE) reports natural efficiency breakpoints of 85-88% for fan assisted, non-condensing commercial boilers, and 88-98% for fan assisted, condensing boilers.

#### Assumptions:

Data based upon the following references:

- California Climate Action Registry 2009. General Reporting Protocol, Version 3.1. Available at: [http://www.climateregistry.org/resources/docs/protocols/grp/GRP\\_3.1\\_January2009.pdf](http://www.climateregistry.org/resources/docs/protocols/grp/GRP_3.1_January2009.pdf)
- Energy Star. Boilers key Product Criteria. Available at: [http://www.energystar.gov/index.cfm?c=boilers.pr\\_crit\\_boilers](http://www.energystar.gov/index.cfm?c=boilers.pr_crit_boilers)
- Science Applications International Corporation 2009. Prepared for California Climate Action Registry. Development of Issue Papers for GHG Reduction Project Types: Boiler Efficiency Projects. Available at: [http://www.climateactionreserve.org/wp-content/uploads/2009/03/future-protocol-development\\_boiler-efficiency.pdf](http://www.climateactionreserve.org/wp-content/uploads/2009/03/future-protocol-development_boiler-efficiency.pdf)

#### Preferred Literature:

Boilers represent 12% of installed building heating equipment. Boiler efficiencies are regulated and commonly presented as annualized fuel utilization efficiency (AFUE), a ratio of the total useful heat delivered to the heat value from the annual amount of fuel consumed. The Climate Action Registry (CAR) Boiler Efficiency Projects estimated potential annual CO<sub>2</sub>e emission reductions of 22,673,929 and 6,584,231 MT for commercial and residential boilers, respectively, from boiler efficiency improvement from 77% to 83% [1]. The Consortium for Energy Efficiency (CEE) reports that the rate of high efficiency boilers ( $\geq 85\%$ ) has gone from 5-15% of sales in 2002 to 50%-60% of sales in 2007 [2]. The CEE study also noted that technical improvements can be made to existing boiler types to improve efficiency to 88%. Efficiency can be further enhanced to up to 98% using the condensing boiler.

Only natural gas boilers are considered under this mitigation measure. The Project Applicant would only need to provide the annual natural gas consumptions to calculate the baseline emissions using heat content and carbon intensity factors from CCAR [3]. To determine the emission reduction, boiler efficiency is also needed, and should be obtainable from manufacturer specifications. A range of efficiencies from the CEE study has been presented for reference, but to take credit for this mitigation measure, the Project Applicant would also need to provide evidence from manufacturers supporting the higher efficiency from a retrofit or new boiler.

# Energy

**BE-5****Building Energy****Alternative Literature:**

None

**Notes:**

- [1] Science Applications International Corporation 2009. Prepared for Climate Action Registry (CAR). Development of Issue Papers for GHG Reduction Project Types: Boiler Efficiency Projects. Available at: [http://www.climateactionreserve.org/wp-content/uploads/2009/03/future-protocol-development\\_boiler-efficiency.pdf](http://www.climateactionreserve.org/wp-content/uploads/2009/03/future-protocol-development_boiler-efficiency.pdf)
- [2] Consortium of Energy Efficiency (CEE) Winter Program Meeting 2008. Market Characterization of Commercial Gas Boilers.
- [3] CCAR 2009. General Reporting Protocol, Version 3.1. Available at: [http://www.climateregistry.org/resources/docs/protocols/grp/GRP\\_3.1\\_January2009.pdf](http://www.climateregistry.org/resources/docs/protocols/grp/GRP_3.1_January2009.pdf)

**Other Literature Reviewed:**

None

# Energy

MP# EE-2.1.5

LE-1

Lighting

## 2.2 Lighting

### 2.2.1 Install Higher Efficacy Public Street and Area Lighting

**Range of Effectiveness:**

16-40% of outdoor lighting

**Measure Description:**

Lighting sources contribute to GHG emissions indirectly, via the production of the electricity that powers these lights. Public street and area lighting includes streetlights, pedestrian pathway lights, area lighting for parks and parking lots, and outdoor lighting around public buildings. Lighting design should consider the amount of light required for the area intended to be lit. Lumens are the measure of the amount of light perceived by the human eye. Different light fixtures have different efficacies or the amount of lumens produced per watt of power supplied. This is different than efficiency, and it is important that lighting improvements are based on maintaining the appropriate lumens per area when applying this measure. Installing more efficacious lamps will use less electricity while producing the same amount of light, and therefore reduces the associated indirect GHG emissions.

**Measure Applicability:**

- Public street and area lighting

**Inputs:**

The following information needs to be provided by the Project Applicant:

- Number of lighting heads (for baseline only)
- Power rating of public street and area lights
- Carbon intensity of local utility (for baseline only)

**Baseline Method:**

$$\text{GHG emissions} = \text{Heads} \times \text{Hours} \times \text{Days} \times \text{Power}_{\text{baseline}} \times \text{Utility}$$

Where:

- GHG emissions = MT CO<sub>2</sub>e/yr
- Heads = Number of public street and area lighting heads. Provided by Applicant.
- Hours = Hours of operation per day (12).
- Days = Days of operation per year (365).
- Power<sub>baseline</sub> = Power rating of public street and area lights (kW).
- Utility = Carbon intensity of Local Utility (CO<sub>2</sub>e/kWh)

# Energy

MP# EE-2.1.5 LE-1 Lighting

**Mitigation Method:**

The minimum reduction in annual energy cost associated with higher efficacy street lighting systems is 16%. Note that a 16% reduction in power rating and GHG emissions is the estimated minimum percent reduction associated with installing higher efficacy public street and area lighting. NYSERDA reports that a 16% reduction is expected for installing metal halide post top lights as opposed to typical mercury cobrahead lights. The percent reduction is expected to increase to 35% for installing metal halide cobrahead or metal halide cutoff lights, and 40% for installing high pressure sodium cutoff lights. For lights operating with a single local utility district, the 16% energy cost reduction is equivalent to a 16% reduction in power rating because the energy cost comparison assumes an equal number of lighting heads and equal operation times. As all other variables remain equal between the baseline and mitigated scenarios, the reduction in GHG emissions is in turn 16%. Therefore, the reduction in GHG emissions associated with installing higher efficacy public street and area lighting is:

$$\text{GHG emission reduction} = \frac{\text{Power}_{\text{baseline}} - \text{Power}_{\text{mitigated}}}{\text{Power}_{\text{baseline}}} = 16\%$$

Where:

- GHG emission reduction = Percentage reduction in GHG emissions for public street and area lighting.
- Power<sub>baseline</sub> = Power rating of public street and area lights (kW).
- Power<sub>mitigated</sub> = Power rating of public street and area lights (kW).

If different types of lampheads result in less heads needing to be installed, the reduction will be as follows:

$$\frac{\text{Head}_{\text{baseline}} \times \text{Power}_{\text{baseline}} - \text{Head}_{\text{mitigated}} \times \text{Power}_{\text{mitigated}}}{\text{Head}_{\text{baseline}} \times \text{Power}_{\text{baseline}}}$$

Where:

- Head<sub>baseline</sub> = the number of heads in the baseline scenario
- Power<sub>baseline</sub> = the number of heads in the mitigated scenario

As it can be seen by this equation, the carbon intensity of the local utility does not play a role in determining the percentage reduction in GHG emissions.

Note that a 16% reduction in power rating and GHG emissions is the estimated minimum percent reduction associated with installing higher efficacy public street and

# Energy

MP# EE-2.1.5 **LE-1** **Lighting**

area lighting. NYSERDA reports that a 16% reduction is expected for installing metal halide post top lights as opposed to typical mercury cobrahead lights. The percent reduction is expected to increase to 35% for installing metal halide cobrahead or metal halide cutoff lights, and 40% for installing high pressure sodium cutoff lights.

**Emission Reduction Ranges and Variables:**

| Pollutant            | Category Emissions Reductions  |
|----------------------|--|
| CO <sub>2</sub> e    | 16% for installing metal halide post top lights;<br>35% for installing metal halide cobrahead or cutoff lights;<br>40% for installing high pressure sodium cutoff lights |
| All other pollutants | Not Quantified <sup>16</sup>   |

**Discussion:**

If the applicant uses public street and area lighting, they would calculate baseline emissions as described in the baseline methodologies section. If the applicant then selects to mitigate public street and area lighting by committing to higher efficacy options, the applicant would reduce the amount of GHG emissions associated with public street and area lighting by 16%.

$$\text{GHG Emissions Reduced} = 16\%$$

**Assumptions:**

Data based upon the following reference:

[1] New York State Energy Research and Development Authority (NYSERDA). 2002. NYSERDA How-to Guide to Effective Energy-Efficient Street Lighting for Municipal Elected/Appointed Officials.

**Preferred Literature:**

The New York State Energy Research and Development Authority (NYSERDA)'s 2002 How-to Guide to Effective Energy-Efficient Street Lighting reports a minimum reduction in electricity demand of 16% due to the installation of energy-efficient street lights such as metal halide and high-pressure sodium models (see page 4).

**Alternative Literature:**

None

**Other Literature Reviewed:**

---

<sup>16</sup> Criteria air pollutant emissions may also be reduced due to the reduction in energy use; however, the reduction may not be in the same air basin as the project.

## Energy

MP# EE-2.1.5

**LE-1**

**Lighting**

[2] The University of Rochester. Light-Emitting Diode (LED), Organic Light-Emitting Diode (OLED), and laser research for lighting applications. Homepage available online at: <http://www.rochester.edu/research/sciences.html>. Accessed February 2010.

[3] Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission. 1996. Outdoor Lighting Manual for Vermont Municipalities.

# Energy

MP# EE-2.3

LE-2

Lighting

## 2.2.2 Limit Outdoor Lighting Requirements

### Range of Effectiveness:

Best Management Practice, but may be quantified.

### Measure Description:

Lighting sources contribute to GHG emissions indirectly, via the production of the electricity that powers these lights. When the operational hours of a light are reduced, GHG emissions are reduced. Strategies for reducing the operational hours of lights include programming lights in public facilities (parks, swimming pools, or recreational centers) to turn off after-hours, or installing motion sensors on pedestrian pathways. Since literature guidance for quantifying these reductions does not exist, this mitigation measure would be employed as a Best Management Practice. In order to take credit for this mitigation measure, the Project Applicant would need to provide detailed and substantial documentation of the reduction in operational hours of lights.

### Measure Applicability:

- Outdoor lighting
- Best Management Practice unless Project Applicant supplies substantial evidence.

### Inputs:

The following information needs to be provided by the Project Applicant:

- Number of outdoor lights
- Power rating of outdoor lights
- Carbon intensity of local utility (for baseline only)
- Limited hours of operation of outdoor lights

### Baseline Method:

$$\text{GHG emissions} = \text{Heads} \times \text{Hours} \times \text{Power}_{\text{baseline}} \times \text{Utility}$$

Where:

GHG emissions = MT CO<sub>2</sub>e/yr

Heads = Number of outdoor lighting heads. Provided by Applicant.

Hours = Annual hours of operation (4,280)<sup>17</sup>.

Power<sub>baseline</sub> = Power rating of outdoor lights (kW).

Utility = Carbon intensity of Local Utility (CO<sub>2</sub>e/kWh)

<sup>17</sup> Estimated based on the annual number of dark hours (hours between sunset and sunrise) for Los Angeles, California.

# Energy

MP# EE-2.3 **LE-2** **Lighting**

**Mitigation Method:**

Limiting the hours of operation of outdoor lights in turn limits the indirect GHG emissions associated with their electricity usage. Therefore, the reduction in GHG emissions associated with limiting outdoor lighting is:

$$\text{GHG emission reduction} = \frac{\text{Hours}_{\text{baseline}} - \text{Hours}_{\text{limited}}}{\text{Hours}_{\text{baseline}}}$$

Where:

- GHG emission reduction = Percentage reduction in GHG emissions for outdoor lighting.
- Hours<sub>baseline</sub> = Annual hours of operation (4,280).
- Hours<sub>limited</sub> = Limited hours of operation per day. Provided by Applicant.

As it can be seen by this equation, the carbon intensity of the local utility does not play a role in determining the percentage reduction in GHG emissions.

**Emission Reduction Ranges and Variables:**

This is a best management practice measure unless the Project Applicant supplies substantial evidence justifying a reduction in hours of operation. Check with local agencies for guidance on any allowed reductions associated with implementation of best management practices.

| Pollutant            | Category Emissions Reductions |
|----------------------|-------------------------------|
| CO <sub>2</sub> e    | 0 to 100%                     |
| All other pollutants | Not Quantified <sup>18</sup>  |

**Discussion:**

If the applicant uses outdoor lighting, they would calculate baseline emissions as described in the baseline methodologies document. If the applicant then selects to mitigate outdoor lighting by limiting operation to 10 hours per day, the applicant would reduce the amount of GHG emissions associated with outdoor lighting by 20%.

$$\text{GHG Emissions Reduced} = \frac{12 - 10}{10} = 0.20 \text{ or } 20\%$$

**Assumptions:**

---

<sup>18</sup> Criteria air pollutant emissions may also be reduced due to the reduction in energy use; however, the reduction may not be in the same air basin as the project.

# Energy

MP# EE-2.3

**LE-2**

**Lighting**

None

**Preferred Literature:**

None

**Other Literature Reviewed:**

None

# Energy

MP# EE-2.1.5

**LE-3**

**Lighting**

## 2.2.3 Replace Traffic Lights with LED Traffic Lights

### Range of Effectiveness:

90% of emissions associated with existing traffic lights.

### Measure Description:

Lighting sources contribute to GHG emissions indirectly, via the production of the electricity that powers these lights. Installing higher efficiency traffic lights reduces energy demand and associated GHG emissions. As high efficiency light-emitting diodes (LEDs), which consume about 90% less energy than traditional incandescent traffic lights while still providing adequate light or lumens when viewed, are currently required to meet minimum federal efficiency standards for new traffic lights. Project Applicants may take credit only if they are retrofitting existing incandescent traffic lights.

### Measure Applicability:

- Traffic lighting – retrofitting incandescent traffic lights

### Inputs:

The following information needs to be provided by the Project Applicant:

- Number of incandescent traffic lights being retrofitted
- Power rating of incandescent traffic lights being retrofitted
- Carbon intensity of local utility (for baseline only)

### Baseline Method:

$$\text{GHG emissions} = \text{Lights} \times \text{Hours} \times \text{Days} \times \text{Power}_{\text{baseline}} \times \text{Utility}$$

Where:

GHG emissions= MT CO<sub>2</sub>e/yr

Lights = Number of incandescent traffic lights being retrofitted. Provided by Applicant.

Hours = Hours of operation per day (24).

Days = Days of operation per year (365).

Power<sub>baseline</sub> = Power rating of incandescent traffic lights being retrofitted (kW).

Utility = Carbon intensity of Local Utility (CO<sub>2</sub>e/kWh)

### Mitigation Method:

Traffic lights using LEDs consume about 90% less power than traditional incandescent traffic lights. Therefore, the reduction in GHG emissions associated with replacing incandescent traffic lights with LED-based traffic lights is:

# Energy

MP# EE-2.1.5

**LE-3**

**Lighting**

$$\text{GHG emission reduction} = \frac{\text{Power}_{\text{baseline}} - \text{Power}_{\text{mitigated}}}{\text{Power}_{\text{baseline}}} = 90\%$$

Where:

GHG emission reduction = Percentage reduction in GHG emissions for traffic lighting.

Power<sub>baseline</sub> = Power rating of incandescent traffic lights (kW).

Power<sub>mitigated</sub> = Power rating of LED traffic lights (kW).

As it can be seen by this equation, the carbon intensity of the local utility does not play a role in determining the percentage reduction in GHG emissions.

### Emission Reduction Ranges and Variables:

| Pollutant            | Category Emissions Reductions |
|----------------------|-------------------------------|
| CO <sub>2</sub> e    | 90%                           |
| All other pollutants | Not Quantified <sup>19</sup>  |

### Discussion:

If the applicant uses traffic lights, they would calculate baseline emissions as described in the baseline methodologies document. If the applicant then selects to mitigate traffic lights by committing to replacing all existing incandescent traffic lights with LED traffic lights, the applicant would reduce the amount of GHG emissions associated with traffic lights in an existing area by 90%.

GHG Emissions Reduced = 90%

### Assumptions:

Data based upon the following references:

[1] USDOE. 2004. NREL. State Energy Program Case Studies: California Says “Go” to Energy-Saving Traffic Lights. Available online at: <http://www.nrel.gov/docs/fy04osti/35551.pdf>

[2] USEPA. ENERGY STAR: Traffic Signals. Available online at: [http://www.energystar.gov/index.cfm?c=traffic.pr\\_traffic\\_signals](http://www.energystar.gov/index.cfm?c=traffic.pr_traffic_signals). Accessed February 2010.

<sup>19</sup> Criteria air pollutant emissions may also be reduced due to the reduction in energy use; however, the reduction may not be in the same air basin as the project.

## Energy

MP# EE-2.1.5

**LE-3**

**Lighting**

### **Preferred Literature:**

NREL reports that traffic lights based on light-emitting diodes (LEDs) consume about 90% less power than traditional incandescent traffic lights. All traffic lights manufactured on or after January 1, 2006 must meet minimum federal efficiency standards, which are consistent with ENERGY STAR specifications for LED traffic lights.

### **Alternative Literature:**

None

### **Other Literature Reviewed:**

[3] The University of Rochester. LED, OLED, and laser research for lighting applications. Homepage available online at: <http://www.rochester.edu/research/sciences.html>. Accessed February 2010.

# Energy

CEQA # MM E-5 **AE-1** **Alternative Energy**  
 MP# AE-2.1

## 2.3 Alternative Energy Generation

### 2.3.1 Establish Onsite Renewable or Carbon-Neutral Energy Systems-Generic

#### Range of Effectiveness:

0-100% of emissions associated with electricity use. Note some systems could increase energy use.

#### Measure Description:

Using electricity generated from renewable or carbon-neutral power systems displaces electricity demand which would ordinarily be supplied by the local utility. Different sources of electricity generation that local utilities use have varying carbon intensities. Renewable energy systems such as fuel cells may have GHG emissions associated with them. Carbon-neutral power systems, such as photovoltaic panels, do not emit GHGs and will be less carbon intense than the local utility. This mitigation measure describes a method to calculate GHG emission reductions from displacing utility electricity with electricity generated from an on-site power system, which may incorporate technology which has not yet been established at the time this document was written.

#### Measure Applicability:

- Electricity use

#### Inputs:

The following information needs to be provided by the Project Applicant:

- Total annual electricity demand (kWh)
- Annual amount of electricity to be provided by the on-site power system (kWh) or percent of total electricity demand to be provided by the on-site power system (%)
- Carbon intensity of local utility and on-site power system if not carbon neutral

#### Baseline Method:

$$\text{GHG emissions} = \text{Electricity}_{\text{baseline}} \times \text{Utility}$$

Where:

$$\text{GHG emissions} = \text{MT CO}_2\text{e}$$

$$\text{Electricity}_{\text{baseline}} = \frac{\text{Total electricity demand (kWh)}}{\text{Provided by Applicant}}$$

$$\text{Utility} = \text{Carbon intensity of Local Utility (CO}_2\text{e/kWh)}$$

# Energy

CEQA # MM E-5  
MP# AE-2.1

## AE-1

### Alternative Energy

#### Mitigation Method:

If the total amount of electricity to be provided by the carbon-neutral power system is known, then the GHG emission reduction is equivalent to the ratio of electricity from the carbon-neutral power system to the total electricity demand:

$$\text{GHG emission reduction} = \frac{\text{Electricity}_{\text{carbon-neutral}}}{\text{Electricity}_{\text{baseline}}}$$

Where:

- GHG emission reduction = Percentage reduction in GHG emissions for electricity use
- Electricity<sub>carbon-neutral</sub> = Electricity to be provided by the carbon-neutral power system (kWh)
- Electricity<sub>baseline</sub> = Total electricity demand (kWh)

If the percent of total electricity demand to be provided by the carbon-neutral power system is known, then the GHG emission reduction is equivalent to that percentage.

As shown in these equations, the carbon intensity of the local utility does not play a role in determining the percentage reduction in GHG emissions for carbon neutral systems.

If the total amount of electricity to be provided by a renewable energy system that is not carbon neutral, then the GHG emission reduction is equivalent to the following equation:

$$\text{GHG emission reduction} = \frac{\text{Electricity}_{\text{renewable}}}{\text{Electricity}_{\text{baseline}}} \times \frac{(\text{Utility} - \text{Renewable})}{\text{Utility}}$$

Where

- Electricity<sub>renewable</sub> = Electricity provided by renewable power system (kWh)
- Renewable = Carbon intensity of renewable system (CO<sub>2</sub>e/kWh)

#### Emission Reduction Ranges and Variables:

| Pollutant            | Category Emissions Reductions  |
|----------------------|--|
| CO <sub>2</sub> e    | Up to 100%, assuming all electricity demand is provided by a carbon-neutral power system |
| All other pollutants | Not Quantified <sup>20, 21</sup>   |

#### Discussion:

<sup>20</sup> Criteria air pollutant emissions may also be reduced due to the reduction in energy use; however, the reduction may not be in the same air basin as the project.

<sup>21</sup> Assumes that the onsite carbon-neutral system displaces electricity use only.

# Energy

CEQA # MM E-5  
MP# AE-2.1

## AE-1

### Alternative Energy

If a project's total electricity demand is 10,000 kWh, and 1,000 kWh of that is provided by the carbon-neutral system, then the GHG emission reduction is 10%

$$\text{GHG Emission Reduced} = \frac{1,000}{10,000} = 0.10 \text{ or } 10\%$$

If a project instead uses a renewable system with carbon intensity of 500 CO<sub>2</sub>e/kWh and the local utility is 100 CO<sub>2</sub>e/kWh, then the GHG emission reduction is 5%.

$$\text{GHG Emission Reduced} = \frac{1,000}{10,000} \times \frac{(1,000 - 500)}{1,000} = 0.05 \text{ or } 5\%$$

# Energy

CEQA # MM E-5  
MP# AE-2.1

## AE-2

### Alternative Energy

### 2.3.2 Establish Onsite Renewable Energy Systems-Solar Power

**Range of Effectiveness:** 0-100% of GHG emissions associated with electricity use.

**Measure Description:**

Using electricity generated from photovoltaic (PV) systems displaces electricity demand which would ordinarily be supplied by the local utility. Since zero GHG emissions are associated with electricity generation from PV systems<sup>22</sup>, the GHG emissions reductions from this mitigation measure are equivalent to the emissions that would have been produced had electricity been supplied by the local utility.

**Measure Applicability:**

- Electricity use

**Inputs:**

The following information needs to be provided by the Project Applicant:

- Total electricity demand (kWh)
- Amount of electricity to be provided by the PV system (kWh) or percent of total electricity demand to be provided by the PV system (%)

**Baseline Method:**

$$\text{GHG emissions} = \text{Electricity}_{\text{baseline}} \times \text{Utility}$$

Where:

$$\text{GHG emissions} = \text{MT CO}_2\text{e}$$

$$\text{Electricity}_{\text{baseline}} = \text{Total electricity demand (kWh)}$$

Provided by Applicant

$$\text{Utility} = \text{Carbon intensity of Local Utility (CO}_2\text{e/kWh)}$$

**Mitigation Method:**

If the total amount of electricity to be provided by the PV system is known, then the GHG emission reduction is equivalent to the ratio of electricity from the PV system to the total electricity demand:

$$\text{GHG emission reduction} = \frac{\text{Electricity}_{\text{PV}}}{\text{Electricity}_{\text{baseline}}}$$

---

<sup>22</sup> This mitigation measure does not account for GHG emissions associated with the embodied energy of PV systems.

# Energy

CEQA # MM E-5  
MP# AE-2.1

## AE-2

### Alternative Energy

Where:

- GHG emission reduction = Percentage reduction in GHG emissions for electricity use
- Electricity<sub>PV</sub> = Electricity to be provided by PV system (kWh)
- Electricity<sub>baseline</sub> = Total electricity demand (kWh)

If the percent of total electricity demand to be provided by the PV system is known, then the GHG emission reduction is equivalent to that percentage.

As shown in these equations, the carbon intensity of the local utility does not play a role in determining the percentage reduction in GHG emissions.

The amount of electricity generated by a PV system depends on the size and type of the PV system and the location of the project. The Project Applicant can use a publically-available solar calculator, such as California's Public Utilities and Energy Commissions Go Solar Clean Power Estimator<sup>23</sup>, to estimate the size of the PV system needed to generate the desired amount of electricity. The only input required for this calculator is the location (zip code). Estimates of the amount of electricity that can be generated from 1.5, 3, 5, and 10 kW PV systems in cities around California are shown in Table AE-2.1 below.

Since there is a range of PV system efficiencies, the local agency may consider checking the type of PV efficiency assumed to ensure the system that is installed meets this capacity.

#### Emission Reduction Ranges and Variables:

| Pollutant            | Category Emissions Reductions   |
|----------------------|---|
| CO <sub>2</sub> e    | Up to 100%, assuming all electricity demand is provided by a PV system.<br><br>Percent reduction would scale down linearly as the percent of electricity provided by a PV system decreases. |
| All other pollutants | Not Quantified <sup>24</sup>  |

#### Discussion:

If a project's total electricity demand is 10,000 kWh, and 1,000 kWh of that is provided by a PV system, then the GHG emission reduction is 10%

<sup>23</sup> Available online at <http://gosolarcalifornia.cleanpowerestimator.com/gosolarcalifornia.htm>.

<sup>24</sup> Criteria air pollutant emissions may also be reduced due to the reduction in energy use; however, the reduction may not be in the same air basin as the project.

# Energy

CEQA # MM E-5  
MP# AE-2.1

## AE-2

### Alternative Energy

$$\text{GHG Emission Reduced} = \frac{1,000}{10,000} = 0.10 \text{ or } 10\%$$

#### Assumptions:

The data in Table AE-2.1 was generated from California's Public Utilities and Energy Commissions Go Solar Clean Power Estimator, a publicly-available solar calculator which the Project Applicant can use to estimate the PV system size needed to generate the desired amount of electricity. It is available online at:

<http://gosolarcalifornia.cleanpowerestimator.com/gosolarcalifornia.htm>.

Other publicly-available solar calculators include:

- USDOE. NREL: PVWatts Calculator. Available online at: <http://www.nrel.gov/rredc/pvwatts/>.
- SolarEstimate.Org. Solar & Wind Estimator. Available online at: <http://www.solar-estimate.org/index.php?page=solar-calculator>.
- SharpUSA. Solar Calculator. Available online at: <http://sharpusa.cleanpowerestimator.com/sharpusa.htm>.

#### Preferred Literature:

None

#### Other Literature Reviewed:

None

# Energy

CEQA # MM E-5  
MP# AE-2.1

## AE-2

## Alternative Energy

**Table AE-2.1**  
**Estimated Electricity Generation from Typical PV Systems**

| Location                   |                  |          | Annual kWh Generated |                |                 |
|----------------------------|------------------|----------|----------------------|----------------|-----------------|
| Air District               | Major City       | Zip Code | 3 kW PV System       | 5 kW PV System | 10 kW PV System |
| Amador County              | Ione             | 95640    | 4,857                | 8,094          | 16,189          |
| Antelope Valley            | Lancaster        | 93534    | 5,034                | 8,390          | 16,781          |
| Bay Area                   | San Francisco    | 94101    | 4,926                | 8,218          | 16,436          |
| Butte County               | Chico            | 95926    | 4,857                | 8,094          | 16,189          |
| Calaveras County           | Rancho Calaveras | 95252    | 4,857                | 8,094          | 16,189          |
| Colusa County              | Colusa           | 95932    | 4,857                | 8,094          | 16,189          |
| El Dorado County           | South Lake Tahoe | 96150    | 5,275                | 8,792          | 17,584          |
| Feather River              | Yuba City        | 95991    | 4,857                | 8,094          | 16,189          |
| Glenn County               | Orland           | 95963    | 4,857                | 8,094          | 16,189          |
| Great Basin Unified        | Bishop           | 93514    | 5,507                | 9,179          | 18,358          |
| Imperial County            | El Centro        | 92243    | 5,117                | 8,528          | 17,056          |
| Kern County                | Bakersfield      | 93301    | 5,082                | 8,470          | 16,939          |
| Lake County                | Lakeport         | 95453    | 4,857                | 8,094          | 16,189          |
| Lassen County              | Susanville       | 96130    | 5,275                | 8,792          | 17,584          |
| Mariposa County            | Mariposa         | 95338    | 5,065                | 8,441          | 16,882          |
| Mendocino County           | Ukiah            | 95482    | 4,926                | 8,218          | 16,436          |
| Modoc County               | Alturas          | 96101    | 5,275                | 8,792          | 17,584          |
| Mojave Desert              | Victorville      | 92392    | 5,885                | 9,808          | 19,617          |
| Monterey Bay Unified       | Monterey         | 93940    | 4,926                | 8,218          | 16,436          |
| North Coast Unified        | Eureka           | 95501    | 4,081                | 6,801          | 13,602          |
| Northern Sierra            | Grass Valley     | 95949    | 4,857                | 8,094          | 16,189          |
| Northern Sonoma County     | Healdsburg       | 95448    | 4,931                | 8,218          | 16,436          |
| Placer County              | Roseville        | 95678    | 4,857                | 8,094          | 16,189          |
| Sacramento Metro           | Sacramento       | 95864    | 4,857                | 8,094          | 16,189          |
| San Diego County           | San Diego        | 92182    | 5,102                | 8,528          | 17,056          |
| San Joaquin Valley Unified | Fresno           | 93650    | 5,065                | 8,441          | 16,882          |
| San Luis Obispo County     | San Luis Obispo  | 93405    | 5,320                | 8,932          | 17,865          |
| Santa Barbara County       | Santa Barbara    | 93101    | 5,320                | 8,932          | 17,865          |
| Shasta County              | Redding          | 96001    | 4,081                | 6,801          | 13,602          |
| Siskiyou County            | Yreka            | 96097    | 4,363                | 7,271          | 14,543          |
| South Coast                | Los Angeles      | 90071    | 5,034                | 8,390          | 16,781          |
| Tehama County              | Red Bluff        | 96080    | 4,857                | 8,094          | 16,189          |
| Tuolumne County            | Sonora           | 95370    | 4,857                | 8,094          | 16,189          |
| Ventura County             | Oxnard           | 93030    | 5,034                | 8,390          | 16,781          |
| Yolo-Solano                | Davis            | 95616    | 4,857                | 8,094          | 16,189          |

# Energy

CEQA # MM E-5  
MP# AE-2.1

## AE-3

### Alternative Energy

#### 2.3.3 Establish Onsite Renewable Energy Systems-Wind Power

**Range of Effectiveness:** 0-100% of GHG emissions associated with electricity use.

**Measure Description:**

Using electricity generated from wind power systems displaces electricity demand which would ordinarily be supplied by the local utility. Since zero GHG emissions are associated with electricity generation from wind turbines<sup>25</sup>, the GHG emissions reductions from this mitigation measure are equivalent to the emissions that would have been produced had electricity been supplied by the local utility.

**Measure Applicability:**

- Electricity use

**Inputs:**

The following information needs to be provided by the Project Applicant:

- Total electricity demand (kWh)
- Amount of electricity to be provided by the wind power system (kWh) or percent of total electricity demand to be provided by the wind power system (%)

**Baseline Method:**

$$\text{GHG emissions} = \text{Electricity}_{\text{baseline}} \times \text{Utility}$$

Where:

$$\text{GHG emissions} = \text{MT CO}_2\text{e}$$

$$\text{Electricity}_{\text{baseline}} = \frac{\text{Total electricity demand (kWh)}}{\text{Provided by Applicant}}$$

$$\text{Utility} = \text{Carbon intensity of Local Utility (CO}_2\text{e/kWh)}$$

**Mitigation Method:**

The GHG emission reduction is equivalent to the ratio of electricity from the wind power system to the total electricity demand:

$$\text{GHG emission reduction} = \frac{\text{Electricity}_{\text{wind}}}{\text{Electricity}_{\text{baseline}}}$$

<sup>25</sup> This mitigation measure does not account for GHG emissions associated with the embodied energy of wind turbines.

# Energy

CEQA # MM E-5 **AE-3** **Alternative Energy**  
 MP# AE-2.1

Where:

GHG emission reduction = Percentage reduction in GHG emissions for electricity use

Electricity<sub>wind</sub> = Electricity to be provided by wind power system (kWh)

Electricity<sub>baseline</sub> = Total electricity demand (kWh)

If the percent of total electricity demand to be provided by the wind power system is known, then the GHG emission reduction is equivalent to that percentage.

As shown in these equations, the carbon intensity of the local utility does not play a role in determining the percentage reduction in GHG emissions.

### Emission Reduction Ranges and Variables:

| Pollutant            | Category Emissions Reductions   |
|----------------------|---|
| CO <sub>2</sub> e    | Up to 100%, assuming all electricity demand is provided by a wind power system.<br><br>Percent reduction would scale down linearly as the percent of electricity provided by a wind power system decreases. |
| All other pollutants | None <sup>26</sup>  |

### Discussion:

If a project's total electricity demand is 10,000 kWh, and 1,000 kWh of that is provided by a wind system, then the GHG emission reduction is 10%

$$\text{GHG Emission Reduced} = \frac{1,000}{10,000} = 0.10 \text{ or } 10\%$$

### Assumptions:

None

### Preferred Literature:

None

---

<sup>26</sup> Criteria air pollutant emissions may also be reduced due to the reduction in energy use; however, the reduction may not be in the same air basin as the project.

# Energy

CEQA # MM E-5  
MP# AE-2.1

**AE-3**

**Alternative Energy**

## Other Literature Reviewed:

None

# Energy

MP# AE-2

**AE-4**

**Alternative Energy**

## 2.3.4 Utilize a Combined Heat and Power System

**Range of Effectiveness:** 0-46% of GHG emissions associated with electricity use.

### Measure Description:

For the same level of power output, combined heat and power (CHP) systems utilize less input energy than traditional separate heat and power (SHP) generation, resulting in fewer CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. In traditional SHP systems, heat created as a by-product is wasted by being released into the environment. In contrast, CHP systems harvest the thermal energy and use it to heat onsite or nearby processes, thus reducing the amount of natural gas or other fuel that would otherwise need to be combusted to heat those processes. In addition CHP systems lower the demand for grid electricity, thereby displacing the CO<sub>2</sub> emissions associated with the production of grid electricity.

This mitigation measure describes how to estimate CO<sub>2</sub> emissions savings (in MT per year) from utilizing a CHP system to supply energy demands which would otherwise be provided by separate heat and power systems (e.g. grid electricity for electricity demand and boilers for thermal demand). CO<sub>2</sub> emissions savings are quantified using the USEPA CHP Emission Calculator which allows users to estimate the CO<sub>2</sub> emissions savings associated with displaced electricity and thermal production from five CHP technologies: microturbine, fuel cell, reciprocating engine, combustion turbine, and backpressure steam turbine. The first three technologies have electricity generation capacities on a scale appropriate for residential neighborhoods, planned communities, and mixed-use and commercial developments. Combustion turbines and backpressure steam turbines are more appropriate for industrial processes or very large commercial developments. The user has the option to input project-specific data such as specific fuels, duct burner operation, cooling demand, and boiler efficiencies.

Table AE-4.1 provides examples of expected CO<sub>2</sub> savings for microturbines, fuel cells, and reciprocating engines of a range of electricity generating capacities for the five major California utilities (Southern California Edison (SCE), Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP), San Diego Gas and Electric (SDGE), Pacific Gas and Electric (PGE), and the Sacramento Municipal Utility District (SMUD). Default values provided by the USEPA CHP Calculator were used wherever possible (see the Assumptions section below). The magnitude of CO<sub>2</sub> reductions depends on the baseline power sources. For thermal demand, the baseline is assumed to be a new boiler with 80% efficiency. For electricity demand, the baseline is the carbon intensity of the local utility, which varies by utility. For reference, Table AE-4.2 provides the 2006 carbon intensity of delivered electricity for the five utilities. As shown in Table AE-4.1, certain CHP systems may not be appropriate for certain locations, especially in Northern California where PGE and SMUD have relatively low carbon intensities.

### Measure Applicability:

# Energy

MP# AE-2 **AE-4** **Alternative Energy**

- Grid electricity use
- Natural gas combustion

**Inputs:**

The following information needs to be provided by the Project Applicant:

- Expected CHP technology (microturbine, fuel cell, or reciprocating engine)
- Expected electricity demand

**Baseline Method:**

$$\text{GHG emissions} = \text{CO}_2 \text{ emissions displaced}$$

Where:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{GHG emissions} &= \text{MT CO}_2\text{e} \\ \text{CO}_2 \text{ emissions displaced} &= \text{MT CO}_2 \text{ from separate heat and power system} \\ &\text{Provided in Table AE-4.1 or calculated using} \\ &\text{USEPA CHP Calculator} \end{aligned}$$

Here it is assumed that all GHG emissions produced from fuel combustion and electricity generation are CO<sub>2</sub> emissions.

**Mitigation Method:**

$$\begin{aligned} \text{GHG emission reduction} &= \text{Percent Reduction in CO}_2 \text{ emissions} \\ &\text{Provided in Table A E-4.1 or calculated using USEPA CHP Calculator} \end{aligned}$$

**Emission Reduction Ranges and Variables:**

| Pollutant            | Category Emissions Reductions  |
|----------------------|--|
| CO <sub>2</sub> e    | Up to 100%, assuming all electricity demand is provided by a CHP system.   |
| All other pollutants | Percent reduction would scale down linearly as the percent of electricity provided by a CHP system decreases.<br>0-70% <sup>27</sup><br>Depends on CHP technology, electricity generating capacity, sulfur content of fuel, and displaced thermal generation technology.<br>Reductions in CO <sub>2</sub> may produce increases in SO <sub>2</sub> and/or NO <sub>x</sub> , or vice versa. |

<sup>27</sup> Criteria air pollutant emissions may also be reduced due to the reduction in energy use; however, the reduction may not be in the same air basin as the project.

# Energy

MP# AE-2

**AE-4**

**Alternative Energy**

## Discussion:

Assume a project is located in SCE's service area and has an expected electricity demand of 100 kW. Using Table AE-4:

- A 100 kW microturbine will generate more CO<sub>2</sub> emissions than a separate heat and power system of equivalent power capacity.
- A 100 kW fuel cell will generate about the same CO<sub>2</sub> emissions than a separate heat and power system of equivalent power capacity.
- A 100 kW reciprocating engine will generate 14% less CO<sub>2</sub> emissions as a separate heat and power system of equivalent power capacity.

Therefore, the Project Applicant should choose the reciprocating engine. This system would generate 568 MT CO<sub>2</sub> compared to 657 MT CO<sub>2</sub> from the separate heat and power system.

## Assumptions:

Table AE-4.1 was prepared using the 2009 USEPA CHP Calculator, a publically-available tool found online at: <http://www.epa.gov/chp/basic/calculator.html>. The following defaults and assumptions were made to generate the data in Table AE-4.1:

- The range of electricity generating capacity shown in Table AE-4.1 is based on the normal range for the technology (as per Calculator default)
- Operates 8,760 hours per year
- Provides heat only (no cooling)
- Combusts natural gas fuel (116.7 CO<sub>2</sub>/MMBtu emission rate and 1,020 Btu/scf HHV as per Calculator defaults)
- No supplementary duct burner
- Assumes 8% transmission loss for displaced electricity

Table AE-4.2 was prepared using data from the California Climate Action Registry (CCAR) Power/Utility Protocol (PUP) public reports for reporting year 2006. These PUP reports are available online at:

<https://www.climateregistry.org/CARROT/public/reports.aspx>.

## Preferred Literature:

The USEPA CHP Emissions Calculator compares the anticipated emissions from a CHP system to the emissions from SHP systems. The Calculator was developed by the U.S. Department of Energy's Distributed Energy Program, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's CHP Partnership. Users can choose from five different CHP technologies (microturbine, fuel cell, reciprocating engine, combustion turbine, and backpressure steam turbine) and compare their performance to a number of different SHP systems (e.g. local electricity utility and

## Energy

MP# AE-2

**AE-4**

**Alternative Energy**

existing or new gas boiler, fuel oil boiler, or heat pump). Additionally, users have the option to refine the analysis with project-specific inputs such as the cooling demand and additional duct burning. Details such as the cooling efficiency of the displaced cooling system must be known to perform more detailed analysis. The calculator can be used to estimate expected reductions in CO<sub>2</sub>, SO<sub>2</sub>, and NO<sub>x</sub> emissions as well as fuel usage.

### **Alternative Literature:**

The USEPA Combined Heat and Power Partnership Catalog of CHP Technologies presents performance details of six CHP technologies: gas turbine, microturbine, spark and compression ignition reciprocating engines, steam turbine, and fuel cell. Table I of the Introduction presents the equations necessary to calculate the percent fuel savings from using a CHP system instead of traditional separate heat and power generation. Subsequent chapters describe performance details of each of the CHP technologies, including estimated CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. The GHG emissions reductions associated with this mitigation measure are the change in emissions from using a CHP system rather than a SHP system in a building. The USEPA CHP Calculator methodologies are based in part on this Catalog of CHP Technologies document.

### **Other Literature Reviewed:**

None

# Energy

MP# AE-2

**AE-4**

**Alternative Energy**

**Table AE-4.1**  
**Estimated CO<sub>2</sub> Emissions Savings from CHP Systems in California<sup>1,2</sup>**

| Utility | CHP Technology                   | Electricity Generating Capacity | Electric Efficiency | Power to Heat Ratio | CO <sub>2</sub> Emissions from CHP | CO <sub>2</sub> Emissions Displaced | Percent Reduction in CO <sub>2</sub> Emissions <sup>3</sup> |
|---------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
|         |                                  | (kW)                            | (% HHV)             | --                  | (MT/year)                          | (MT/year)                           | (%)   |
| SCE     | Microturbine                     | 30                              | 24%                 | 0.51                | 200                                | 200                                 | 0%  |
|         |                                  | 50                              | 24%                 | 0.51                | 334                                | 333                                 | 0%  |
|         |                                  | 100                             | 26%                 | 0.7                 | 607                                | 559                                 | -9%   |
|         |                                  | 250                             | 26%                 | 0.92                | 1517                               | 1229                                | -23%  |
|         | Fuel Cell                        | 5                               | 30%                 | 0.79                | 26                                 | 26                                  | 0%  |
|         |                                  | 100                             | 30%                 | 0.79                | 527                                | 527                                 | 0%  |
|         |                                  | 1000                            | 43%                 | 1.95                | 3679                               | 3783                                | 3%  |
|         |                                  | 2000                            | 46%                 | 1.92                | 6884                               | 7597                                | 9%  |
|         | Reciprocating Engine (Rich Burn) | 55                              | 30%                 | 0.63                | 290                                | 325                                 | 11%   |
|         |                                  | 100                             | 28%                 | 0.52                | 568                                | 657                                 | 14%   |
|         |                                  | 1000                            | 29%                 | 0.64                | 5514                               | 5859                                | 6%  |
|         |                                  | 1200                            | 28%                 | 0.63                | 6759                               | 7052                                | 4%  |
| LADWP   | Microturbine                     | 30                              | 24%                 | 0.51                | 200                                | 277                                 | 28%   |
|         |                                  | 50                              | 24%                 | 0.51                | 334                                | 462                                 | 28%   |
|         |                                  | 100                             | 26%                 | 0.7                 | 607                                | 817                                 | 26%   |
|         |                                  | 250                             | 26%                 | 0.92                | 1517                               | 1875                                | 19%   |
|         | Fuel Cell                        | 5                               | 30%                 | 0.79                | 26                                 | 39                                  | 33%   |
|         |                                  | 100                             | 30%                 | 0.79                | 527                                | 786                                 | 33%   |
|         |                                  | 1000                            | 43%                 | 1.95                | 3679                               | 6366                                | 42%   |
|         |                                  | 2000                            | 46%                 | 1.92                | 6884                               | 12762                               | 46%   |
|         | Reciprocating Engine (Rich Burn) | 55                              | 30%                 | 0.63                | 290                                | 466                                 | 38%   |
|         |                                  | 100                             | 28%                 | 0.52                | 568                                | 915                                 | 38%   |
|         |                                  | 1000                            | 29%                 | 0.64                | 5514                               | 8441                                | 35%   |
|         |                                  | 1200                            | 28%                 | 0.63                | 6759                               | 10188                               | 34%   |
| SDGE    | Microturbine                     | 30                              | 24%                 | 0.51                | 200                                | 218                                 | 8%  |
|         |                                  | 50                              | 24%                 | 0.51                | 334                                | 363                                 | 8%  |
|         |                                  | 100                             | 26%                 | 0.7                 | 607                                | 620                                 | 2%  |
|         |                                  | 250                             | 26%                 | 0.92                | 1517                               | 1381                                | -10%  |
|         | Fuel Cell                        | 5                               | 30%                 | 0.79                | 26                                 | 30                                  | 12%   |
|         |                                  | 100                             | 30%                 | 0.79                | 527                                | 588                                 | 10%   |
|         |                                  | 1000                            | 43%                 | 1.95                | 3679                               | 4387                                | 16%   |
|         |                                  | 2000                            | 46%                 | 1.92                | 6884                               | 8806                                | 22%   |

# Energy

MP# AE-2

**AE-4**

**Alternative Energy**

| Utility | CHP Technology                   | Electricity Generating Capacity | Electric Efficiency | Power to Heat Ratio | CO <sub>2</sub> Emissions from CHP | CO <sub>2</sub> Emissions Displaced | Percent Reduction in CO <sub>2</sub> Emissions <sup>3</sup> |
|---------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
|         |                                  | (kW)                            | (% HHV)             | --                  | (MT/year)                          | (MT/year)                           | (%)   |
|         | Reciprocating Engine (Rich Burn) | 55                              | 30%                 | 0.63                | 290                                | 358                                 | 19%   |
|         |                                  | 100                             | 28%                 | 0.52                | 568                                | 717                                 | 21%   |
|         |                                  | 1000                            | 29%                 | 0.64                | 5514                               | 6463                                | 15%   |
|         |                                  | 1200                            | 28%                 | 0.63                | 6759                               | 7814                                | 14%   |
| PGE     | Microturbine                     | 30                              | 24%                 | 0.51                | 200                                | 175                                 | -15%  |
|         |                                  | 50                              | 24%                 | 0.51                | 334                                | 293                                 | -14%  |
|         |                                  | 100                             | 26%                 | 0.7                 | 607                                | 479                                 | -27%  |
|         |                                  | 250                             | 26%                 | 0.92                | 1517                               | 1030                                | -47%  |
|         | Fuel Cell                        | 5                               | 30%                 | 0.79                | 26                                 | 23                                  | -16%  |
|         |                                  | 100                             | 30%                 | 0.79                | 527                                | 447                                 | -18%  |
|         |                                  | 1000                            | 43%                 | 1.95                | 3679                               | 2984                                | -23%  |
|         |                                  | 2000                            | 46%                 | 1.92                | 6884                               | 5999                                | -15%  |
|         | Reciprocating Engine (Rich Burn) | 55                              | 30%                 | 0.63                | 290                                | 280                                 | -4%   |
|         |                                  | 100                             | 28%                 | 0.52                | 568                                | 577                                 | 2%  |
|         |                                  | 1000                            | 29%                 | 0.64                | 5514                               | 5059                                | -9%   |
|         |                                  | 1200                            | 28%                 | 0.63                | 6759                               | 6130                                | -10%  |
| SMUD    | Microturbine                     | 30                              | 24%                 | 0.51                | 200                                | 188                                 | -7%   |
|         |                                  | 50                              | 24%                 | 0.51                | 334                                | 314                                 | -6%   |
|         |                                  | 100                             | 26%                 | 0.7                 | 607                                | 522                                 | -16%  |
|         |                                  | 250                             | 26%                 | 0.92                | 1517                               | 1137                                | -33%  |
|         | Fuel Cell                        | 5                               | 30%                 | 0.79                | 26                                 | 24                                  | -7%   |
|         |                                  | 100                             | 30%                 | 0.79                | 527                                | 490                                 | -8%   |
|         |                                  | 1000                            | 43%                 | 1.95                | 3679                               | 3411                                | -8%   |
|         |                                  | 2000                            | 46%                 | 1.92                | 6884                               | 6855                                | 0%  |
|         | Reciprocating Engine (Rich Burn) | 55                              | 30%                 | 0.63                | 290                                | 304                                 | 4%  |
|         |                                  | 100                             | 28%                 | 0.52                | 568                                | 620                                 | 8%  |
|         |                                  | 1000                            | 29%                 | 0.64                | 5514                               | 5487                                | 0%  |
|         |                                  | 1200                            | 28%                 | 0.63                | 6759                               | 6643                                | -2%   |

**Abbreviations:**

CHP - combined heat and power

CO<sub>2</sub> - carbon dioxide

HHV - higher heating value

kW - kilowatt

LADWP - Los Angeles Department of Water and Power

# Energy

MP# AE-2

**AE-4**

**Alternative Energy**

PGE - Pacific Gas and Electric  
 SCE - Southern California Edison  
 SDGE - San Diego Gas and Electric  
 SMUD - Sacramento Municipal Utility District  
 USEPA - United State Environmental Protection Agency

**Notes:**

1. All data in this table generated using the USEPA CHP Calculator using utility-specific CO<sub>2</sub> intensity factors (see Table B). The following defaults and assumptions for the CHP system were used:
  - electricity generating capacity based on normal range for the technology (as per Calculator default)
  - operate 8,760 hours per year
  - heating only (no cooling)
  - natural gas fuel (116.7 CO<sub>2</sub>/MMBtu emission rate and 1,020 Btu/scf HHV as per Calculator defaults)
  - no duct burner
  - assumed 8% transmission loss for displaced electricity
2. All CHP systems were compared to a baseline separate heat and power system consisting of a "new gas boiler" (assumed 80% efficiency as per Calculator default) and the local utility CO<sub>2</sub> intensity factor as provided in Table B.
3. A negative value indicates that the proposed CHP system is expected to generate more CO<sub>2</sub> emissions than the baseline separate heat and power system.

**Source:**

USEPA. 2009. CHP Emissions Calculator. Available online at:  
<http://www.epa.gov/chp/basic/calculator.html>. Accessed April 2010.

**Table AE-4.2  
Carbon Intensity of California Utilities**

| Utility  | Total From All Generation Sources <sup>1</sup> |                           |                                  |
|--|--|---------------------------|----------------------------------|
|  | Electricity                                    | CO <sub>2</sub> Emissions | CO <sub>2</sub> intensity factor |
|  | (MWh)  | (MT)                      | (lb/MWh)                         |
| SCE  | 82,776,309                                     | 24,077,133                | 641                              |
| LADWP  | 29,029,883                                     | 16,308,526                | 1,239                            |
| SDGE   | 19,108,166                                     | 6,767,326                 | 781                              |
| PGE  | 79,211,982                                     | 16,377,172                | 456                              |
| SMUD   | 15,133,569                                     | 3,811,571                 | 555                              |
| eGRID National Average<br>(default in USEPA CHP Calculator) <sup>2,3</sup>             |  |                           | 540                              |
| eGRID National Fossil Fuel Average<br>(default in USEPA CHP Calculator) <sup>2,4</sup> |  |                           | 1,076                            |

**Abbreviations:**

CHP - combined heat and power

CO<sub>2</sub> - carbon dioxide

eGRID - Emissions and Generation Resource Integrated Database

LADWP - Los Angeles Department of Water and Power

lb - pound

MWh - megawatt-hour

PGE - Pacific Gas and Electric

SCE - Southern California Edison

SDGE - San Diego Gas and Electric

SMUD - Sacramento Municipal Utility District

USEPA - United State Environmental Protection Agency

**Notes:**

1. Total electricity and CO<sub>2</sub> emissions reported by the utility in the California Climate Action Registry Power/Utility Protocol (PUP) Reports for reporting year 2006. PUP Reports available online at: <https://www.climateregistry.org/CARROT/public/reports.aspx>.

2. eGRID is a comprehensive inventory of environmental attributes of electricity generation (such as the carbon intensity of power generation), compiled from data from three federal agencies: EPA, the Energy Information Administration (EIA), and the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC). The USEPA CHP Calculator provides default 2005 eGRID carbon intensities for the U.S. and California. For more information, see: <http://www.epa.gov/rdee/energy-resources/egrid/index.html>.

3. eGRID National Average represents the national average carbon intensity for electricity generation from all power sources (hydropower, nuclear, renewables, and fossil fuels including oil, natural gas, and coal).

4. eGRID National Fossil Fuel Average represents the national average carbon intensity for electricity generation from fossil fuel sources only (oil, natural gas, and coal).

# Energy

MP# WRD-1

**AE-5**

**Alternative Energy**

## 2.3.5 Establish Methane Recovery in Landfills

**Range of Effectiveness:** 73-77% reduction in GHG emissions from landfills without methane recovery

### Measure Description:

One of the U.S.'s largest sources of methane emissions is from the decomposition of waste in landfills. Methane (CH<sub>4</sub>) is a potent GHG and has a global warming potential (GWP) over 20 times that of CO<sub>2</sub>. Capturing methane in landfills and combusting it to generate electricity for on-site energy needs reduces GHG emissions in two ways: it reduces direct methane emissions, and it displaces electricity demand and the associated indirect GHG emissions from electricity production.

### Measure Applicability:

- Electricity from utility
- Note: this mitigation measure does not include energy generation from burning municipal solid waste.

### Inputs:

The following information needs to be provided by the Project Applicant:

- Amount of mixed solid waste (short tons)

### Baseline Method:

In landfills without landfill gas recovery systems, greenhouse gases are emitted directly to the atmosphere.

$$\text{CO}_2\text{e}_{\text{baseline}} = \text{MSW} \times \text{LFM} \times (44/12)$$

Where

|                                       |   |   |
|---------------------------------------|---|---|
| CO <sub>2</sub> e <sub>baseline</sub> | = | Amount of CO <sub>2</sub> e generated from landfilling mixed solid waste (MT)   |
| MSW                                   | = | Amount of mixed solid waste (short tons)<br>Provided by Applicant               |
| LFM                                   | = | Landfill methane generated from mixed solid waste<br>0.580 MTCE / short ton MSW |
| (44/12)                               | = | Conversion from MTCE to MT CO <sub>2</sub> e                                    |

# Energy

MP# WRD-1

**AE-5**

**Alternative Energy**

## Mitigation Method:

*Mitigation Option 1 – Methane is captured and flared*

USEPA assumes that 10% of the landfill CH<sub>4</sub> generated is either converted by bacteria or chemically oxidized to CO<sub>2</sub>. The remaining 90% remains as CH<sub>4</sub> and is either captured and flared<sup>28</sup> or released directly to the atmosphere as fugitive CH<sub>4</sub> emissions. Assume a 99% combustion conversion efficiency.

$$CO_{2eMit1} = MSW \times LFM \times 1/(12/44 \times 21) \times [(CO_{2oxidation} + CO_{2flare}) \times 1 + (CH_{4fugitive} + CH_{4unflare}) \times 21]$$

Where

|                          |   |   |
|--------------------------|---|---|
| CO <sub>2eMit1</sub>     | = | Amount of CO <sub>2e</sub> from flaring landfill methane (MT)   |
| MSW                      | = | Amount of mixed solid waste (short tons)<br>Provided by Applicant   |
| LFM                      | = | MTCE <sup>29</sup> methane generated per short ton MSW<br>0.580 MTCE / short ton MSW  |
| 1/(12/44 x 21)           | = | Conversion from MTCE to MT CH <sub>4</sub>  |
| CO <sub>2oxidation</sub> | = | Contribution from CO <sub>2</sub> generated from chemical or biological oxidation.<br>0.10  |
| CO <sub>2flare</sub>     | = | Contribution from CO <sub>2</sub> generated from the flaring of methane.<br>(1-0.10) x 0.75 x 0.99 = 0.66825  |
| 1                        | = | Global warming potential of CO <sub>2</sub> , used to convert from CO <sub>2</sub> to CO <sub>2e</sub>  |
| CH <sub>4fugitive</sub>  | = | Contribution from CH <sub>4</sub> which remains unoxidized to CO <sub>2</sub> and is not captured for flaring, and therefore is released directly to the atmosphere.<br>(1-0.10) x (1-0.75) = 0.225 |

<sup>28</sup> Seek local agency guidance on whether to include CO<sub>2flare</sub> emissions. USEPA and IPCC consider these emissions to be biogenic; therefore, the emissions are not included in USEPA and IPCC greenhouse gas emissions inventories.

<sup>29</sup> MTCE = metric MTMTMTMT carbon equivalent. The MTCE equivalent of 1 MT of a greenhouse gas is (12/44) multiplied by the greenhouse gas global warming potential.

# Energy

MP# WRD-1

## AE-5

## Alternative Energy

$$\begin{aligned} \text{CH}_{4\text{unflare}} &= \text{Contribution from CH}_4 \text{ which remains unoxidized and is captured for flaring, but remains unconverted due to incomplete combustion.} \\ &(1-0.10) \times 0.75 \times (1-0.99) = 0.00675 \\ 21 &= \text{Global warming potential of CH}_4, \text{ used to convert from CH}_4 \text{ to CO}_2\text{e} \end{aligned}$$

Therefore:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{CO}_2\text{e}_{\text{Mit1}} &= \text{MSW} \times 0.580 \times 1/(12/44 \times 21) \times [(0.76825 \times 1) + (0.23175 \times 21)] \\ \text{CO}_2\text{e}_{\text{Mit1}} &= \text{MSW} \times 0.571 \end{aligned}$$

And then the percent reduction in GHG emissions from Mitigation Option 1 is:

$$\text{GHG reduction}_{\text{Mit1}} = \frac{\text{CO}_2\text{e}_{\text{baseline}} - \text{CO}_2\text{e}_{\text{Mit1}}}{\text{CO}_2\text{e}_{\text{baseline}}}$$

$$\text{GHG reduction}_{\text{Mit1}} = 73\%$$

As shown from this equation, the percent reduction in greenhouse gas emissions does not depend on the amount of mixed solid waste in the landfill.

### *Mitigation Option 2 – Methane is captured and combusted for cogeneration*

If a cogeneration system is used to generate electricity from the combusted methane, the following equation is used to calculate the amount of electricity generated:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Electricity} &= \text{MSW} \times \text{LFM} \times 1/(12/44 \times 21) \times \text{Combust} \times \text{Density} \times 10^6 \times \text{HHV} \times \\ &\text{ECF} \times \text{EFF} \times \end{aligned}$$

Where

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Electricity} &= \text{Amount of electricity generated from combustion of methane (kWh)} \\ \text{LFM} &= \text{MTCE methane generated per short ton MSW} \\ &0.580 \text{ MTCE / short ton MSW} \\ 1/(12/44 \times 21) &= \text{Conversion from MTCE to MT CH}_4 \\ \text{Combust} &= \text{Fraction of CH}_4 \text{ captured and combusted for cogeneration} \end{aligned}$$

# Energy

MP# WRD-1

## AE-5

### Alternative Energy

$(1-0.10) \times 0.75 = 0.675$ ; assumes 10% of methane is oxidized prior to capture and 75% capture efficiency

Density = Density of CH<sub>4</sub>  
0.05 ft<sup>3</sup> CH<sub>4</sub> / gram CH<sub>4</sub>

10<sup>6</sup> = Conversion from grams to MT

HHV = Heating value of CH<sub>4</sub>  
1,012 BTU / ft<sup>3</sup> CH<sub>4</sub>

ECF = Energy conversion factor  
0.00009 kWh/BTU

EFF = Efficiency Factor  
0.85; USEPA assumes a 15% system efficiency loss to account for system down-time

Therefore:

$$\text{Electricity} = \text{MSW} \times 265$$

Since this amount of electricity is generated on-site and no longer needs to be supplied by the local electricity utility, the indirect CO<sub>2</sub>e emissions associated with that utility electricity generation are also avoided:

$$\text{CO}_{2e\text{displaced}} = \text{Electricity} \times \text{Utility}$$

Where

Utility = Carbon intensity of Local Utility (MT CO<sub>2</sub>e/kWh) from table below

| Power Utility | Carbon-Intensity<br>(lbs CO <sub>2</sub> e/MWh) |
|---------------|---|
| LADW&P        | 1,238   |
| PG&E          | 456   |
| SCE           | 641   |
| SDGE          | 781   |
| SMUD          | 555   |

Therefore:

$$\text{CO}_{2e\text{Mit2}} = \text{CO}_{2e\text{Mit1}} - \text{CO}_{2e\text{displaced}}$$

# Energy

MP# WRD-1

## AE-5

## Alternative Energy

And then the percent reduction in GHG emissions from Mitigation 2 is:

$$\text{GHG reduction}_{\text{Mit2}} = \frac{\text{CO}_2\text{e}_{\text{baseline}} - (\text{CO}_2\text{e}_{\text{Mit1}} - \text{CO}_2\text{e}_{\text{displaced}})}{\text{CO}_2\text{e}_{\text{baseline}}}$$

$$\text{GHG reduction}_{\text{Mit2}} = \frac{1.556 + (265 \times \text{Utility})}{2.127}$$

As shown from these equations, the percent reduction in GHG emissions does not depend on the amount of mixed solid waste in the landfill.

Note that further reductions could be achieved if the heat generated from combustion and cogeneration were recovered and used to displace thermal energy that otherwise would have been generated from a separate heat system, such as a boiler. The magnitude of reductions depends on the system being displaced, including the boiler efficiency and the heating value of the fuel as compared to the heating value of methane. To take credit for this additional reduction, the Project Applicant would need to quantify displaced GHG emissions using the baseline document and the Mitigation Measure BE-5, Install Energy Efficient Boilers.

### Emission Reduction Ranges and Variables:

| Pollutant            | Category Emissions Reductions |
|----------------------|-------------------------------|
| CO <sub>2</sub> e    | 73-77%                        |
| All other pollutants | Not Quantified <sup>30</sup>  |

### Discussion:

In Southern California Edison's service area, a landfill which captures and flares methane achieves a 73% reduction in GHG emissions compared to a landfill without a methane recovery system. A landfill which captures and combusts methane for cogeneration achieves a 77% reduction in GHG emissions compared to a landfill without a methane recovery system:

$$\text{GHG reduction Mit2} = \frac{1.556 + (265 \times 2.909 \times 10^{-4})}{2.127} = 77\%$$

### Assumptions:

<sup>30</sup> Criteria air pollutant emissions may also be reduced due to the reduction in energy use; however, the reduction may not be in the same air basin as the project.

# Energy

MP# WRD-1

**AE-5**

**Alternative Energy**

Data based upon the following reference:

- USEPA. 2006. Solid Waste Management and Greenhouse Gases: A Life-Cycle Assessment of Emissions and Sinks, 3rd Ed. Available online at: <http://www.epa.gov/climatechange/wycd/waste/downloads/fullreport.pdf>

## Preferred Literature:

Section 6 of USEPA's Solid Waste Management and Greenhouse Gases report presents methodology for calculating greenhouse gas emissions associated with three different landfill management systems: landfills which do not capture landfill gas, landfills which recover methane and flare it, and landfills which recover methane and combust it for cogeneration. Column (b) of Exhibit 6-6 shows methane generation factors for various types of landfill waste in MTCE per short ton of waste. For this analysis, the value for mixed solid waste is used. Section 6.2 provides USEPA defaults for percent of methane chemically or biologically oxidized to CO<sub>2</sub> (10%) and the efficiency of methane capture systems (75%). Exhibit 6-7 provides USEPA defaults used for calculating the amount of electricity generated from methane combustion and cogeneration.

## Alternative Literature:

None

## Other Literature Reviewed:

- CAR. 2009. Landfill Project Protocol: Collecting and Destroying Methane from Landfills. Version 3.0. Available online at: <http://www.climateactionreserve.org/how/protocols/adopted/landfill/current-landfill-project-protocol/>
- CalRecycle (CIWMB). Climate Change and Solid Waste Management: Draft Final Report and Draft GHG Calculator Tool. Available online at: <http://www.calrecycle.ca.gov/Climate/Organics/LifeCycle/default.htm>. Accessed February 2010.
- CARB. 2008. Local Government Operations Protocol. Version 1.0. Available online at: [http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/protocols/localgov/pubs/final\\_lgo\\_protocol\\_2008-09-25.pdf](http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/protocols/localgov/pubs/final_lgo_protocol_2008-09-25.pdf)
- American Carbon Registry. Standards. Available online at: <http://www.americancarbonregistry.org/carbon-accounting/standards/?searchterm=landfill>. Accessed February 2010.

# Energy

MP# WRD-1

**AE-6**

**Alternative Energy**

## 2.3.6 Establish Methane Recovery in Wastewater Treatment Plants

**Range of Effectiveness:** 95-97% reduction in GHG emissions from wastewater treatment plants without recovery.

### Measure Description:

Methane (CH<sub>4</sub>) is a potent GHG and has a global warming potential (GWP) over 20 times that of CO<sub>2</sub>. Capturing methane from wastewater treatment (WWT) plants and combusting it to generate electricity for on-site energy needs reduces GHG emissions in two ways: it reduces direct methane emissions, and it displaces electricity demand and the associated indirect GHG emissions from electricity production.

### Measure Applicability:

- Electricity from utility

### Inputs:

The following information needs to be provided by the Project Applicant:

- Liters of wastewater

### Baseline Method:

Centralized wastewater treatment facilities may use anaerobic or facultative lagoons or anaerobic digesters to treat wastewater. The methane emissions expected from anaerobic or facultative lagoons is calculated using the following equation from the California Air Resources Board (CARB)'s Local Government Reporting Protocol:

$$\text{CO}_2\text{e}_{\text{baseline}} = \text{Wastewater} \times \text{BOD}_5 \text{ load} \times 10^{-6} \times \text{Bo} \times \text{MCF}_{\text{anaerobic}} \times 10^{-3} \times 21$$

Where

|                                       |   |   |
|---------------------------------------|---|---|
| CO <sub>2</sub> e <sub>baseline</sub> | = | Amount of CO <sub>2</sub> e generated from wastewater treatment (MT)  |
| Wastewater                            | = | Volume of wastewater (liters)<br>Provided by Applicant  |
| BOD <sub>5</sub> load                 | = | Concentration of BOD <sub>5</sub> in wastewater<br>200 mg / liter wastewater  |
| 10 <sup>-6</sup>                      | = | Conversion from mg to kg  |
| Bo                                    | = | Maximum CH <sub>4</sub> -producing capacity for domestic wastewater<br>0.6 kg CH <sub>4</sub> / kg BOD <sub>5</sub> removed |
| MCF <sub>anaerobic</sub>              | = | CH <sub>4</sub> correction factor for anaerobic systems<br>0.8  |
| 10 <sup>-3</sup>                      | = | Conversion from kg to MT  |

# Energy

MP# WRD-1

**AE-6**

**Alternative Energy**

21 = Global warming potential of CH<sub>4</sub>, used to convert from CH<sub>4</sub> to CO<sub>2</sub>e

Therefore:

$$\text{CO}_2\text{e}_{\text{baseline}} = \text{Wastewater} \times 2.02 \times 10^{-6}$$

## Mitigation Method:

*Mitigation Option 1 – Methane is captured and flared*

Anaerobic digesters produce methane-rich biogas which can be combusted and converted to CO<sub>2</sub>.<sup>31</sup> Inherent inefficiencies in the system results in incomplete combustion of the biogas, which results in remaining methane emissions:

$$\text{CO}_2\text{e}_{\text{Mit1}} = \text{Wastewater} \times 0.2642 \times \text{Digester Gas} \times \text{FCH}_4 \times (\text{CH}_4\text{unflare} + \text{CO}_2\text{flare})$$

Where

|                                   |   |   |
|-----------------------------------|---|---|
| CO <sub>2</sub> e <sub>Mit1</sub> | = | Amount of CO <sub>2</sub> e generated from flaring methane from wastewater treatment plant (MT)   |
| Wastewater                        | = | Volume of wastewater (liters)<br>Provided by Applicant  |
| 0.2642                            | = | Conversion from liters to gallons   |
| Digester Gas                      | = | Volume of biogas generated per volume of wastewater treated<br>ft <sup>3</sup> biogas / gallon wastewater<br>0.01   |
| F <sub>CH4</sub>                  | = | Fraction of CH <sub>4</sub> in biogas<br>0.65   |
| CH <sub>4</sub> unflare           | = | Contribution from CH <sub>4</sub> which is captured for flaring, but remains unconverted due to incomplete combustion<br>$\text{CH}_{4\text{unflare}} = \rho_{\text{CH}_4} \times (1-\text{DE}) \times 0.0283 \times 10^{-6} \times 21 = 3.93 \times 10^{-6}$ |
| ρ <sub>CH4</sub>                  | = | Density of CH <sub>4</sub> at standard conditions<br>662 g/m <sup>3</sup>   |
| DE                                | = | CH <sub>4</sub> destruction efficiency<br>0.99  |
| 0.0283                            | = | Conversion factor from ft <sup>3</sup> to m <sup>3</sup>  |
| 10 <sup>-6</sup>                  | = | Conversion factor from g to MT  |
| 21                                | = | Global warming potential of CH <sub>4</sub> , used to convert from CH <sub>4</sub> to CO <sub>2</sub> e   |
| CO <sub>2</sub> flare             | = | Contribution from CO <sub>2</sub> generated from the flaring of methane   |
| CO <sub>2</sub> flare             | = | $\text{EF} / 2204.623 \times 1 = 5.44 \times 10^{-5}$   |
| EF                                | = | Emission factor for methane combustion  |

<sup>31</sup> Seek local agency guidance on whether to include CO<sub>2</sub> combustion emissions. USEPA and IPCC consider these emissions to be biogenic; therefore, the emissions are not included in USEPA and IPCC greenhouse gas emissions inventories.

# Energy

MP# WRD-1

## AE-6

## Alternative Energy

|          |   |   |
|----------|---|---|
|          |   | 0.120 lb CO <sub>2</sub> /ft <sup>3</sup> CH <sub>4</sub>   |
| 2204.623 | = | Conversion factor from lb to MT   |
| 1        | = | Global warming potential of CO <sub>2</sub> , used to convert from CO <sub>2</sub> to CO <sub>2</sub> e |

Therefore:

$$\text{CO}_2\text{e}_{\text{Mit1}} = \text{Wastewater} \times 1.00 \times 10^{-7}$$

And then the percent reduction in GHG emissions from Mitigation Option 1 is:

$$\text{GHG reduction}_{\text{Mit1}} = \frac{\text{CO}_2\text{e}_{\text{baseline}} - \text{CO}_2\text{e}_{\text{Mit1}}}{\text{CO}_2\text{e}_{\text{baseline}}}$$

$$\text{GHG reduction}_{\text{Mit1}} = 95\%$$

As shown from this equation, the percent reduction in greenhouse gas emissions does not depend on the amount of wastewater being treated.

### *Mitigation Option 2 – Methane is captured and combusted for cogeneration*

If a cogeneration system is used to generate electricity from the combusted biogas, the following equation is used to calculate the amount of electricity generated:

$$\text{Electricity} = \text{Wastewater} \times 0.2642 \times \text{Digester Gas} \times F_{\text{CH}_4} \times \text{HHV}_{\text{CH}_4} \times \text{ECF} \times \text{EFF}$$

Where:

|                             |   |  |
|-----------------------------|---|--|
| Electricity                 | = | Amount of electricity generated from combustion of methane (kWh)   |
| Wastewater                  | = | Volume of wastewater (liters)<br>Provided by Applicant   |
| 0.2642                      | = | Conversion from liters to gallons  |
| Digester Gas                | = | Volume of biogas generated per volume of wastewater treated<br>0.01 ft <sup>3</sup> biogas / gallon wastewater |
| F <sub>CH<sub>4</sub></sub> | = | Fraction of CH <sub>4</sub> in biogas<br>0.65  |
| HHV                         | = | Heating value of methane<br>1,012 BTU / ft <sup>3</sup> CH <sub>4</sub>  |
| ECF                         | = | Energy conversion factor<br>0.00009 kWh/BTU  |
| EFF                         | = | Efficiency Factor<br>0.85; USEPA assumes a 15% system efficiency loss to account for system down-time          |

Therefore:

# Energy

MP# WRD-1

## AE-6

## Alternative Energy

$$\text{Electricity} = \text{Wastewater} \times 1.33 \times 10^{-4}$$

Since this amount of electricity is generated on-site and no longer needs to be supplied by the local electricity utility, the indirect CO<sub>2</sub>e emissions associated with that utility electricity generation are also avoided:

$$\text{CO}_2\text{e}_{\text{displaced}} = \text{Electricity} \times \text{Utility}$$

Where

Utility = Carbon intensity of Local Utility (MT CO<sub>2</sub>e/kWh) from table below

| Power Utility | Carbon-Intensity<br>(lbs CO <sub>2</sub> e/MWh) |
|---------------|---|
| LADW&P        | 1,238   |
| PG&E          | 456   |
| SCE           | 641   |
| SDGE          | 781   |
| SMUD          | 555   |

Therefore:

$$\text{CO}_2\text{e}_{\text{Mit2}} = \text{CO}_2\text{e}_{\text{Mit1}} - \text{CO}_2\text{e}_{\text{displaced}}$$

And then the percent reduction in GHG emissions from Mitigation 2 is:

$$\text{GHG reduction}_{\text{Mit2}} = \frac{\text{CO}_2\text{e}_{\text{baseline}} - (\text{CO}_2\text{e}_{\text{Mit1}} - \text{CO}_2\text{e}_{\text{displaced}})}{\text{CO}_2\text{e}_{\text{baseline}}}$$

$$\text{GHG reduction}_{\text{Mit2}} = \frac{1.92 \times 10^{-6} + (1.33 \times 10^{-4} \times \text{Utility})}{2.02 \times 10^{-6}}$$

As shown from these equations, the percent reduction in GHG emissions does not depend on the amount of wastewater being treated.

Note that further reductions could be achieved if the heat generated from combustion and cogeneration were recovered and used to displace thermal energy that otherwise would have been generated from a separate heat system, such as a boiler. The magnitude of reductions depends on the system being displaced, including the boiler efficiency and the heating value of the fuel as compared to the heating value of methane. To take credit for this additional reduction, the Project Applicant would need to quantify displaced GHG emissions using the baseline document and the Mitigation Measure BE-5, Install Energy Efficient Boilers.

# Energy

MP# WRD-1

**AE-6**

**Alternative Energy**

## Emission Reduction Ranges and Variables:

| Pollutant            | Category Emissions Reductions |
|----------------------|-------------------------------|
| CO <sub>2</sub> e    | 95-97%                        |
| All other pollutants | Not Quantified <sup>32</sup>  |

### Discussion:

In Southern California Edison's service area, a WWT plant which captures and flares methane achieves a 95% reduction in GHG emissions compared to a WWT plant without a methane recovery system. A WWT plant which captures and combusts methane for cogeneration achieves a 97% reduction in GHG emissions compared to a landfill without a methane recovery system:

$$\text{GHG reduction Mit2} = \frac{1.92 \times 10^{-6} + (1.33 \times 10^{-4} \times 2.909 \times 10^{-4})}{2.02 \times 10^{-6}} = 97\%$$

### Assumptions:

Data based upon the following references:

- CARB. 2008. Local Government Operations Protocol. Chapter 10: Wastewater Treatment Facilities. Available online at: [http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/protocols/localgov/pubs/final\\_lgo\\_protocol\\_2008-09-25.pdf](http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/protocols/localgov/pubs/final_lgo_protocol_2008-09-25.pdf)
- USEPA. 2008. Inventory of US Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks: 1990-2006. Chapter 8: Waste. Available online at: [http://www.epa.gov/climatechange/emissions/downloads/08\\_CR.pdf](http://www.epa.gov/climatechange/emissions/downloads/08_CR.pdf)
- USEPA. 2006. Solid Waste Management and Greenhouse Gases: A Life-Cycle Assessment of Emissions and Sinks, 3rd Ed. Available online at: <http://www.epa.gov/climatechange/wycd/waste/downloads/fullreport.pdf>

Preferred Literature: Chapter 10 of CARB's Local Government Operations Protocol (LGOP) provides the methodology for calculating methane emissions from wastewater treatment. Centralized wastewater treatment facilities may use anaerobic or facultative lagoons or anaerobic digesters to treat wastewater. Equation 10.3 of the LGOP calculates methane emissions from anaerobic or facultative lagoons. Equation 10.1 of the LGOP calculates the methane emissions remaining due to incomplete combustion of anaerobic digester gas. Default values for the amount of digester gas produced per volume of wastewater and the fraction of methane in digester gas are taken from the 2008 USEPA Inventory of U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks. Exhibit 6-7 of

<sup>32</sup> Criteria air pollutant emissions may also be reduced due to the reduction in energy use; however, the reduction may not be in the same air basin as the project.

# Energy

MP# WRD-1

**AE-6**

**Alternative Energy**

USEPA's Solid Waste Management and Greenhouse Gases report provides the methodology for calculating the amount of electricity generated from methane combustion and cogeneration.

**Alternative Literature:**

None

**Other Literature Reviewed:**

None

| Section    | Category  | Page #     | Measure # |
|------------|---|------------|-----------|
| <b>3.0</b> | <b>Transportation</b>   | <b>155</b> |           |
| <b>3.1</b> | <b>Land Use/Location</b>  | <b>155</b> |           |
| 3.1.1      | Increase Density  | 155        | LUT-1     |
| 3.1.2      | Increase Location Efficiency  | 159        | LUT-2     |
| 3.1.3      | Increase Diversity of Urban and Suburban Developments (Mixed Use)             | 162        | LUT-3     |
| 3.1.4      | Increase Destination Accessibility  | 167        | LUT-4     |
| 3.1.5      | Increase Transit Accessibility  | 171        | LUT-5     |
| 3.1.6      | Integrate Affordable and Below Market Rate Housing                            | 176        | LUT-6     |
| 3.1.7      | Orient Project Toward Non-Auto Corridor                                       | 179        | LUT-7     |
| 3.1.8      | Locate Project near Bike Path/Bike Lane                                       | 181        | LUT-8     |
| 3.1.9      | Improve Design of Development   | 182        | LUT-9     |
| <b>3.2</b> | <b>Neighborhood/Site Enhancements</b>   | <b>186</b> |           |
| 3.2.1      | Provide Pedestrian Network Improvements                                       | 186        | SDT-1     |
| 3.2.2      | Provide Traffic Calming Measures  | 190        | SDT-2     |
| 3.2.3      | Implement a Neighborhood Electric Vehicle (NEV) Network                       | 194        | SDT-3     |
| 3.2.4      | Create Urban Non-Motorized Zones  | 198        | SDT-4     |
| 3.2.5      | Incorporate Bike Lane Street Design (on-site)                                 | 200        | SDT-5     |
| 3.2.6      | Provide Bike Parking in Non-Residential Projects                              | 202        | SDT-6     |
| 3.2.7      | Provide Bike Parking with Multi-Unit Residential Projects                     | 204        | SDT-7     |
| 3.2.8      | Provide Electric Vehicle Parking  | 205        | SDT-8     |
| 3.2.9      | Dedicate Land for Bike Trails   | 206        | SDT-9     |
| <b>3.3</b> | <b>Parking Policy/Pricing</b>   | <b>207</b> |           |
| 3.3.1      | Limit Parking Supply  | 207        | PDT-1     |
| 3.3.2      | Unbundle Parking Costs from Property Cost                                     | 210        | PDT-2     |
| 3.3.3      | Implement Market Price Public Parking (On-Street)                             | 213        | PDT-3     |
| 3.3.4      | Require Residential Area Parking Permits                                      | 217        | PDT-4     |
| <b>3.4</b> | <b>Commute Trip Reduction Programs</b>  | <b>218</b> |           |
| 3.4.1      | Implement Commute Trip Reduction Program - Voluntary                          | 218        | TRT-1     |
| 3.4.2      | Implement Commute Trip Reduction Program – Required Implementation/Monitoring | 223        | TRT-2     |
| 3.4.3      | Provide Ride-Sharing Programs   | 227        | TRT-3     |
| 3.4.4      | Implement Subsidized or Discounted Transit Program                            | 230        | TRT-4     |
| 3.4.5      | Provide End of Trip Facilities  | 234        | TRT-5     |
| 3.4.6      | Encourage Telecommuting and Alternative Work Schedules                        | 236        | TRT-6     |
| 3.4.7      | Implement Commute Trip Reduction Marketing                                    | 240        | TRT-7     |
| 3.4.8      | Implement Preferential Parking Permit Program                                 | 244        | TRT-8     |
| 3.4.9      | Implement Car-Sharing Program   | 245        | TRT-9     |
| 3.4.10     | Implement a School Pool Program   | 250        | TRT-10    |
| 3.4.11     | Provide Employer-Sponsored Vanpool/Shuttle                                    | 253        | TRT-11    |
| 3.4.12     | Implement Bike-Sharing Programs   | 256        | TRT-12    |
| 3.4.13     | Implement School Bus Program  | 258        | TRT-13    |
| 3.4.14     | Price Workplace Parking   | 261        | TRT-14    |
| 3.4.15     | Implement Employee Parking “Cash-Out”   | 266        | TRT-15    |

| Section    | Category   | Page #     | Measure # |
|------------|--|------------|-----------|
| <b>3.5</b> | <b>Transit System Improvements</b>   | <b>270</b> |           |
| 3.5.1      | Provide a Bus Rapid Transit System   | 270        | TST-1     |
| 3.5.2      | Implement Transit Access Improvements  | 275        | TST-2     |
| 3.5.3      | Expand Transit Network   | 276        | TST-3     |
| 3.5.4      | Increase Transit Service Frequency/Speed   | 280        | TST-4     |
| 3.5.5      | Provide Bike Parking Near Transit  | 285        | TST-5     |
| 3.5.6      | Provide Local Shuttles   | 286        | TST-6     |
| <b>3.6</b> | <b>Road Pricing/Management</b>   | <b>287</b> |           |
| 3.6.1      | Implement Area or Cordon Pricing   | 287        | RPT-1     |
| 3.6.2      | Improve Traffic Flow   | 291        | RPT-2     |
| 3.6.3      | Required Project Contributions to Transportation Infrastructure Improvement Projects | 297        | RPT-3     |
| 3.6.4      | Install Park-and-Ride Lots   | 298        | RPT-4     |
| <b>3.7</b> | <b>Vehicles</b>  | <b>300</b> |           |
| 3.7.1      | Electrify Loading Docks and/or Require Idling-Reduction Systems                      | 300        | VT-1      |
| 3.7.2      | Utilize Alternative Fueled Vehicles  | 304        | VT-2      |
| 3.7.3      | Utilize Electric or Hybrid Vehicles  | 309        | VT-3      |

# Transportation

CEQA# MM D-1 & D-4  
 MP# LU-1.5 & LU-2.1.8

**LUT-1**

**Land Use / Location**

## 3.0 Transportation

### 3.1 Land Use/Location

#### 3.1.1 Increase Density

**Range of Effectiveness:** 0.8 – 30.0% vehicle miles traveled (VMT) reduction and therefore a 0.8 – 30.0% reduction in GHG emissions.

**Measure Description:**

Designing the Project with increased densities, where allowed by the General Plan and/or Zoning Ordinance reduces GHG emissions associated with traffic in several ways. Density is usually measured in terms of persons, jobs, or dwellings per unit area. Increased densities affect the distance people travel and provide greater options for the mode of travel they choose. This strategy also provides a foundation for implementation of many other strategies which would benefit from increased densities. For example, transit ridership increases with density, which justifies enhanced transit service.

The reductions in GHG emissions are quantified based on reductions to VMT. The relationship between density and VMT is described by its elasticity. According to a recent study published by Brownstone, et al. in 2009, the elasticity between density and VMT is 0.12. Default densities are based on the typical suburban densities in North America which reflects the characteristics of the ITE Trip Generation Manual data used in the baseline estimates.

**Measure Applicability:**

- Urban and suburban context
  - Negligible impact in a rural context
- Appropriate for residential, retail, office, industrial, and mixed-use projects

**Baseline Method:**

See introduction to transportation section for a discussion of how to estimate trip rates and VMT. The CO<sub>2</sub> emissions are calculated from VMT as follows:

$$CO_2 = VMT \times EF_{\text{running}}$$

Where:

traveled

for running emissions

VMT = vehicle miles

EF<sub>running</sub> = emission factor

# Transportation

CEQA# MM D-1 & D-4  
MP# LU-1.5 & LU-2.1.8

**LUT-1**

**Land Use / Location**

## Inputs:

The following information needs to be provided by the Project Applicant:

- Number of housing units per acre or jobs per job acre

## Mitigation Method:

$$\% \text{ VMT Reduction} = A * B \text{ [not to exceed 30\%]}$$

Where:

A = Percentage increase in housing units per acre or jobs per job acre<sup>33</sup> = (number of housing units per acre or jobs per job acre – number of housing units per acre or jobs per job acre for typical ITE development) / (number of housing units per acre or jobs per job acre for typical ITE development) For small and medium sites (less than ½ mile in radius) the calculation of housing and jobs per acre should be performed for the development site as a whole, so that the analysis does not erroneously attribute trip reduction benefits to measures that simply shift jobs and housing within the site with no overall increase in site density. For larger sites, the analysis should address the development as several ½-mile-radius sites, so that shifts from one area to another would increase the density of the receiving area but reduce the density of the donating area, resulting in trip generation rate decreases and increases, respectively, which cancel one another.

B = Elasticity of VMT with respect to density (from literature)

Detail:

- A: [not to exceed 500% increase]
  - If housing: (Number of housing units per acre – 7.6) / 7.6  
(See Appendix C for detail)
  - If jobs: (Number of jobs per acre – 20) / 20  
(See Appendix C for detail)
- B: 0.07 (Boarnet and Handy 2010)

## Assumptions:

Data based upon the following references:

- Boarnet, Marlon and Handy, Susan. 2010. “DRAFT Policy Brief on the Impacts of Residential Density Based on a Review of the Empirical Literature.” <http://arb.ca.gov/cc/sb375/policies/policies.htm>; Table 1.

<sup>33</sup> This value should be checked first to see if it exceeds 500% in which case A = 500%.

# Transportation

CEQA# MM D-1 & D-4  
MP# LU-1.5 & LU-2.1.8

LUT-1

Land Use / Location

## Emission Reduction Ranges and Variables:

| Pollutant         | Category Emissions Reductions <sup>34</sup> |
|-------------------|---|
| CO <sub>2</sub> e | 1.5-30% of running                          |
| PM                | 1.5-30% of running                          |
| CO                | 1.5-30% of running                          |
| NOx               | 1.5-30% of running                          |
| SO <sub>2</sub>   | 1.5-30% of running                          |
| ROG               | 0.9-18% of total                            |

### Discussion:

The VMT reductions for this strategy are based on changes in density versus the typical suburban residential and employment densities in North America (referred to as “ITE densities”). These densities are used as a baseline to mirror those densities reflected in the ITE Trip Generation Manual, which is the baseline method for determining VMT.

There are two separate maxima noted in the fact sheet: a cap of 500% on the allowable percentage increase of housing units or jobs per acre (variable A) and a cap of 30% on % VMT reduction. The rationale for the 500% cap is that there are diminishing returns to any change in environment. For example, it is reasonably doubtful that increasing residential density by a factor of six instead of five would produce any additional change in travel behavior. The purpose for the 30% cap is to limit the influence of any single environmental factor (such as density). This emphasizes that community designs that implement multiple land use strategies (such as density, design, diversity, etc.) will show more of a reduction than relying on improvements from a single land use factor.

### Example:

Sample calculations are provided below for housing:

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{Low Range \% VMT Reduction (8.5 housing units per acre)} \\ &= (8.5 - 7.6) / 7.6 * 0.07 = 0.8\% \end{aligned}$$

$$\text{High Range \% VMT Reduction (60 housing units per acre)}$$

$$= \frac{60 - 7.6}{7.6} = 6.9 \text{ or } 690\% \text{ Since greater than } 500\%, \text{ set to } 500\%$$

$$= 500\% \times 0.07 = 0.35 \text{ or } 35\% \text{ Since greater than } 30\%, \text{ set to } 30\%$$

<sup>34</sup> The percentage reduction reflects emission reductions from running emissions. The actual value will be less than this when starting and evaporative emissions are factored into the analysis. ROG emissions have been adjusted to reflect a ratio of 40% evaporative and 60% exhaust emissions based on a statewide EMFAC run of all vehicles.

# Transportation

CEQA# MM D-1 & D-4  
MP# LU-1.5 & LU-2.1.8

LUT-1

Land Use / Location

Sample calculations are provided below for jobs:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Low Range \% VMT Reduction (25 jobs per acre)} \\ = (25 - 20) / 20 * 0.12 = 3\% \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{High Range \% VMT Reduction (100 jobs per acre)} \\ = \frac{100 - 20}{20} = 4 \text{ or } 400\% \\ = 400\% \times 0.12 = 0.48 \text{ or } 48\% \text{ Since greater than } 30\%, \text{ set to } 30\% \end{aligned}$$

### Preferred Literature:

- -0.07 = elasticity of VMT with respect to density

Boarnet and Handy's detailed review of existing literature highlighted three individual studies that used the best available methods for analyzing data for individual households. These studies provided the following elasticities: -0.12 - Brownstone (2009), -0.07 - Bento (2005), and -0.08 - Fang (2008). To maintain a conservative estimate of the impacts of this strategy, the lower elasticity of -0.07 is used in the calculations.

### Alternative Literature:

- -0.05 to -0.25 = elasticity of VMT with respect to density

The *TRB Special Report 298* literature suggests that doubling neighborhood density across a metropolitan area might lower household VMT by about 5 to 12 percent, and perhaps by as much as 25 percent, if coupled with higher employment concentrations, significant public transit improvements, mixed uses, and other supportive demand management measures.

### Alternative Literature References:

TRB, 2009. *Driving and the Built Environment*, Transportation Research Board Special Report 298. <http://onlinepubs.trb.org/Onlinepubs/sr/sr298.pdf> . Accessed March 2010. (p. 4)

### Other Literature Reviewed:

None

# Transportation

MP# LU-3.3

LUT-2

Land Use / Location

## 3.1.2 Increase Location Efficiency

**Range of Effectiveness:** 10-65% vehicle miles traveled (VMT) reduction and therefore 10-65% reduction in GHG emissions

### Measure Description:

This measure is not intended as a separate strategy but rather a documentation of empirical data to justify the “cap” for all land use/location strategies. The location of the Project relative to the type of urban landscape such as being located in an urban area, infill, or suburban center influences the amount of VMT compared to the statewide average. This is referred to as the location of efficiency since there are synergistic benefits to these urban landscapes.

To receive the maximum reduction for this location efficiency, the project will be located in an urban area/ downtown central business district. Projects located on brownfield sites/infill areas receive a lower, but still significant VMT reduction. Finally, projects in suburban centers also receive a reduction for their efficient location. Reductions are based on the typical VMT of a specific geographic area relative to the average VMT statewide.

### Measure Applicability:

- Urban and suburban context
- Negligible impact in a rural context
- Appropriate for residential, retail, office, industrial and mixed-use projects

### Baseline Method:

See introduction to transportation section for a discussion of how to estimate trip rates and VMT. The CO<sub>2</sub> emissions are calculated from VMT as follows:

$$CO_2 = VMT \times EF_{\text{running}}$$

Where:

VMT = vehicle miles traveled  
 EF<sub>running</sub> = emission factor for running emissions

### Inputs:

- No inputs are needed. VMT reduction ranges are based on the geographic location of the project within the region.

### Mitigation Method:

% VMT reduction =

# Transportation

MP# LU-3.3

**LUT-2**

**Land Use / Location**

- Urban: 65% (representing VMT reductions for the average urban area in California versus the statewide average VMT)
- Compact Infill: 30% (representing VMT reductions for the average compact infill area in California versus the statewide average VMT)
- Suburban Center: 10% (representing VMT reductions for the average suburban center in California versus the statewide average VMT)

## Assumptions:

Data based upon the following references:

- 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.

## Emission Reduction Ranges and Variables:

| Pollutant         | Category Emissions Reductions <sup>35</sup> |
|-------------------|---|
| CO <sub>2</sub> e | 10-65% of running                           |
| PM                | 10-65% of running                           |
| CO                | 10-65% of running                           |
| NOx               | 10-65% of running                           |
| SO <sub>2</sub>   | 10-65% of running                           |
| ROG               | 6-39% of total                              |

## Discussion:

### Example:

N/A – no calculations needed

### Alternative Literature:

- 13-72% reduction in VMT for infill projects

### Preferred Literature:

Holtzclaw, et al., [1] studied relationships between auto ownership and mileage per car and neighborhood urban design and socio-economic characteristics in the Chicago, Los

<sup>35</sup> The percentage reduction reflects emission reductions from running emissions. The actual value will be less than this when starting and evaporative emissions are factored into the analysis. ROG emissions have been adjusted to reflect a ratio of 40% evaporative and 60% exhaust emissions based on a statewide EMFAC run of all vehicles.

# Transportation

MP# LU-3.3

**LUT-2**

**Land Use / Location**

Angeles, and San Francisco metro areas. In all three regions, average annual vehicle miles traveled is a function of density, income, household size, and public transit, as well as pedestrian and bicycle orientation (to a lesser extent). The annual VMT for each neighborhood was reviewed to determine empirical VMT reduction “caps” for this report. These location-based caps represent the average and maximum reductions that would likely be expected in urban, infill, suburban center, and suburban locations.

*Growing Cooler* looked at 10 studies which have considered the effects of regional location on travel and emissions generated by individual developments. The studies differ in methodology and context but they tend to yield the same conclusion: infill locations generate substantially lower VMT per capita than do greenfield locations, ranging from 13 - 72% lower VMT.

### Literature References:

- [1] 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.
- [2] Ewing, et al, 2008. *Growing Cooler – The Evidence on Urban Development and Climate Change*. Urban Land Institute. (p.88, Figure 4-30)

### Other Literature Reviewed:

None

# Transportation

CEQA# MM D-9 & D-4  
MP# LU-2

**LUT-3**

**Land Use / Location**

### 3.1.3 Increase Diversity of Urban and Suburban Developments (Mixed Use)

**Range of Effectiveness:** 9-30% vehicle miles traveled (VMT) reduction and therefore 9-30% reduction in GHG emissions.

#### Measure Description:

Having different types of land uses near one another can decrease VMT 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. A description of diverse uses for urban and suburban areas is provided below.

#### *Urban:*

The urban project will be predominantly characterized by properties on which various uses, such as office, commercial, institutional, and residential, are combined in a single building or on a single site in an integrated development project with functional interrelationships and a coherent physical design. The mixed-use development should encourage walking and other non-auto modes of transport from residential to office/commercial/institutional locations (and vice versa). The residential units should be within ¼-mile of parks, schools, or other civic uses. The project should minimize the need for external trips by including services/facilities for day care, banking/ATM, restaurants, vehicle refueling, and shopping.

#### *Suburban:*

The suburban project will have at least three of the following on site and/or offsite within ¼-mile: Residential Development, Retail Development, Park, Open Space, or Office. The mixed-use development should encourage walking and other non-auto modes of transport from residential to office/commercial locations (and vice versa). The project should minimize the need for external trips by including services/facilities for day care, banking/ATM, restaurants, vehicle refueling, and shopping.

#### Measure Applicability:

- Urban and suburban context
- Negligible impact in a rural context (unless the project is a master-planned community)
- Appropriate for mixed-use projects

#### Baseline Method:

See introduction to transportation section for a discussion of how to estimate trip rates and VMT. The CO<sub>2</sub> emissions are calculated from VMT as follows:

# Transportation

CEQA# MM D-9 & D-4 **LUT-3** **Land Use / Location**  
 MP# LU-2

$$CO_2 = VMT \times EF_{\text{running}}$$

Where:

traveled

for running emissions

VMT = vehicle miles

EF<sub>running</sub> = emission factor

**Inputs:**

The following information needs to be provided by the Project Applicant:

- Percentage of each land use type in the project (to calculate land use index)

**Mitigation Method:**

$$\% \text{ VMT Reduction} = \text{Land Use} * B \text{ [not to exceed 30\%]}$$

Where

Land Use = Percentage increase in land use index versus single use development  
 = (land use index – 0.15)/0.15 (see Appendix C for detail)

Land use index = -a / ln(6)

(from [2])

$$a = \sum_{i=1}^6 a_i \times \ln(a_i)$$

a<sub>i</sub> = building floor area of land use i / total square feet of area considered

- residential a<sub>1</sub> = single family
- a<sub>2</sub> = multifamily residential
- a<sub>3</sub> = commercial
- a<sub>4</sub> = industrial
- a<sub>5</sub> = institutional
- a<sub>6</sub> = park

if land use is not present and a<sub>i</sub> is equal to 0, set a<sub>i</sub> equal to 0.01

B with respect to land use index (0.09 from [1])

= elasticity of VMT

increase

not to exceed 500%

# Transportation

CEQA# MM D-9 & D-4  
MP# LU-2

LUT-3

Land Use / Location

## Assumptions:

Data based upon the following references:

- [1] Ewing, R., and Cervero, R., "Travel and the Built Environment - A Meta-Analysis." *Journal of the American Planning Association*, <to be published> (2010). Table 4.
- [2] Song, Y., and Knaap, G., "Measuring the effects of mixed land uses on housing values." *Regional Science and Urban Economics* 34 (2004) 663-680. (p. 669)  
[http://urban.csuohio.edu/~sugie/papers/RSUE/RSUE2005\\_Measuring%20the%20effects%20of%20mixed%20land%20use.pdf](http://urban.csuohio.edu/~sugie/papers/RSUE/RSUE2005_Measuring%20the%20effects%20of%20mixed%20land%20use.pdf)

## Emission Reduction Ranges and Variables:

| Pollutant         | Category Emissions Reductions <sup>36</sup> |
|-------------------|---|
| CO <sub>2</sub> e | 9-30% of running                            |
| PM                | 9-30% of running                            |
| CO                | 9-30% of running                            |
| NO <sub>x</sub>   | 9-30% of running                            |
| SO <sub>2</sub>   | 9-30% of running                            |
| ROG               | 5.4-18% of total                            |

## Discussion:

In the above calculation, a land use index of 0.15 is used as a baseline representing a development with a single land use (see Appendix C for calculations).

There are two separate maxima noted in the fact sheet: a cap of 500% on the allowable percentage increase of land use index (variable A) and a cap of 30% on % VMT reduction. The rationale for the 500% cap is that there are diminishing returns to any change in environment. For example, it is reasonably doubtful that increasing the land use index by a factor of six instead of five would produce any additional change in travel behavior. The purpose for the 30% cap is to limit the influence of any single environmental factor (such as diversity). This emphasizes that community designs that implement multiple land use strategies (such as density, design, diversity, etc.) will show more of a reduction than relying on improvements from a single land use factor.

<sup>36</sup> The percentage reduction reflects emission reductions from running emissions. The actual value will be less than this when starting and evaporative emissions are factored into the analysis. ROG emissions have been adjusted to reflect a ratio of 40% evaporative and 60% exhaust emissions based on a statewide EMFAC run of all vehicles.

# Transportation

CEQA# MM D-9 & D-4  
MP# LU-2

LUT-3

Land Use / Location

## Example:

Sample calculations are provided below:

90% single family homes, 10% commercial

- Land use index =  $-[0.9 \ln(0.9) + 0.1 \ln(0.1) + 4 \cdot 0.01 \ln(0.01)] / \ln(6) = 0.3$
- Low Range % VMT Reduction =  $(0.3 - 0.15) / 0.15 \cdot 0.09 = 9\%$

1/6 single family, 1/6 multi-family, 1/6 commercial, 1/6 industrial, 1/6 institutional, 1/6 parks

- Land use index =  $-[6 \cdot 0.17 \ln(0.17)] / \ln(6) = 1$
- High Range % VMT Reduction (land use index = 1)
- Land use =  $(1 - 0.15) / 0.15 = 5.6$  or 566%. Since this is greater than 500%, set to 500%.
- % VMT Reduction =  $(5 \times 0.09) = 0.45$  or 45%. Since this is greater than 30%, set to 30%.

## Preferred Literature:

- -0.09 = elasticity of VMT with respect to land use index

The land use (or entropy) index measurement looks at the mix of land uses of a development. An index of 0 indicates a single land use while 1 indicates a full mix of uses. Ewing's [1] synthesis looked at a total of 10 studies, where none controlled for self-selection<sup>37</sup>. The weighted average elasticity of VMT with respect to the land use mix index is -0.09. The methodology for calculating the land use index is described in Song and Knaap [2].

## Alternative Literature:

- Vehicle trip reduction =  $[1 - (\text{ABS}(1.5 \cdot h - e) / (1.5 \cdot h + e)) - 0.25] / 0.25 \cdot 0.03$

Where :

h = study area housing units, and

e = study area employment.

Nelson\Nygaard's report [3] describes a calculation adapted from Criterion and Fehr & Peers [4]. The formula assumes an "ideal" housing balance of 1.5 jobs per household and a baseline diversity of 0.25. The maximum trip reduction with this method is 9%.

<sup>37</sup> Self selection occurs when residents or employees that favor travel by non-auto modes choose locations where this type of travel is possible. They are therefore more inclined to take advantage of the available options than a typical resident or employee might otherwise be.

# Transportation

CEQA# MM D-9 & D-4

MP# LU-2

**LUT-3**

**Land Use / Location**

## Alternative Literature References:

[3] Nelson\Nygaard, 2005. Crediting Low-Traffic Developments (p.12).

[http://www.montgomeryplanning.org/transportation/documents/TripGenerationAnalysisU  
singURBEMIS.pdf](http://www.montgomeryplanning.org/transportation/documents/TripGenerationAnalysisU<br/>singURBEMIS.pdf)

[4] Criterion Planner/Engineers and Fehr & Peers Associates (2001). Index 4D Method. *A Quick-Response Method of Estimating Travel Impacts from Land-Use Changes*. Technical Memorandum prepared for US EPA, October 2001.

## Other Literature Reviewed:

None

# Transportation

CEQA# MM D-3 **LUT-4** **Land Use / Location**  
 MP# LU-2.1.4

### 3.1.4 Increase Destination Accessibility

**Range of Effectiveness:** 6.7 – 20% vehicle miles traveled (VMT) reduction and therefore 6.7-20% reduction in GHG emissions.

**Measure Description:**

The project will be located in an area with high accessibility to destinations. 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. The location of the project also increases the potential for pedestrians to walk and bike to these destinations and therefore reduces the VMT.

**Measure Applicability:**

- Urban and suburban context
- Negligible impact in a rural context
- Appropriate for residential, retail, office, industrial and mixed-use projects

**Baseline Method:**

See introduction to transportation section for a discussion of how to estimate trip rates and VMT. The CO<sub>2</sub> emissions are calculated from VMT as follows:

$$CO_2 = VMT \times EF_{\text{running}}$$

Where:

|                       |   |
|-----------------------|---|
| traveled              | VMT = vehicle miles                     |
| for running emissions | EF <sub>running</sub> = emission factor |

**Inputs:**

The following information needs to be provided by the Project Applicant:

- Distance to downtown or major job center

**Mitigation Method:**

$$\% \text{ VMT Reduction} = \text{Center Distance} * B \text{ [not to exceed 30\%]}$$

Where

# Transportation

CEQA# MM D-3  
MP# LU-2.1.4

## LUT-4

### Land Use / Location

Center Distance = Percentage decrease in distance to downtown or major job center versus typical ITE suburban development = (distance to downtown/job center for typical ITE development – distance to downtown/job center for project) / (distance to downtown/job center for typical ITE development)

Center Distance = 12 - Distance to downtown/job center for project) / 12  
See Appendix C for detail

B = Elasticity of VMT with respect to distance to downtown or major job center (0.20 from [1])

**Assumptions:**

Data based upon the following references:

[1] Ewing, R., and Cervero, R., "Travel and the Built Environment - A Meta-Analysis." Journal of the American Planning Association, <to be published> (2010). Table 4.

**Emission Reduction Ranges and Variables:**

| Pollutant         | Category Emissions Reductions <sup>38</sup> |
|-------------------|---|
| CO <sub>2</sub> e | 6.7 – 20% of running                        |
| PM                | 6.7 – 20% of running                        |
| CO                | 6.7 – 20% of running                        |
| NOx               | 6.7 – 20% of running                        |
| SO <sub>2</sub>   | 6.7 – 20% of running                        |
| ROG               | 4 – 12% of total                            |

**Discussion:**

The VMT reductions for this strategy are based on changes in distance to key destinations versus the standard suburban distance in North America. This distance is used as a baseline to mirror the distance to destinations reflected in the land uses for the ITE Trip Generation Manual, which is the baseline method for determining VMT.

The purpose for the 30% cap on % VMT reduction is to limit the influence of any single environmental factor (such as destination accessibility). This emphasizes that community designs that implement multiple land use strategies (such as density,

---

<sup>38</sup> The percentage reduction reflects emission reductions from running emissions. The actual value will be less than this when starting and evaporative emissions are factored into the analysis. ROG emissions have been adjusted to reflect a ratio of 40% evaporative and 60% exhaust emissions based on a statewide EMFAC run of all vehicles.

# Transportation

CEQA# MM D-3  
MP# LU-2.1.4

LUT-4

Land Use / Location

design, diversity, destination, etc.) will show more of a reduction than relying on improvements from a single land use factor.

## Example:

Sample calculations are provided below:

- Low Range % VMT Reduction (8 miles to downtown/job center) =  $\frac{12-8}{12} \times 0.20 = 6.7\%$
- High Range % VMT Reduction (0.1 miles to downtown/job center) =  $\frac{12-0.1}{12} \times 0.20 = 20.0\%$

## Preferred Literature:

- -0.20 = elasticity of VMT with respect to job accessibility by auto
- -0.20 = elasticity of VMT with respect to distance to downtown

The Ewing and Cervero report [1] finds that VMT is strongly related to measures of accessibility to destinations. The weighted average elasticity of VMT with respect to job accessibility by auto is -0.20 (looking at five total studies). The weighted average elasticity of VMT with respect to distance to downtown is -0.22 (looking at four total studies, of which one controls for self selection<sup>39</sup>).

## Alternative Literature:

- 10-30% reduction in vehicle trips

The VTPI literature [2] suggests a 10-30% reduction in vehicle trips for “smart growth” development practices that result in more compact, accessible, multi-modal communities where travel distances are shorter, people have more travel options, and it is possible to walk and bicycle more.

## Alternative Literature References:

[2] Litman, T., 2009. “Win-Win Emission Reduction Strategies.” Victoria Transport Policy Institute (VTPI). Website: <http://www.vtpi.org/wwclimate.pdf>. Accessed March 2010. (p. 7, Table 3)

<sup>39</sup> Self selection occurs when residents or employees that favor travel by non-auto modes choose locations where this type of travel is possible. They are therefore more inclined to take advantage of the available options than a typical resident or employee might otherwise be.

# Transportation

CEQA# MM D-3  
MP# LU-2.1.4

**LUT-4**

**Land Use / Location**

## Other Literature Reviewed:

None

# Transportation

CEQA# MM D-2  
MP# LU-1,LU-4

**LUT-5**

**Land Use / Location**

## 3.1.5 Increase Transit Accessibility

**Range of Effectiveness:** 0.5 – 24.6% VMT reduction and therefore 0.5-24.6% reduction in GHG emissions.<sup>40</sup>

### Measure Description:

Locating a project with high density near 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. 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

In addition to the features listed above, the following strategies may also be implemented to provide an added benefit beyond what is documented in the literature:

- Mixed use development [LUT-3]
- Traffic calmed streets with good connectivity [SDT-2]
- Parking management strategies such as unbundled parking, maximum parking requirements, market pricing implemented to reduce amount of land dedicated to vehicle parking [see PPT-1 through PPT-7]

### Measure Applicability:

- Urban and suburban context
- Appropriate in a rural context if development site is adjacent to a commuter rail station with convenient rail service to a major employment center
- Appropriate for residential, retail, office, industrial, and mixed-use projects

### Baseline Method:

---

<sup>40</sup> Transit vehicles may also result in increases in emissions that are associated with electricity production or fuel use. The Project Applicant should consider these potential additional emissions when estimating mitigation for these measures.

# Transportation

CEQA# **MM D-2** **LUT-5** **Land Use / Location**  
 MP# **LU-1,LU-4**

See introduction to transportation section for a discussion of how to estimate trip rates and VMT. The CO<sub>2</sub> emissions are calculated from VMT as follows:

$$CO_2 = VMT \times EF_{\text{running}}$$

Where:

traveled VMT = vehicle miles  
 for running emissions EF<sub>running</sub> = emission factor

**Inputs:**

The following information needs to be provided by the Project Applicant:

- Distance to transit station in project

**Mitigation Method:**

$$\% \text{ VMT} = \text{Transit} * B \text{ [not to exceed 30\%]}$$

Where

Transit = Increase in transit mode share = % transit mode share for project - % transit mode share for typical ITE development (1.3% as described in Appendix C)

% transit mode share for project (see Table)

| Distance to transit   | Transit mode share calculation equation (where x = distance of project to transit) |
|---|--|
| 0 – 0.5 miles   | -50*x + 38   |
| 0.5 to 3 miles  | -4.4*x + 15.2  |
| > 3 miles   | no impact  |
| Source: Lund et al, 2004; Fehr & Peers 2010 (see Appendix C for calculation detail) |  |

B = adjustments from transit ridership increase to VMT (0.67, see Appendix C for detail)

**Assumptions:**

Data based upon the following references:

[1] Lund, H. and R. Cervero, and R. Willson (2004). *Travel Characteristics of Transit-Oriented Development in California*. (p. 79, Table 5-25)

# Transportation

CEQA# MM D-2  
MP# LU-1,LU-4

## LUT-5

Land Use / Location

### Emission Reduction Ranges and Variables:

| Pollutant         | Category Emissions Reductions <sup>41</sup> |
|-------------------|---|
| CO <sub>2</sub> e | 0.5 – 24.6% of running                      |
| PM                | 0.5 – 24.6% of running                      |
| CO                | 0.5 – 24.6% of running                      |
| NO <sub>x</sub>   | 0.5 – 24.6% of running                      |
| SO <sub>2</sub>   | 0.5 – 24.6% of running                      |
| ROG               | 0.3 – 14.8% of total                        |

### Discussion:

The purpose for the 30% cap on % VMT reduction is to limit the influence of any single environmental factor (such as transit accessibility). This emphasizes that community designs that implement multiple land use strategies (such as density, design, diversity, transit accessibility, etc.) will show more of a reduction than relying on improvements from a single land use factor.

### Example:

Sample calculations are provided below for a rail station:

- Low Range % VMT Reduction (3 miles from station) =  $[(-4.4 \cdot 3 + 15.2) - 1.3\%] \cdot 0.67 = 0.5\%$
- High Range % VMT Reduction (0 miles from station) =  $[(-50 \cdot 0 + 38) - 1.3\%] \cdot 0.67 = 24.6\%$

### Preferred Literature:

- 13 to 38% transit mode share (residents in TODs with ½ mile of rail station)
- 5 to 13% transit mode share (residents in TODs from ½ mile to 3 miles of rail station)

The *Travel Characteristics* report [1] surveyed TODs and surrounding areas in San Diego, Los Angeles, San Jose, Sacramento, and Bay Area regions. Survey sites are all located in non-central business district locations, are within walking distance of a transit station with rail service headways of 15 minutes or less, and were intentionally developed as TODs.

<sup>41</sup> The percentage reduction reflects emission reductions from running emissions. The actual value will be less than this when starting and evaporative emissions are factored into the analysis. ROG emissions have been adjusted to reflect a ratio of 40% evaporative and 60% exhaust emissions based on a statewide EMFAC run of all vehicles.

# Transportation

CEQA# MM D-2  
MP# LU-1,LU-4

LUT-5

Land Use / Location

## Alternative Literature:

### Alternate:

- -0.05 = elasticity of VMT with respect to distance to nearest transit stop

Ewing and Cervero's meta-analysis [2] provides this weighted average elasticity based on six total studies, of which one controls for self-selection. The report does not provide the range of distances where this elasticity is valid.

### Alternate:

- 5.9 – 13.3% reduction in VMT

The Bailey, et al. 2008 report [3] predicted a reduction of household daily VMT of 5.8 miles for a location next to a rail station and 2.6 miles for a location next to a bus station. Using the report's estimate of 43.75 daily average miles driven, the estimated reduction in VMT for rail accessibility is 13.3% (5.8/43.75) and for bus accessibility is 5.9% (2.6/43.75).

### Alternate:

- 15% reduction in vehicle trips
- 2 to 5 times higher transit mode share

*TCRP Report 128* [4] concludes that transit-oriented developments, compared to typical developments represented by the *ITE Trip Generation Manual*, have 47% lower vehicle trip rates and have 2 to 5 times higher transit mode share. *TCRP Report 128* notes that the *ITE Trip Generation Manual* shows 6.67 daily trips per unit while detailed counts of 17 residential TODs resulted in 3.55 trips per unit (a 47% reduction in vehicle trips). This study looks at mid-rise and high-rise apartments at the residential TOD sites. A more conservative comparison would be to look at the *ITE Trip Generation Manual* rates for high-rise apartments, 4.2 trips per unit. This results in a 15% reduction in vehicle trips.

## Alternative Literature References:

- [2] Ewing, R., and Cervero, R., "Travel and the Built Environment - A Meta-Analysis." *Journal of the American Planning Association*, <to be published> (2010). Table 4.
- [3] Bailey, L., Mokhtarian, P.L., & Little, A. (2008). "The Broader Connection between Public Transportation, Energy Conservation and Greenhouse Gas Reduction." ICF International. (Table 4 and 5)
- [4] TCRP, 2008. *TCRP Report 128 - Effects of TOD on Housing, Parking, and Travel*. [http://onlinepubs.trb.org/onlinepubs/tcrp/tcrp\\_rpt\\_128.pdf](http://onlinepubs.trb.org/onlinepubs/tcrp/tcrp_rpt_128.pdf) (p. 11, 69).

# Transportation

CEQA# MM D-2  
MP# LU-1,LU-4

**LUT-5**

**Land Use / Location**

## Other Literature Reviewed:

None

# Transportation

CEQA# MM D-7  
MP# LU-2.1.8

## LUT-6

Land Use / Location

### 3.1.6 Integrate Affordable and Below Market Rate Housing

**Range of Effectiveness:** 0.04 – 1.20% vehicle miles traveled (VMT) reduction and therefore 0.04-1.20% reduction in GHG emissions.

#### Measure Description:

Income has a statistically significant effect on the probability that a commuter will take transit or walk to work [4]. BMR housing provides greater opportunity for lower income families to live closer to jobs centers and achieve jobs/housing match near transit. It also addresses to some degree the risk that new transit oriented development would displace lower income families. This strategy potentially encourages building a greater percentage of smaller units that allow a greater number of families to be accommodated on infill and transit-oriented development sites within a given building footprint and height limit. Lower income families tend to have lower levels of auto ownership, allowing buildings to be designed with less parking which, in some cases, represents the difference between a project being economically viable or not.

Residential development projects of five or more dwelling units will provide a deed-restricted low-income housing component on-site.

#### Measure Applicability:

- Urban and suburban context
- Negligible impact in a rural context unless transit availability and proximity to jobs/services are existing characteristics
- Appropriate for residential and mixed-use projects

#### Baseline Method:

See introduction to transportation section for a discussion of how to estimate trip rates and VMT. The CO<sub>2</sub> emissions are calculated from VMT as follows:

$$CO_2 = VMT \times EF_{\text{running}}$$

Where:

VMT = vehicle miles traveled

for running emissions

EF<sub>running</sub> = emission factor

#### Inputs:

The following information needs to be provided by the Project Applicant:

- Percentage of units in project that are deed-restricted BMR housing

# Transportation

CEQA# MM D-7  
MP# LU-2.1.8

**LUT-6**

**Land Use / Location**

## Mitigation Method:

% VMT Reduction = 4% \* Percentage of units in project that are deed-restricted BMR housing [1]

## Assumptions:

Data based upon the following references:

- [1] Nelson\Nygaard, 2005. Crediting Low-Traffic Developments (p.15).  
<http://www.montgomeryplanning.org/transportation/documents/TripGenerationAnalysisUsingURBEMIS.pdf>  
 Criterion Planner/Engineers and Fehr & Peers Associates (2001). Index 4D Method. *A Quick-Response Method of Estimating Travel Impacts from Land-Use Changes*. Technical Memorandum prepared for US EPA, October 2001.  
 Holtzclaw, John; Clear, Robert; Dittmar, Hank; Goldstein, David; and Haas, Peter (2002), "Location Efficiency: Neighborhood and Socio-Economic Characteristics Determine Auto Ownership and Use – Studies in Chicago, Los Angeles and San Francisco", *Transportation Planning and Technology*, 25 (1): 1-27.

All trips affected are assumed average trip lengths to convert from percentage vehicle trip reduction to VMT reduction (%VT = %VMT)

## Emission Reduction Ranges and Variables:

| Pollutant         | Category Emissions Reductions <sup>42</sup> |
|-------------------|---|
| CO <sub>2</sub> e | 0.04 – 1.20% of running                     |
| PM                | 0.04 – 1.20% of running                     |
| CO                | 0.04 – 1.20% of running                     |
| NOx               | 0.04 – 1.20% of running                     |
| SO <sub>2</sub>   | 0.04 – 1.20% of running                     |
| ROG               | 0.024 – 0.72% of total                      |

## Discussion:

At a low range, 1% BMR housing is assumed. At a medium range, 15% is assumed (based on the requirements of the San Francisco BMR Program[5]). At a high range, the San Francisco program is doubled to reach 30% BMR. Higher percentages of BMR are possible, though not discussed in the literature or calculated.

<sup>42</sup> The percentage reduction reflects emission reductions from running emissions. The actual value will be less than this when starting and evaporative emissions are factored into the analysis. ROG emissions have been adjusted to reflect a ratio of 40% evaporative and 60% exhaust emissions based on a statewide EMFAC run of all vehicles.

# Transportation

CEQA# MM D-7  
MP# LU-2.1.8

LUT-6

Land Use / Location

## Example:

Sample calculations are provided below:

- Low Range % VMT Reduction =  $4\% * 1\% = 0.04\%$
- High Range % VMT Reduction =  $4\% * 30\% = 1.20\%$

## Preferred Literature:

Nelson\Nygaard [1] provides a 4% reduction in vehicle trips for each deed-restricted BMR unit. This is calculated from Holtzclaw [3], with the following assumptions: 12,000 average annual VMT per vehicle, \$33,000 median per capita income (2002 figures per CA State Department of Finance), and average income in BMR units 25% below median. With a coefficient of -0.0565 (estimate for VMT/vehicle as a function of \$/capita) from [3], the VMT reduction is  $0.0565 * 33,000 * 0.25 / 12,000 = 4\%$ .

## Alternative Literature:

- 50% greater transit school trips than higher income households

Fehr & Peers [6] developed Direct Ridership Models to predict the Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) ridership activity. One of the objectives of this assessment was to understand the land use and system access factors that influence commute period versus off-peak travel on BART. The analysis focused on the Metropolitan Transportation Commission 2000 Bay Area Travel Survey [7], using the data on household travel behavior to extrapolate relationships between household characteristics and BART mode choice. The study found that regardless of distance from BART, lower income households generate at least 50% higher BART use for school trips than higher income households. More research would be needed to provide more applicable information regarding other types of transit throughout the state.

## Other Literature Reviewed:

[4] Bento, Antonio M., Maureen L. Cropper, Ahmed Mushfiq Mobarak, and Katja Vinha. 2005. "The Effects of Urban Spatial Structure on Travel Demand in the United States." *The Review of Economics and Statistics* 87,3: 466-478. (cited in Measure Description section)

[5] San Francisco BMR Program: [http://www.ci.sf.ca.us/site/moh\\_page.asp?id=48083](http://www.ci.sf.ca.us/site/moh_page.asp?id=48083) (p.1) (cited in Discussion section).

[6] Fehr & Peers. *Access BART*. 2006.

[7] BATS. 2000. 2000 Bay Area Travel Survey.

### 3.1.7 Orient Project Toward Non-Auto Corridor

**Range of Effectiveness:** Grouped strategy. [See LUT-3]

**Measure Description:**

A project that is designed around an existing or planned transit, bicycle, or pedestrian corridor encourages alternative mode use. For this measure, the project is oriented towards a planned or existing transit, bicycle, or pedestrian corridor. Setback distance is minimized.

The benefits of Orientation toward Non-Auto Corridor have not been sufficiently quantified in the existing literature. This measure is most effective when applied in combination of multiple design elements that encourage this use. There is not sufficient evidence that this measure results in non-negligible trip reduction unless combined with measures described elsewhere in this report, including neighborhood design, density and diversity of development, transit accessibility and pedestrian and bicycle network improvements. Therefore, the trip reduction percentages presented below should be used only as reasonableness checks. They may be used to assess whether, when applied to projects oriented toward non-auto corridors, analysis of all of those other development design factors presented in this report produce trip reductions at least as great as the percentages listed below.

**Measure Applicability:**

- Urban or suburban context; may be applicable in a master-planned rural community
- Appropriate for residential, retail, office, industrial, and mixed-use projects

**Alternative Literature:**

*Alternate:*

- 0.25 – 0.5% reduction in vehicle miles traveled (VMT)

The Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD) Recommended Guidance for Land Use Emission Reductions attributes 0.5% reduction for a project oriented towards an *existing* corridor. A 0.25% reduction is attributed for a project oriented towards a *planned* corridor. The planned transit, bicycle, or pedestrian corridor must be in a General Plan, Community Plan, or similar plan.

*Alternate:*

- 0.5% reduction in VMT per 1% improvement in transit frequency
- 0.5% reduction in VMT per 10% increase in transit ridership

# Transportation

MP# LU-4.2

**LUT-7**

**Land Use / Location**

The *Center for Clean Air Policy (CCAP) Guidebook* [2] attributes a 0.5 % reduction per 1% improvement in transit frequency. Based on a case study presented in the CCAP report, a 10% increase in transit ridership would result in a 0.5% reduction. (This information is based on a TIAX review for SMAQMD).

The sources cited above reflect existing guidance rather than empirical studies.

### **Alternative Literature References:**

[1] Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD).  
 “Recommended Guidance for Land Use Emission Reductions.”  
<http://www.airquality.org/ceqa/GuidanceLUEmissionReductions.pdf>

[2] Center for Clean Air Policy (CCAP). *Transportation Emission Guidebook*.  
[http://www.ccap.org/safe/guidebook/guide\\_complete.html](http://www.ccap.org/safe/guidebook/guide_complete.html)  
 TIAX Results of 2005 Literature Search Conducted by TIAX on behalf of  
 SMAQMD

### **Other Literature Reviewed:**

None

# Transportation

## LUT-8

## Land Use / Location

### 3.1.8 Locate Project near Bike Path/Bike Lane

**Range of Effectiveness:** Grouped strategy. [See LUT-4]

**Measure Description:**

A Project that is designed around an existing or planned bicycle facility encourages alternative mode use. The project will be located within 1/2 mile of an existing Class I path or Class II bike lane. The project design should include a comparable network that connects the project uses to the existing offsite facilities.

This measure is most effective when applied in combination of multiple design elements that encourage this use. Refer to Increase Destination Accessibility (LUT-4) strategy. The benefits of Proximity to Bike Path/Bike Lane are small as a standalone strategy. The strategy should be grouped with the Increase Destination Accessibility strategy to increase the opportunities for multi-modal travel.

**Measure Applicability:**

- Urban or suburban context; may be applicable in a rural master planned community
- Appropriate for residential, retail, office, industrial, and mixed-use projects

**Alternative Literature:**

*Alternate:*

- 0.625% reduction in vehicle miles traveled (VMT)

As a rule of thumb, the *Center for Clean Air Policy (CCAP) Guidebook* [1] attributes a 1% to 5% reduction associated with comprehensive bicycle programs. Based on the CCAP guidebook, the TIAX report allots 2.5% reduction for all bicycle-related measures and a 1/4 of that for this measure alone. (This information is based on a TIAX review for SMAQMD).

**Alternative Literature References:**

[1] Center for Clean Air Policy (CCAP). *Transportation Emission Guidebook*. [http://www.ccap.org/safe/guidebook/guide\\_complete.html](http://www.ccap.org/safe/guidebook/guide_complete.html); TIAX Results of 2005 Literature Search Conducted by TIAX on behalf of SMAQMD.

**Other Literature Reviewed:**

None

# Transportation

## LUT-8 Land Use / Location

### 3.1.9 Improve Design of Development

**Range of Effectiveness:** 3.0 – 21.3% vehicle miles traveled (VMT) reduction and therefore 3.0-21.3% reduction in GHG emissions.

**Measure Description:**

The project will include improved design elements to enhance walkability and connectivity. Improved street network characteristics within a neighborhood include street accessibility, usually measured in terms of average block size, proportion of four-way intersections, or number of intersections per square mile. Design is also measured in terms of sidewalk coverage, building setbacks, street widths, pedestrian crossings, presence of street trees, and a host of other physical variables that differentiate pedestrian-oriented environments from auto-oriented environments.

**Measure Applicability:**

- Urban and suburban context
- Negligible impact in a rural context
- Appropriate for residential, retail, office, industrial and mixed-use projects

**Baseline Method:**

See introduction to transportation section for a discussion of how to estimate trip rates and VMT. The CO<sub>2</sub> emissions are calculated from VMT as follows:

$$CO_2 = VMT \times EF_{\text{running}}$$

Where:

|                       |   |
|-----------------------|---|
| traveled              | VMT = vehicle miles                     |
| for running emissions | EF <sub>running</sub> = emission factor |

**Inputs:**

The following information needs to be provided by the Project Applicant:

- Number of intersections per square mile

**Mitigation Method:**

$$\% \text{ VMT Reduction} = \text{Intersections} * B$$

Where

# Transportation

## LUT-8 Land Use / Location

Intersections = Percentage increase in intersections versus a typical ITE suburban development

$$= \frac{\text{Intersections per square mile of project} - \text{Intersections per square mile of typical ITE suburban development}}{\text{Intersections per square mile of typical ITE suburban development}}$$

$$= \frac{\text{Intersections per square mile of project} - 36}{36}$$

See Appendix C for detail [not to exceed 500% increase]

B = Elasticity of VMT with respect to percentage of intersections (0.12 from [1])

### Assumptions:

Data based upon the following references:

[1] Ewing, R., and Cervero, R., "Travel and the Built Environment - A Meta-Analysis." *Journal of the American Planning Association*, <to be published> (2010). Table 4.

### Emission Reduction Ranges and Variables:

| Pollutant         | Category Emissions Reductions <sup>43</sup> |
|-------------------|---|
| CO <sub>2</sub> e | 3.0 – 21.3% of running                      |
| PM                | 3.0 – 21.3% of running                      |
| CO                | 3.0 – 21.3% of running                      |
| NO <sub>x</sub>   | 3.0 – 21.3% of running                      |
| SO <sub>2</sub>   | 3.0 – 21.3% of running                      |
| ROG               | 1.8 – 12.8% of total                        |

### Discussion:

The VMT reductions for this strategy are based on changes in intersection density versus the standard suburban intersection density in North America. This standard density is used as a baseline to mirror the density reflected in the *ITE Trip Generation Manual*, which is the baseline method for determining VMT.

The calculations in the Example section look at a low and high range of intersection densities. The low range is simply a slightly higher density than the typical ITE

<sup>43</sup> The percentage reduction reflects emission reductions from running emissions. The actual value will be less than this when starting and evaporative emissions are factored into the analysis. ROG emissions have been adjusted to reflect a ratio of 40% evaporative and 60% exhaust emissions based on a statewide EMFAC run of all vehicles.

# Transportation

## LUT-8

## Land Use / Location

development. The high range uses an average intersection density of mixed use/transit-oriented development sites (TOD Site surveys in the Bay Area for *Candlestick-Hunters Point Phase II TIA*, Fehr & Peers, 2009).

There are two separate maxima noted in the fact sheet: a cap of 500% on the allowable percentage increase of intersections per square mile (variable A) and a cap of 30% on % VMT reduction. The rationale for the 500% cap is that there are diminishing returns to any change in environment. For example, it is reasonably doubtful that increasing intersection density by a factor of six instead of five would produce any additional change in travel behavior. The purpose for the 30% cap is to limit the influence of any single environmental factor (such as design). This emphasizes that community designs that implement multiple land use strategies (such as density, design, diversity, etc.) will show more of a reduction than relying on improvements from a single land use factor.

### Example:

Sample calculations are provided below:

- Low Range % VMT Reduction (45 intersections per square mile) =  $(45 - 36) / 36 * 0.12 = 3.0\%$
- High Range % VMT Reduction (100 intersections per square mile) =  $(100 - 36) / 36 * 0.12 = 21.3\%$

### Preferred Literature:

- -0.12 = elasticity of VMT with respect to design (intersection/street density)
- -0.12 = elasticity of VMT with respect to design (% of 4-way intersections)

Ewing and Cervero's [1] synthesis showed a strong relationship of VMT to design elements, second only to destination accessibility. The weighted average elasticity of VMT to intersection/street density was -0.12 (looking at six studies). The weighted average elasticity of VMT to percentage of 4-way intersections was -0.12 (looking at four studies, of which one controlled for self-selection<sup>44</sup>).

### Alternative Literature:

*Alternate:*

- 2-19% reduction in VMT

<sup>44</sup> Self selection occurs when residents or employees that favor travel by non-auto modes choose locations where this type of travel is possible. They are therefore more inclined to take advantage of the available options than a typical resident or employee might otherwise be.

# Transportation

## LUT-8

### Land Use / Location

*Growing Cooler* [2] looked at various reports which studied the effect of site design on VMT, showing a range of 2-19% reduction in VMT. In each case, alternative development plans for the same site were compared to a baseline or trend plan. Results suggest that VMT and CO<sub>2</sub> per capita decline as site density increases as well as the mix of jobs, housing, and retail uses become more balanced. *Growing Cooler* notes that the limited number of studies, differences in assumptions and methodologies, and variability of results make it difficult to generalize.

#### *Alternate:*

- 3 – 17% shift in mode share from auto to non-auto

The Marshall and Garrick paper [3] analyzes the differences in mode shares for grid and non-grid (“tree”) neighborhoods. For a city with a tributary tree street network, a neighborhood with a tree network had auto mode share of 92% while a neighborhood with a grid network had auto mode share of 89% (3% difference). For a city with a tributary radial street network, a tree neighborhood had auto mode share of 97% while a grid neighborhood had auto mode share of 84% (13% difference). For a city with a grid network, a tree neighborhood had auto mode share of 95% while a grid neighborhood had auto mode share of 78% (17% difference). The research is based on 24 California cities with populations between 30,000 and 100,000.

#### **Alternative Literature References:**

[2] Ewing, et al, 2008. *Growing Cooler – The Evidence on Urban Development and Climate Change*. Urban Land Institute.

[3] Marshall and Garrick, 2009. “The Effect of Street Network Design on Walking and Biking.” Submitted to the 89<sup>th</sup> Annual Meeting of Transportation Research Board, January 2010. (Table 3)

#### **Other Literature Reviewed:**

None

# Transportation

CEQA# MM-T-6 **SDT-1** **Neighborhood / Site Enhancement**  
 MP# LU-4

## 3.2 Neighborhood/Site Enhancements

### 3.2.1 Provide Pedestrian Network Improvements

**Range of Effectiveness:** 0 - 2% vehicle miles traveled (VMT) reduction and therefore 0 - 2% reduction in GHG emissions.

**Measure Description:**

Providing a pedestrian access network to link areas of the Project site encourages people to walk instead of drive. This mode shift results in people driving less and thus a reduction in VMT. The project will provide a pedestrian access network that internally links all uses and connects to all existing or planned external streets and pedestrian facilities contiguous with the project site. The project will minimize barriers to pedestrian access and interconnectivity. Physical barriers such as walls, landscaping, and slopes that impede pedestrian circulation will be eliminated.

**Measure Applicability:**

- Urban, suburban, and rural context
- Appropriate for residential, retail, office, industrial and mixed-use projects
- Reduction benefit only occurs if the project has both pedestrian network improvements on site and connections to the larger off-site network.

**Baseline Method:**

See introduction to transportation section for a discussion of how to estimate trip rates and VMT. The CO<sub>2</sub> emissions are calculated from VMT as follows:

$$CO_2 = VMT \times EF_{\text{running}}$$

Where:

traveled VMT = vehicle miles  
 for running emissions EF<sub>running</sub> = emission factor

**Inputs:**

The project applicant must provide information regarding pedestrian access and connectivity within the project and to/from off-site destinations.

# Transportation

CEQA# MM-T-6  
MP# LU-4

**SDT-1**

**Neighborhood / Site  
Enhancement**

## Mitigation Method:

| Estimated VMT Reduction | Extent of Pedestrian Accommodations         | Context        |
|-------------------------|---|----------------|
| 2%                      | Within Project Site and Connecting Off-Site | Urban/Suburban |
| 1%                      | Within Project Site                         | Urban/Suburban |
| < 1%                    | Within Project Site and Connecting Off-Site | Rural          |

## Assumptions:

Data based upon the following references:

- Center for Clean Air Policy (CCAP) Transportation Emission Guidebook. [http://www.ccap.org/safe/guidebook/guide\\_complete.html](http://www.ccap.org/safe/guidebook/guide_complete.html) (accessed March 2010)
- 1000 Friends of Oregon (1997) “Making the Connections: A Summary of the LUTRAQ Project” (p. 16): [http://www.onethousandfriendsoforegon.org/resources/lut\\_vol7.html](http://www.onethousandfriendsoforegon.org/resources/lut_vol7.html)

## Emission Reduction Ranges and Variables:

| Pollutant         | Category Emissions Reductions <sup>45</sup> |
|-------------------|---|
| CO <sub>2</sub> e | 0 - 2% of running                           |
| PM                | 0 - 2% of running                           |
| CO                | 0 - 2% of running                           |
| NO <sub>x</sub>   | 0 - 2% of running                           |
| SO <sub>2</sub>   | 0 - 2% of running                           |
| ROG               | 0 – 1.2% of total                           |

## Discussion:

As detailed in the preferred literature section below, the lower range of 1 – 2% VMT reduction was pulled from the literature to provide a conservative estimate of reduction potential. The literature does not speak directly to a rural context, but an assumption was made that the benefits will likely be lower than a suburban/urban context.

## Example:

N/A – calculations are not needed.

## Preferred Literature:

<sup>45</sup> The percentage reduction reflects emission reductions from running emissions. The actual value will be less than this when starting and evaporative emissions are factored into the analysis. ROG emissions have been adjusted to reflect a ratio of 40% evaporative and 60% exhaust emissions based on a statewide EMFAC run of all vehicles.

# Transportation

CEQA# **MM-T-6** **SDT-1** **Neighborhood / Site Enhancement**  
 MP# **LU-4**

- 1 - 2% reduction in VMT

The Center for Clean Air Policy (CCAP) attributes a 1% reduction in VMT from pedestrian-oriented design assuming this creates a 5% decrease in automobile mode share (e.g. auto split shifts from 95% to 90%). This mode split is based on the Portland Regional Land Use Transportation and Air Quality (LUTRAQ) project. The LUTRAQ analysis also provides the high end of 10% reduction in VMT. This 10% assumes the following features:

- |                         |                              |
|-------------------------|------------------------------|
| – communities           | Compact, mixed-use           |
| – network               | Interconnected street        |
| – shorter block lengths | Narrower roadways and        |
| –                       | Sidewalks                    |
| – transit shelters      | Accessibility to transit and |
| – and street trees      | Traffic calming measures     |
| –                       | Parks and public spaces      |

Other strategies (development density, diversity, design, transit accessibility, traffic calming) are intended to account for the effects of many of the measures in the above list. Therefore, the assumed effectiveness of the Pedestrian Network measure should utilize the lower end of the 1 - 10% reduction range. If the pedestrian improvements are being combined with a significant number of the companion strategies, trip reductions for those strategies should be applied as well, based on the values given specifically for those strategies in other sections of this report. Based upon these findings, and drawing upon recommendations presented in the alternate literature below, the recommended VMT reduction attributable to pedestrian network improvements, above and beyond the benefits of other measures in the above bullet list, should be 1% for comprehensive pedestrian accommodations within the development plan or project itself, or 2% for comprehensive internal accommodations and external accommodations connecting to off-site destinations.

**Alternative Literature:**

*Alternate:*

- Walking is three times more common with enhanced pedestrian infrastructure
- 58% increase in non-auto mode share for work trips

# Transportation

CEQA# MM-T-6  
MP# LU-4

**SDT-1**

**Neighborhood / Site  
Enhancement**

The Nelson\Nygaard [1] report for the City of Santa Monica Land Use and Circulation Element EIR summarized studies looking at pedestrian environments. These studies have found a direct connection between non-auto forms of travel and a high quality pedestrian environment. Walking is three times more common with communities that have pedestrian friendly streets compared to less pedestrian friendly communities. Non-auto mode share for work trips is 49% in a pedestrian friendly community, compared to 31% in an auto-oriented community. Non-auto mode share for non-work trips is 15%, compared to 4% in an auto-oriented community. However, these effects also depend upon other aspects of the pedestrian friendliness being present, which are accounted for separately in this report through land use strategy mitigation measures such as density and urban design.

*Alternate:*

- 0.5% - 2.0% reduction in VMT

The Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD) Recommended Guidance for Land Use Emission Reductions [2] attributes 1% reduction for a project connecting to *existing* external streets and pedestrian facilities. A 0.5% reduction is attributed to connecting to *planned* external streets and pedestrian facilities (which must be included in a pedestrian master plan or equivalent). Minimizing pedestrian barriers attribute an additional 1% reduction in VMT. These recommendations are generally in line with the recommended discounts derived from the preferred literature above.

**Preferred and Alternative Literature Notes:**

[1] Nelson\Nygaard, 2010. City of Santa Monica Land Use and Circulation Element EIR Report, Appendix – Santa Monica Luce Trip Reduction Impacts Analysis (p.401). <http://www.shapethefuture2025.net/>

Nelson\Nygaard looked at the following studies: Anne Vernez Moudon, Paul Hess, Mary Catherine Snyder and Kiril Stanilov (2003), Effects of Site Design on Pedestrian Travel in Mixed Use, Medium-Density Environments, <http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/research/reports/fullreports/432.1.pdf>; Robert Cervero and Carolyn Radisch (1995), Travel Choices in Pedestrian Versus Automobile Oriented Neighborhoods, <http://www.uctc.net/papers/281.pdf>;

[2] Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD) Recommended Guidance for Land Use Emission Reductions. (p. 11) <http://www.airquality.org/ceqa/GuidanceLUEmissionReductions.pdf>

**Other Literature Reviewed:**

None

# Transportation

CEQA# MM-T-8  
MP# LU-1.6

**SDT-2**

**Neighborhood / Site  
Enhancement**

### 3.2.2 Provide Traffic Calming Measures

**Range of Effectiveness:** 0.25 – 1.00% vehicle miles traveled (VMT) reduction and therefore 0.25 – 1.00% reduction in GHG emissions.

**Measure Description:**

Providing traffic calming measures encourages people to walk or bike instead of using a vehicle. This mode shift will result in a decrease in VMT. Project design will include pedestrian/bicycle safety and traffic calming measures in excess of jurisdiction requirements. Roadways will be designed to reduce motor vehicle speeds and encourage pedestrian and bicycle trips with traffic calming features. Traffic calming features may include: marked crosswalks, count-down signal timers, curb extensions, speed tables, raised crosswalks, raised intersections, median islands, tight corner radii, roundabouts or mini-circles, on-street parking, planter strips with street trees, chicanes/chokers, and others.

**Measure Applicability:**

- Urban, suburban, and rural context
- Appropriate for residential, retail, office, industrial and mixed-use projects

**Baseline Method:**

See introduction to transportation section for a discussion of how to estimate trip rates and VMT. The CO<sub>2</sub> emissions are calculated from VMT as follows:

$$CO_2 = VMT \times EF_{\text{running}}$$

Where:

|                       |   |
|-----------------------|---|
| traveled              | VMT = vehicle miles                     |
| for running emissions | EF <sub>running</sub> = emission factor |

**Inputs:**

The following information needs to be provided by the Project Applicant:

- Percentage of streets within project with traffic calming improvements
- Percentage of intersections within project with traffic calming improvements

# Transportation

CEQA# MM-T-8  
MP# LU-1.6

**SDT-2**

**Neighborhood / Site  
Enhancement**

## Mitigation Method:

|                                      |      | % of streets with improvements |              |              |              |
|--------------------------------------|------|--------------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
|                                      |      | 25%                            | 50%          | 75%          | 100%         |
|                                      |      | % VMT Reduction                |              |              |              |
| % of intersections with improvements | 25%  | <b>0.25%</b>                   | <b>0.25%</b> | <b>0.5%</b>  | <b>0.5%</b>  |
|                                      | 50%  | <b>0.25%</b>                   | <b>0.5%</b>  | <b>0.5%</b>  | <b>0.75%</b> |
|                                      | 75%  | <b>0.5%</b>                    | <b>0.5%</b>  | <b>0.75%</b> | <b>0.75%</b> |
|                                      | 100% | <b>0.5%</b>                    | <b>0.75%</b> | <b>0.75%</b> | <b>1%</b>    |

## Assumptions:

Data based upon the following references:

- [1] Cambridge Systematics. *Moving Cooler: An Analysis of Transportation Strategies for Reducing Greenhouse Gas Emissions.*(p. B-25)  
[http://www.movingcooler.info/Library/Documents/Moving%20Cooler\\_Appendices\\_Complete\\_102209.pdf](http://www.movingcooler.info/Library/Documents/Moving%20Cooler_Appendices_Complete_102209.pdf)
- [2] Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD)  
*Recommended Guidance for Land Use Emission Reductions.* (p.13)  
<http://www.airquality.org/ceqa/GuidanceLUEmissionReductions.pdf>

## Emission Reduction Ranges and Variables:

| Pollutant         | Category Emissions Reductions <sup>46</sup> |
|-------------------|---|
| CO <sub>2</sub> e | 0.25 – 1.00% of running                     |
| PM                | 0.25 – 1.00% of running                     |
| CO                | 0.25 – 1.00% of running                     |
| NOx               | 0.25 – 1.00% of running                     |
| SO <sub>2</sub>   | 0.25 – 1.00% of running                     |
| ROG               | 0.15 – 0.6% of total                        |

## Discussion:

The table above allows the Project Applicant to choose a range of street and intersection improvements to determine an appropriate VMT reduction estimate. The Applicant will look at the rows on the left and choose the percent of intersections within

<sup>46</sup> The percentage reduction reflects emission reductions from running emissions. The actual value will be less than this when starting and evaporative emissions are factored into the analysis. ROG emissions have been adjusted to reflect a ratio of 40% evaporative and 60% exhaust emissions based on a statewide EMFAC run of all vehicles.

# Transportation

CEQA# MM-T-8  
MP# LU-1.6

## SDT-2

### Neighborhood / Site Enhancement

the project which will have traffic calming improvements. Then, the Applicant will look at the columns along the top and choose the percent of streets within the project which will have traffic calming improvements. The intersection cell of the row and column selected in the matrix is the VMT reduction estimate.

Though the literature provides some difference between a suburban and urban context, the difference is small and thus a conservative estimate was used to be applied to all contexts. Rural context is not specifically discussed in the literature but is assumed to have similar impacts.

For a low range, a project is assumed to have 25% of its streets with traffic calming improvements and 25% of its intersections with traffic calming improvements. For a high range, 100% of streets and intersections are assumed to have traffic calming improvements

#### Example:

N/A - No calculations needed.

#### Preferred Literature:

- -0.03 = elasticity of VMT with respect to a pedestrian environment factor (PEF)
- 1.5% - 2.0% reduction in suburban VMT
- 0.5% - 0.6% reduction in urban VMT

*Moving Cooler* [1] looked at Ewing's synthesis elasticity from the Smart Growth INDEX model (-0.03) to estimate VMT reduction for a suburban and urban location. The estimated reduction in VMT came from looking at the difference between the VMT results for Moving Cooler's strategy of pedestrian accessibility only compared to an aggressive strategy of pedestrian accessibility and traffic calming.

The Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD) *Recommended Guidance for Land Use Emission Reductions* [2] attributes 0.25 – 1% of VMT reductions to traffic calming measures. The table above illustrates the range of VMT reductions based on the percent of streets and intersections with traffic calming measures implemented. This range of reductions is recommended because it is generally consistent with the effectiveness ranges presented in the other preferred literature for situations in which the effects of traffic calming are distinguished from the other measures often found to co-exist with calming, and because it provides graduated effectiveness estimates depending on the degree to which calming is implemented.

#### Alternative Literature:

None

# Transportation

CEQA# MM-T-8  
MP# LU-1.6

**SDT-2**

**Neighborhood / Site  
Enhancement**

**Alternative Literature References:**

None

**Other Literature Reviewed:**

None

# Transportation

CEQA# MM-D-6  
MP# TR-6

**SDT-3**

**Neighborhood / Site  
Enhancement**

### 3.2.3 Implement a Neighborhood Electric Vehicle (NEV) Network

**Range of Effectiveness:** 0.5-12.7% vehicle miles traveled (VMT) reduction since Neighborhood Electric Vehicles (NEVs) would result in a mode shift and therefore reduce the traditional vehicle VMT and GHG emissions<sup>47</sup>. Range depends on the available NEV network and support facilities, NEV ownership levels, and the degree of shift from traditional

**Measure Description:**

The project will create local "light" vehicle networks, such as NEV networks. NEVs are classified in the California Vehicle Code as a "low speed vehicle". They are electric powered and must conform to applicable federal automobile safety standards. NEVs offer an alternative to traditional vehicle trips and can legally be used on roadways with speed limits of 35 MPH or less (unless specifically restricted). They are ideal for short trips up to 30 miles in length. To create an NEV network, the project will implement the necessary infrastructure, including NEV parking, charging facilities, striping, signage, and educational tools. NEV routes will be implemented throughout the project and will double as bicycle routes.

**Measure Applicability:**

- Urban, suburban, and rural context
- Small citywide or large multi-use developments
- Appropriate for mixed-use projects

**Baseline Method:**

See introduction to transportation section for a discussion of how to estimate trip rates and VMT. The CO<sub>2</sub> emissions are calculated from VMT as follows:

$$CO_2 = VMT \times EF_{\text{running}}$$

Where:

|                       |   |
|-----------------------|---|
| traveled              | VMT = vehicle miles                     |
| for running emissions | EF <sub>running</sub> = emission factor |

---

<sup>47</sup> Transit vehicles may also result in increases in emissions that are associated with electricity production or fuel use. The Project Applicant should consider these potential additional emissions when estimating mitigation for these measures.

# Transportation

CEQA# MM-D-6 **SDT-3** **Neighborhood / Site Enhancement**  
 MP# TR-6

**Inputs:**

The following information needs to be provided by the Project Applicant:

- low vs. high penetration

**Mitigation Method:**

$$\% \text{ VMT reduction} = \text{Pop} * \text{Number} * \text{NEV}$$

Where

- Penetration = Number of NEVs per household (0.04 to 1.0 from [1])
- NEV = VMT reduction rate per household (12.7% from [2])

**Assumptions:**

Data based upon the following reference:

[1] City of Lincoln, MHM Engineers & Surveyors, *Neighborhood Electric Vehicle Transportation Program Final Report*, Issued 04/05/05

[2] City of Lincoln, *A Report to the California Legislature as required by Assembly Bill 2353, Neighborhood Electric Vehicle Transportation Plan Evaluation*, January 1, 2008.

**Emission Reduction Ranges and Variables:**

| Pollutant         | Category Emissions Reductions <sup>48</sup> |
|-------------------|---|
| CO <sub>2</sub> e | 0.5 – 12.7% of running                      |
| PM                | 0.5 – 12.7% of running                      |
| CO                | 0.5 – 12.7% of running                      |
| NO <sub>x</sub>   | 0.5 – 12.7% of running                      |
| SO <sub>2</sub>   | 0.5 – 12.7% of running                      |
| ROG               | 0.3 – 7.6% of total                         |

**Discussion:**

The estimated number of NEVs per household may vary based on what the project estimates as a penetration rate for implementing an NEV network. Adjust according to project characteristics. The estimated reduction in VMT is for non-NEV miles traveled. The calculations below assume that NEV miles traveled replace regular vehicle travel.

---

▪ <sup>48</sup> The percentage reduction reflects emission reductions from running emissions. The actual value will be less than this when starting and evaporative emissions are factored into the analysis. ROG emissions have been adjusted to reflect a ratio of 40% evaporative and 60% exhaust emissions based on a statewide EMFAC run of all vehicles.

# Transportation

CEQA# MM-D-6  
MP# TR-6

**SDT-3**

**Neighborhood / Site  
Enhancement**

This may not be the case and the project should consider applying an appropriate discount rate on what percentage of VMT is actually replaced by NEV travel..

## Example:

Sample calculations are provided below:

- Low Range % VMT Reduction (low penetration) =  $0.04 * 12.7\% = 0.5\%$
- High Range % VMT Reduction (high penetration) =  $1.0 * 12.7\% = 12.7\%$

## Preferred Literature:

- 12.7% reduction in VMT per household
- Penetration rates: 0.04 to 1 NEV / household

The NEV Transportation Program plans to implement the following strategies: charging facilities, striping, signage, parking, education on NEV safety, and NEV/bicycle lines throughout the community. . One estimate of current NEV ownership reported roughly 600 NEVs in the city of Lincoln in 2008<sup>49</sup>. With current estimated households of ~13,500<sup>50</sup>, a low estimate of NEV penetration would be 0.04 NEV per household. A high NEV penetration can be estimated at 1 NEV per household. The 2007 survey of NEV users in Lincoln revealed an average use of about 3,500 miles per year [2]. With an estimated annual 27,500 VMT/household<sup>51</sup>, this results in a 12.7% reduction in VMT per household.

## Alternative Literature:

- 0.5% VMT reduction for neighborhoods with internal NEV connections
- 1% VMT reduction for internal and external connections to surrounding neighborhoods
- 1.5% VMT reduction for internal NEV connections and connections to other existing NEV networks serving all other types of uses.

The Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD) Recommended Guidance for Land Use Emission Reductions notes that current studies show NEVs do not replace gas-fueled vehicles as the primary vehicle. For the purpose

<sup>49</sup> Lincoln, California: A NEV-Friendly Community, Bennett Engineering, the City of Lincoln, and LincolnNEV, August 28, 2008 - <http://electricrickenmotorsports.com/news.php>

<sup>50</sup> SACOG Housing Estimates Statistics (<http://www.sacog.org/about/advocacy/pdf/factsheets/HousingStats.pdf>). Linearly interpolated 2008 household numbers between 2005 and 2035 projections.

<sup>51</sup> SACOG SACSIm forecasts for VMT per household at 75.4 daily VMT per household \* 365 days = 27521 annual VMT per household

# Transportation

CEQA# MM-D-6  
MP# TR-6

**SDT-3**

**Neighborhood / Site  
Enhancement**

of providing incentives for developers to promote NEV use, a project will receive the above listed VMT reductions for implementation.

**Alternative Literature Reference:**

[1] Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD)  
Recommended Guidance for Land Use Emission Reductions. (p. 21)  
<http://www.airquality.org/ceqa/GuidanceLUEmissionReductions.pdf>

**Other Literature Reviewed:**

None

# Transportation

MP# LU-3.2.1 & 4.1.4

**SDT-4**

**Neighborhood / Site  
Enhancement**

## 3.2.4 Create Urban Non-Motorized Zones

**Range of Effectiveness:** Grouped strategy. [See SDT-1]

### Measure Description:

The project, if located in a central business district (CBD) or major activity center, will convert a percentage of its roadway miles to transit malls, linear parks, or other non-motorized zones. These features encourage non-motorized travel and thus a reduction in VMT.

This measure is most effective when applied with multiple design elements that encourage this use. Refer to Pedestrian Network Improvements (SDT-1) strategy for ranges of effectiveness in this category. The benefits of Urban Non-Motorized Zones alone have not been shown to be significant.

### Measure Applicability:

- Urban context
- Appropriate for residential, retail, office, industrial, and mixed-use projects

### Alternative Literature:

#### *Alternate:*

- 0.01 – 0.2% annual Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) reduction

*Moving Cooler* [1] assumes 2 – 6% of U.S. CBDs/activity centers will convert to non-motorized zones for the purpose of calculating the potential impact. At full implementation, this would result in a range of CBD/activity center annual VMT reduction of 0.07-0.2% and metro VMT reduction of 0.01-0.03%.

#### *Alternate:*

Pucher, Dill, and Handy (2010) [2] note several international case studies of urban non-motorized zones. In Bologna, Italy, vehicle traffic declined by 50%, and 8% of those arriving in the CBD came by bicycle after the conversion. In Lubeck, Germany, of those who used to drive, 12% switched to transit, walking, or bicycling with the conversion. In Aachen, Germany, car travel declined from 44% to 36%, but bicycling stayed constant at 3%

#### *Notes:*

No literature was identified that quantifies the benefits of this strategy at a smaller scale.

# Transportation

MP# LU-3.2.1 & 4.1.4

**SDT-4**

**Neighborhood / Site  
Enhancement**

## Alternative Literature References:

[1] Cambridge Systematics. *Moving Cooler: An Analysis of Transportation Strategies for Reducing Greenhouse Gas Emissions*. Technical Appendices. Prepared for the Urban Land Institute.  
[http://www.movingcooler.info/Library/Documents/Moving%20Cooler\\_Appendix%20B\\_Effectiveness\\_102209.pdf](http://www.movingcooler.info/Library/Documents/Moving%20Cooler_Appendix%20B_Effectiveness_102209.pdf)

[2] Pucher J., Dill, J., and Handy, S. *Infrastructure, Programs and Policies to Increase Bicycling: An International Review*. February 2010. *Preventive Medicine* 50 (2010) S106–S125.  
[http://policy.rutgers.edu/faculty/pucher/Pucher\\_Dill\\_Handy10.pdf](http://policy.rutgers.edu/faculty/pucher/Pucher_Dill_Handy10.pdf)

## Other Literature Reviewed:

None

### 3.2.5 Incorporate Bike Lane Street Design (on-site)

**Range of Effectiveness:** Grouped strategy. [See LUT-9]

**Measure Description:**

The project will incorporate bicycle lanes, routes, and shared-use paths into street systems, new subdivisions, and large developments. These on-street bike accommodations will be created to provide a continuous network of routes, facilitated with markings and signage. These improvements can help reduce peak-hour vehicle trips by making commuting by bike easier and more convenient for more people. In addition, improved bicycle facilities can increase access to and from transit hubs, thereby expanding the “catchment area” of the transit stop or station and increasing ridership. Bicycle access can also reduce parking pressure on heavily-used and/or heavily-subsidized feeder bus lines and auto-oriented park-and-ride facilities.

Refer to Improve Design of Development (LUT-9) strategy for overall effectiveness levels. The benefits of Bike Lane Street Design are small and should be grouped with the Improve Design of Development strategy to strengthen street network characteristics and enhance multi-modal environments.

**Measure Applicability:**

- Urban and suburban context
- Appropriate for residential, retail, office, industrial, and mixed-use projects

**Alternative Literature:**

*Alternate:*

- 1% increase in share of workers commuting by bicycle (for each additional mile of bike lanes per square mile)

Dill and Carr (2003) [1] showed that each additional mile of Type 2 bike lanes per square mile is associated with a 1% increase in the share of workers commuting by bicycle. Note that increasing by 1 mile is significant compared to the current average of 0.34 miles per square mile. Also, an increase in 1% in share of bicycle commuters would double the number of bicycle commuters in many areas with low existing bicycle mode share.

*Alternate:*

- 0.05 – 0.14% annual greenhouse gas (GHG) reduction
- 258 – 830% increase in bicycle community

*Moving Cooler* [2], based off of a national baseline, estimates 0.05% annual reduction in GHG emissions and 258% increase in bicycle commuting assuming 2 miles of bicycle

# Transportation

MP# TR-4.1

**SDT-5**

**Neighborhood / Site  
Enhancement**

lanes per square mile in areas with density > 2,000 persons per square mile. For 4 miles of bicycle lanes, estimates 0.09% GHG reductions and 449% increase in bicycle commuting. For 8 miles of bicycle lanes, estimates 0.14% GHG reductions and 830% increase in bicycle commuting. Companion strategies assumed include bicycle parking at commercial destinations, busses fitted with bicycle carriers, bike accessible rapid transit lines, education, bicycle stations, end-trip facilities, and signage.

*Alternate:*

- 0.075% increase in bicycle commuting with each mile of bikeway per 100,000 residents

A before-and-after study by Nelson and Allen (1997) [3] of bicycle facility implementation found that each mile of bikeway per 100,000 residents increases bicycle commuting 0.075%, all else being equal.

## **Alternative Literature References:**

- [1] Dill, Jennifer and Theresa Carr (2003). "Bicycle Commuting and Facilities in Major U.S. Cities: If You Build Them, Commuters Will Use Them – Another Look." *TRB 2003 Annual Meeting CD-ROM*.
- [2] Cambridge Systematics. *Moving Cooler: An Analysis of Transportation Strategies for Reducing Greenhouse Gas Emissions*. Technical Appendices. Prepared for the Urban Land Institute.  
[http://www.movingcooler.info/Library/Documents/Moving%20Cooler\\_Appendix%20B\\_Effectiveness\\_102209.pdf](http://www.movingcooler.info/Library/Documents/Moving%20Cooler_Appendix%20B_Effectiveness_102209.pdf)
- [3] Nelson, Arthur and David Allen (1997). "If You Build Them, Commuters Will Use Them; Cross-Sectional Analysis of Commuters and Bicycle Facilities." *Transportation Research Record 1578*.

## **Other Literature Reviewed:**

None

# Transportation

CEQA# MM T-1  
MP# TR-4.1

## SDT-6

Neighborhood / Site  
Enhancement

### 3.2.6 Provide Bike Parking in Non-Residential Projects

**Range of Effectiveness:** Grouped strategy. [See LUT-9]

#### Measure Description:

A non-residential project will provide short-term and long-term bicycle parking facilities to meet peak season maximum demand. Refer to Improve Design of Development (LUT-9) strategy for overall effectiveness ranges. Bike Parking in Non-Residential Projects has minimal impacts as a standalone strategy and should be grouped with the Improve Design of Development strategy to encourage bicycling by providing strengthened street network characteristics and bicycle facilities.

#### Measure Applicability:

- Urban, suburban, and rural contexts
- Appropriate for retail, office, industrial, and mixed-use projects

#### Alternative Literature:

*Alternate:*

- 0.625% reduction in Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)

As a rule of thumb, the Center for Clean Air Policy (CCAP) guidebook [1] attributes a 1% to 5% reduction in VMT to the use of bicycles, which reflects the assumption that their use is typically for shorter trips. Based on the *CCAP Guidebook*, the TIAX report allots 2.5% reduction for all bicycle-related measures and a quarter of that for this bicycle parking alone. (This information is based on a TIAX review for Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD).)

*Alternate:*

- 0.05 – 0.14% annual greenhouse gas (GHG) reduction
- 258 – 830% increase in bicycle community

*Moving Cooler* [2], based off of a national baseline, estimates 0.05% annual reduction in GHG emissions and 258% increase in bicycle commuting assuming 2 miles of bicycle lanes per square mile in areas with density > 2,000 persons per square mile. For 4 miles of bicycle lanes, *Moving Cooler* estimates 0.09% GHG reductions and 449% increase in bicycle commuting. For 8 miles of bicycle lanes, *Moving Cooler* estimates 0.14% GHG reductions and 830% increase in bicycle commuting. Companion strategies assumed include bicycle parking at commercial destinations, busses fitted with bicycle carriers, bike accessible rapid transit lines, education, bicycle stations, end-trip facilities, and signage.

# Transportation

CEQA# MM T-1  
MP# TR-4.1

**SDT-6**

**Neighborhood / Site  
Enhancement**

## **Alternative Literature References:**

- [1] Center For Clean Air Policy (CCAP) *Transportation Emission Guidebook*.  
[http://www.ccap.org/safe/guidebook/guide\\_complete.html](http://www.ccap.org/safe/guidebook/guide_complete.html); Based on results of  
2005 literature search conducted by TIAX on behalf of SMAQMD.
- [2] Cambridge Systematics. *Moving Cooler: An Analysis of Transportation Strategies  
for Reducing Greenhouse Gas Emissions*. Technical Appendices. Prepared for  
the Urban Land Institute.  
[http://www.movingcooler.info/Library/Documents/Moving%20Cooler\\_Appendix%  
20B\\_Effectiveness\\_102209.pdf](http://www.movingcooler.info/Library/Documents/Moving%20Cooler_Appendix%20B_Effectiveness_102209.pdf)

## **Other Literature Reviewed:**

None

# Transportation

CEQA# MM T-3  
MP# TR-4.1.2

**SDT-7**

**Neighborhood / Site  
Enhancement**

## 3.2.7 Provide Bike Parking with Multi-Unit Residential Projects

**Range of Effectiveness:** Grouped strategy. [See LUT-9]

### Measure Description:

Long-term bicycle parking will be provided at apartment complexes or condominiums without garages. Refer to Improve Design of Development (LUT-9) strategy for effectiveness ranges in this category. The benefits of Bike Parking with Multi-Unit Residential Projects have no quantified impacts and should be grouped with the Improve Design of Development strategy to encourage bicycling by providing strengthened street network characteristics and bicycle facilities.

### Measure Applicability:

- Urban, suburban, or rural contexts
- Appropriate for residential projects

### Alternative Literature:

No literature was identified that specifically looks at the quantitative impact of including bicycle parking at multi-unit residential sites.

### Alternative Literature References:

None

### Other Literature Reviewed:

None

# Transportation

CEQA# MM T-17 & E-11  
MP# TR-5.4

**SDT-8**

**Neighborhood / Site  
Enhancement**

## 3.2.8 Provide Electric Vehicle Parking

**Range of Effectiveness:** Grouped strategy. [See SDT-3]

### Measure Description:

This project will implement accessible electric vehicle parking. The project will provide conductive/inductive electric vehicle charging stations and signage prohibiting parking for non-electric vehicles. Refer to Neighborhood Electric Vehicle Network (SDT-3) strategy for effectiveness ranges in this category. The benefits of Electric Vehicle Parking may be quantified when grouped with the use of electric vehicles and or Neighborhood Electric Vehicle Network.

### Measure Applicability:

- Urban or suburban contexts
- Appropriate for residential, retail, office, mixed use, and industrial projects

### Alternative Literature:

No literature was identified that specifically looks at the quantitative impact of implementing electric vehicle parking.

### Alternative Literature References:

None

### Other Literature Reviewed:

None

# Transportation

MP# TR-4.1

**SDT-9**

**Neighborhood / Site  
Enhancement**

## 3.2.9 Dedicate Land for Bike Trails

**Range of Effectiveness:** Grouped strategy. [See LUT-9]

### Measure Description:

Larger projects may be required to provide for, contribute to, or dedicate land for the provision of off-site bicycle trails linking the project to designated bicycle commuting routes in accordance with an adopted citywide or countywide bikeway plan.

Refer to Improve Design of Development (LUT-9) strategy for ranges of effectiveness in this category. The benefits of Land Dedication for Bike Trails have not been quantified and should be grouped with the Improve Design of Development strategy to strengthen street network characteristics and improve connectivity to off-site bicycle networks.

### Measure Applicability:

- Urban, suburban, or rural contexts
- Appropriate for large residential, retail, office, mixed use, and industrial projects

### Alternative Literature:

No literature was identified that specifically looks at the quantitative impact of implementing land dedication for bike trails.

### Alternative Literature References:

None

### Other Literature Reviewed:

None

# Transportation

MP# LU-1.7 & LU-2.1.1.4

PDT-1

Parking Policy / Pricing

## 3.3 Parking Policy/Pricing

### 3.3.1 Limit Parking Supply

**Range of Effectiveness:** 5 – 12.5% vehicle miles travelled (VMT) reduction and therefore 5 – 12.5% reduction in GHG emissions.

**Measure Description:**

The project will change parking requirements and types of supply within the project site to encourage “smart growth” development and alternative transportation choices by project residents and employees. This will be accomplished in a multi-faceted strategy:

- Elimination (or reduction) of minimum parking requirements<sup>52</sup>
- Creation of maximum parking requirements
- Provision of shared parking

**Measure Applicability:**

- Urban and suburban context
- Negligible in a rural context
- Appropriate for residential, retail, office, industrial and mixed-use projects
- Reduction can be counted only if spillover parking is controlled (via residential permits and on-street market rate parking) [See PPT-5 and PPT-7]

**Baseline Method:**

See introduction to transportation section for a discussion of how to estimate trip rates and VMT. The CO<sub>2</sub> emissions are calculated from VMT as follows:

$$CO_2 = VMT \times EF_{\text{running}}$$

Where:

VMT = vehicle miles traveled

EF<sub>running</sub> = emission factor for running emissions

**Inputs:**

The following information needs to be provided by the Project Applicant:

- ITE parking generation rate for project site
- Actual parking provision rate for project site

---

<sup>52</sup> This may require changes to local ordinances and regulations.

# Transportation

MP# LU-1.7 & LU-2.1.1.4 **PDT-1** **Parking Policy / Pricing**

**Mitigation Method:**

$$\% \text{ VMT Reduction} = \frac{\text{Actual parking provision} - \text{ITE parking generation rate}}{\text{ITE parking generation rate}} \times 0.5$$

**Assumptions:**

Data based upon the following references:

[1] Nelson\Nygaard, 2005. Crediting Low-Traffic Developments (p. 16)  
<http://www.montgomeryplanning.org/transportation/documents/TripGenerationAnalysisUsingURBEMIS.pdf>

All trips affected are assumed average trip lengths to convert from percentage vehicle trip reduction to VMT reduction (% vehicle trips = %VMT).

**Emission Reduction Ranges and Variables:**

| Pollutant         | Category Emissions Reductions <sup>53</sup> |
|-------------------|---|
| CO <sub>2</sub> e | 5 – 12.5% of running                        |
| PM                | 5 – 12.5% of running                        |
| CO                | 5 – 12.5% of running                        |
| NO <sub>x</sub>   | 5 – 12.5% of running                        |
| SO <sub>2</sub>   | 5 – 12.5% of running                        |
| ROG               | 3 – 7.5% of total                           |

**Discussion:**

The literature suggests that a 50% reduction in conventional parking provision rates (per ITE rates) should serve as a typical ceiling for the reduction calculation. The upper range of VMT reduction will vary based on the size of the development (total number of spaces provided). ITE rates are used as baseline conditions to measure the effectiveness of this strategy.

Though not specifically documented in the literature, the degree of effectiveness of this measure will vary based on the level of urbanization of the project and surrounding areas, level of existing transit service, level of existing pedestrian and bicycle networks and other factors which would complement the shift away from single-occupant vehicle travel.

---

<sup>53</sup> The percentage reduction reflects emission reductions from running emissions. The actual value will be less than this when starting and evaporative emissions are factored into the analysis.

# Transportation

MP# LU-1.7 & LU-2.1.1.4

PDT-1

Parking Policy / Pricing

## Example:

If the ITE parking generation rate for the project is 100 spaces, for a low range a 5% reduction in spaces is assumed. For a high range a 25% reduction in spaces is assumed.

- Low range % VMT Reduction =  $[(100 - 95)/100] * 0.5 = 2.5\%$
- High range % VMT Reduction =  $[(100 - 75)/100] * 0.5 = 12.5\%$

## Preferred Literature:

To develop this model, Nelson\Nygaard [1] used the Institute of Transportation Engineers' *Parking Generation* handbook as the baseline figure for parking supply. This is assumed to be unconstrained demand. Trip reduction should only be credited if measures are implemented to control for spillover parking in and around the project, such as residential parking permits, metered parking, or time-limited parking.

## Alternative Literature:

- 100% increase in transit ridership
- 100% increase in transit mode share

According to *TCRP Report 95, Chapter 18* [2], the central business district of Portland, Oregon implemented a maximum parking ratio of 1 space per 1,000 square feet of new buildings and implemented surface lot restrictions which limited conditions where buildings could be razed for parking. A "before and after" study was not conducted specifically for the maximum parking requirements and data comes from various surveys and published reports. Based on rough estimates the approximate parking ratio of 3.4 per 1,000 square feet in 1973 (for entire downtown) had been reduce to 1.5 by 1990. Transit mode share increased from 20% to 40%. The increases in transit ridership and mode share are not solely from maximum parking requirements. Other companion strategies, such as market parking pricing and high fuel costs, were in place.

## Alternative Literature Sources:

[1] TCRP Report 95, Chapter 18: Parking Management and Supply: Traveler Response to *Transportation System Changes*. (p. 18-6)

[http://onlinepubs.trb.org/onlinepubs/tcrp/tcrp\\_rpt\\_95c18.pdf](http://onlinepubs.trb.org/onlinepubs/tcrp/tcrp_rpt_95c18.pdf)

## Other Literature Reviewed:

None

# Transportation

MP# LU-1.7 **PDT-2** **Parking Policy / Pricing**

### 3.3.2 Unbundle Parking Costs from Property Cost

**Range of Effectiveness:** 2.6 – 13% vehicles miles traveled (VMT) reduction and therefore 2.6 – 13% reduction in GHG emissions.

**Measure Description:**

This project will unbundle parking costs from property costs. Unbundling separates parking from property costs, requiring those who wish to purchase parking spaces to do so at an additional cost from the property cost. This removes the burden from those who do not wish to utilize a parking space. Parking will be priced separately from home rents/purchase prices or office leases. An assumption is made that the parking costs are passed through to the vehicle owners/drivers utilizing the parking spaces.

**Measure Applicability:**

- Urban and suburban context
- Negligible impact in a rural context
- Appropriate for residential, retail, office, industrial and mixed-use projects
- Complementary strategy includes Workplace Parking Pricing. Though not required, implementing workplace parking pricing ensures the market signal from unbundling parking is transferred to the employee.

**Baseline Method:**

See introduction to transportation section for a discussion of how to estimate trip rates and VMT. The CO<sub>2</sub> emissions are calculated from VMT as follows:

$$CO_2 = VMT \times EF_{\text{running}}$$

Where:

traveled VMT = vehicle miles  
 for running emissions EF<sub>running</sub> = emission factor

**Inputs:**

The following information needs to be provided by the Project Applicant:

- Monthly parking cost for project site

**Mitigation Method:**

$$\% \text{ Reduction in VMT} = \text{Change in vehicle cost} * \text{elasticity} * A$$

# Transportation

MP# LU-1.7

PDT-2

Parking Policy / Pricing

Where:

- -0.4 = elasticity of vehicle ownership with respect to total vehicle costs (lower end per VTPI)
- Change in vehicle cost = monthly parking cost \* (12 / \$4,000), with \$4,000 representing the annual vehicle cost per VTPI [1]
- A: 85% = adjustment from vehicle ownership to VMT (see Appendix C for detail)

## Assumptions:

Data based upon the following references:

[1] Victoria Transport Policy Institute, *Parking Requirement Impacts on Housing Affordability*; <http://www.vtpi.org/park-hou.pdf>; January 2009; accessed March 2010. (Annual/monthly parking fees estimated by VTPI in 2009) (p. 8, Table 3)

- For the elasticity of vehicle ownership, VTPI cites Phil Goodwin, Joyce Dargay and Mark Hanly (2003), *Elasticities Of Road Traffic And Fuel Consumption With Respect To Price And Income: A Review*, ESRC Transport Studies Unit, University College London ([www.transport.ucl.ac.uk](http://www.transport.ucl.ac.uk)), commissioned by the UK Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions (now UK Department for Transport); J.O. Jansson (1989), "Car Demand Modeling and Forecasting," *Journal of Transport Economics and Policy*, May 1989, pp. 125-129; Stephen Glaister and Dan Graham (2000), *The Effect of Fuel Prices on Motorists*, AA Motoring Policy Unit ([www.theaa.com](http://www.theaa.com)) and the UK Petroleum Industry Association ([http://195.167.162.28/policyviews/pdf/effect\\_fuel\\_prices.pdf](http://195.167.162.28/policyviews/pdf/effect_fuel_prices.pdf)); and Thomas F. Golob (1989), "The Casual Influences of Income and Car Ownership on Trip Generation by Mode", *Journal of Transportation Economics and Policy*, May 1989, pp. 141-162

## Emission Reduction Ranges and Variables:

| Pollutant         | Category Emissions Reductions <sup>54</sup> |
|-------------------|---|
| CO <sub>2</sub> e | 2.6 – 13% of running                        |
| PM                | 2.6 – 13% of running                        |
| CO                | 2.6 – 13% of running                        |

<sup>54</sup> The percentage reduction reflects emission reductions from running emissions. The actual value will be less than this when starting and evaporative emissions are factored into the analysis. ROG emissions have been adjusted to reflect a ratio of 40% evaporative and 60% exhaust emissions based on a statewide EMFAC run of all vehicles.

# Transportation

MP# LU-1.7 **PDT-2** **Parking Policy / Pricing**

|                 |                      |
|-----------------|----------------------|
| NOx             | 2.6 – 13% of running |
| SO <sub>2</sub> | 2.6 – 13% of running |
| ROG             | 1.6 – 7.8% of total  |

**Discussion:**

As discussed in the preferred literature section, monthly parking costs typically range from \$25 to \$125. The lower end of the elasticity range provided by VTPI is used here to be conservative.

**Example:**

Sample calculations are provided below:

- Low Range % VMT Reduction =  $\$25 * 12 / \$4000 * 0.4 * 85\% = 2.6\%$
- High Range % VMT Reduction =  $\$125 * 12 / \$4000 * 0.4 * 85\% = 12.8\%$

**Preferred Literature:**

- -0.4 to -1.0 = elasticity of vehicle ownership with respect to total vehicle costs

The above elasticity comes from a synthesis of literature. As noted in the VTPI report [1], a 10% increase in total vehicle costs (operating costs, maintenance, fuel, parking, etc.) reduces vehicle ownership between 4% and 10%. The report, estimating \$4,000 in annual costs per vehicle, calculated vehicle ownership reductions from residential parking pricing.

*Vehicle Ownership Reductions from Residential Parking Pricing*

| Annual (Monthly) Parking Fee | -0.4 Elasticity | -0.7 Elasticity | -1.0 Elasticity |
|------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| \$300 (\$25)                 | 4%              | 6%              | 8%              |
| \$600 (\$50)                 | 8%              | 11%             | 15%             |
| \$900 (\$75)                 | 11%             | 17%             | 23%             |
| \$1,200 (\$100)              | 15%             | 23%             | 30%             |
| \$1,500 (\$125)              | 19%             | 28%             | 38%             |

**Alternative Literature:**

None

**Alternative Literature Notes:**

None

**Other Literature Reviewed:**

None

# Transportation

## PDT-3 Parking Policy / Pricing

### 3.3.3 Implement Market Price Public Parking (On-Street)

**Range of Effectiveness:** 2.8 – 5.5% vehicle miles traveled (VMT) reduction and therefore 2.8 – 5.5% reduction in GHG emissions.

**Measure Description:**

This project and city in which it is located will 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.

**Measure Applicability:**

- Urban and suburban context
- Negligible impact in a rural context
- Appropriate for retail, office, and mixed-use projects
- Applicable in a specific or general plan context only
- Reduction can be counted only if spillover parking is controlled (via residential permits)
- Study conducted in a downtown area, and thus should be applied carefully if project is not in a central business/activity center

**Baseline Method:**

See introduction to transportation section for a discussion of how to estimate trip rates and VMT. The CO<sub>2</sub> emissions are calculated from VMT as follows:

$$CO_2 = VMT \times EF_{\text{running}}$$

Where:

traveled  
for running emissions

VMT = vehicle miles  
EF<sub>running</sub> = emission factor

**Inputs:**

The following information needs to be provided by the Project Applicant:

- Location of project site: low density suburb, suburban center, or urban location

# Transportation

## PDT-3 Parking Policy / Pricing

- Percent increase in on-street parking prices (minimum 25% needed)

### Mitigation Method:

$$\% \text{ VMT Reduction} = \text{Park\$} * B$$

Where:

Park\$ = Percent increase in on-street parking prices (minimum of 25% increase [1])

B = Elasticity of VMT with respect to parking price (0.11, from [2])

### Assumptions:

Data based upon the following references:

- [1] Cambridge Systematics. *Moving Cooler: An Analysis of Transportation Strategies for Reducing Greenhouse Gas Emissions*. Technical Appendices. Prepared for the Urban Land Institute. (p. B-10)  
 Moving Cooler's parking pricing analysis cited Victoria Transport Policy Institute, *How Prices and Other Factors Affect Travel Behavior* ([http://www.vtpi.org/tdm/tdm11.htm#\\_Toc161022578](http://www.vtpi.org/tdm/tdm11.htm#_Toc161022578)). The VTPI paper summarized the elasticities found in the Hensher and King paper. David A. Hensher and Jenny King (2001), "Parking Demand and Responsiveness to Supply, Price and Location in Sydney Central Business District," *Transportation Research A*, Vol. 35, No. 3 ([www.elsevier.com/locate/tra](http://www.elsevier.com/locate/tra)), March 2001, pp. 177-196.
- [2] J. Peter Clinch and J. Andrew Kelly (2003), *Temporal Variance Of Revealed Preference On-Street Parking Price Elasticity*, Department of Environmental Studies, University College Dublin ([www.environmentaleconomics.net](http://www.environmentaleconomics.net)). (p. 2) <http://www.ucd.ie/gpep/research/workingpapers/2004/04-02.pdf> As referenced in VTPI: [http://www.vtpi.org/tdm/tdm11.htm#\\_Toc161022578](http://www.vtpi.org/tdm/tdm11.htm#_Toc161022578)

### Emission Reduction Ranges and Variables:

| Pollutant         | Category Emissions Reductions <sup>55</sup> |
|-------------------|---|
| CO <sub>2</sub> e | 2.8 – 5.5% of running                       |

<sup>55</sup> The percentage reduction reflects emission reductions from running emissions. The actual value will be less than this when starting and evaporative emissions are factored into the analysis. ROG emissions have been adjusted to reflect a ratio of 40% evaporative and 60% exhaust emissions based on a statewide EMFAC run of all vehicles.

# Transportation

## PDT-3

## Parking Policy / Pricing

|                 |                       |
|-----------------|-----------------------|
| PM              | 2.8 – 5.5% of running |
| CO              | 2.8 – 5.5% of running |
| NOx             | 2.8 – 5.5% of running |
| SO <sub>2</sub> | 2.8 – 5.5% of running |
| ROG             | 1.7 – 3.3% of total   |

### Discussion:

The range of parking price increases should be a minimum of 25% and a maximum of 50%. The minimum is based on Moving Cooler [1] discussions which state that a less than 25% increase would not be a sufficient amount to reduce VMT. The case study [2] looked at a 50% price increase, and thus no conclusions can be made on the elasticities above a 50% increase. This strategy may certainly be implemented at a higher price increase, but VMT reductions should be capped at results from a 50% increase to be conservative.

### Example:

Assuming a baseline on-street parking price of \$1, sample calculations are provided below:

- Low Range % VMT Reduction (25% increase) =  $(\$1.25 - \$1)/\$1 * 0.11 = 2.8\%$
- High Range % VMT Reduction (50% increase) =  $(\$1.50 - \$1)/\$1 * 0.11 = 5.5\%$

### Preferred Literature:

- -0.11 parking demand elasticity with respect to parking prices

The Clinch & Kelly study [2] of parking meters looked at the impacts of a 50% price increase in the cost of on-street parking. The case study location was a central on-street parking area with a 3-hour time limit and a mix of business and non-business uses. The study concluded the parking increases resulted in an estimated average price elasticity of demand of -0.11, while factoring in parking duration results in an elasticity of -0.2 (cost increases also affect the amount of time cars are parked).

Though this study is international (Dublin, Ireland), it represents a solid study of parking meter price increases and provides a conservative estimate of elasticity compared to the alternate literature.

### Alternative Literature:

*Alternate:*

- -0.19 shopper parking elasticity with respect to parking price
- -0.48 commuter parking elasticity with respect to parking price

The *TCRP 95 Chapter 13* [3] report looked at a case study of the city of San Francisco implementing a parking tax on all public and private off-street parking (in 1970). Based on the number of cars parked, the report estimated parking price elasticities of -0.19 to -0.48, an average over a three year period.

*Alternate:*

- -0.15 VMT elasticity with respect to parking prices (for low density regions)
- -0.47 VMT elasticity with respect to parking prices (for high density regions)

The Moving Cooler analysis assumes a 25 percent increase in on-street parking fees is a starting point sufficient to reduce VMT. Using the elasticities stated above, Moving Cooler estimates an annual percent VMT reduction from 0.42% - 1.14% for a range of regions from a large low density region to a small high density region. The calculations assume that pricing occurs at the urban central business district/employment center/retail center, one-fourth of all person trips are commute based trips, and approximately 15% of commute trips are to the CBD or regional activity centers.

**Alternative Literature References:**

[3] TCRP Report 95. *Chapter 13: Parking Pricing and Fees - Traveler Response to Transportation System Changes*.  
[http://onlinepubs.trb.org/onlinepubs/tcrp/tcrp\\_rpt\\_95c13.pdf](http://onlinepubs.trb.org/onlinepubs/tcrp/tcrp_rpt_95c13.pdf). (p.13-42)

**Other Literature Reviewed:**

None

### 3.3.4 Require Residential Area Parking Permits

**Range of Effectiveness:** Grouped strategy. (See PPT-1, PPT-2, and PPT-3)

**Measure Description:**

This project will require the purchase of residential parking permits (RPPs) for long-term use of on-street parking in residential areas. Permits reduce the impact of spillover parking in residential areas adjacent to commercial areas, transit stations, or other locations where parking may be limited and/or priced. Refer to Parking Supply Limitations (PPT-1), Unbundle Parking Costs from Property Cost (PPT-2), or Market Rate Parking Pricing (PPT-3) strategies for the ranges of effectiveness in these categories. The benefits of Residential Area Parking Permits strategy should be combined with any or all of the above mentioned strategies, as providing RPPs are a key complementary strategy to other parking strategies.

**Measure Applicability:**

- Urban context
- Appropriate for residential, retail, office, mixed use, and industrial projects

**Alternative Literature:**

- -0.45 = elasticity of vehicle miles traveled (VMT) with respect to price
- 0.08% greenhouse gas (GHG) reduction
- 0.09-0.36% VMT reduction

*Moving Cooler* [1] suggested residential parking permits of \$100-\$200 annually. This mitigation would impact home-based trips, which are reported to represent approximately 60% of all urban trips. The range of VMT reductions can be attributed to the type of urban area. VMT reductions for \$100 annual permits are 0.09% for large, high-density; 0.12% for large, low-density; 0.12% for medium, high-density; 0.18% for medium, low-density; 0.18% for small, high-density; and 0.12% for small, low-density. VMT reductions for \$200 annual permits are 0.18% for large, high-density; 0.24% for large, low-density; 0.24% for medium, high-density; 0.36% for medium, low-density; 0.36% for small, high-density; and 0.24% for small, low-density.

**Alternative Literature References:**

[1] Cambridge Systematics. *Moving Cooler: An Analysis of Transportation Strategies for Reducing Greenhouse Gas Emissions*. Technical Appendices. Prepared for the Urban Land Institute.  
[http://www.movingcooler.info/Library/Documents/Moving%20Cooler\\_Appendix%20B\\_Effectiveness\\_102209.pdf](http://www.movingcooler.info/Library/Documents/Moving%20Cooler_Appendix%20B_Effectiveness_102209.pdf)

### 3.4 Commute Trip Reduction Programs

#### 3.4.1 Implement Commute Trip Reduction Program - Voluntary

Commute Trip Reduction Program – Voluntary, is a multi-strategy program that encompasses a combination of individual measures described in sections 3.4.3 through 3.4.9. It is presented as a means of preventing double-counting of reductions for individual measures that are included in this strategy. It does so by setting a maximum level of reductions that should be permitted for a combined set of strategies within a voluntary program.

**Range of Effectiveness:** 1.0 – 6.2% commute vehicle miles traveled (VMT) Reduction and therefore 1.0 – 6.2% reduction in commute trip GHG emissions.

**Measure Description:**

The project will implement a voluntary Commute Trip Reduction (CTR) program with employers to discourage single-occupancy vehicle trips and encourage alternative modes of transportation such as carpooling, taking transit, walking, and biking. The main difference between a voluntary and a required program is:

- Monitoring and reporting is not required
- No established performance standards (i.e. no trip reduction requirements)

The CTR program will provide employees with assistance in using alternative modes of travel, and provide both “carrots” and “sticks” to encourage employees. 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)

Other strategies may also be included as part of a voluntary CTR program, though they are not included in the reductions estimation and thus are not incorporated in the estimated VMT reductions. These include: new employee orientation of trip reduction and alternative mode options, event promotions and publications, flexible work schedule for all employees, transit subsidies, parking cash-out or priced parking, shuttles, emergency ride home, and improved on-site amenities.

# Transportation

## TRT-1 Commute Trip Reduction

### Measure Applicability:

- Urban and suburban context
- Negligible in a rural context, unless large employers exist, and suite of strategies implemented are relevant in rural settings
- Appropriate for retail, office, industrial and mixed-use projects

### Baseline Method:

See introduction to transportation section for a discussion of how to estimate trip rates and VMT. The CO<sub>2</sub> emissions are calculated from VMT as follows:

$$CO_2 = VMT \times EF_{\text{running}}$$

Where:

traveled for running emissions

VMT = vehicle miles  
 EF<sub>running</sub> = emission factor

### Inputs:

The following information needs to be provided by the Project Applicant:

- Percentage of employees eligible
- Location of project site: low density suburb, suburban center, or urban location

### Mitigation Method:

$$\% \text{ VMT Reduction} = A * B$$

Where

A = % reduction in commute VMT (from [1])  
 B = % employees eligible

Detail:

- A: 5.2% (low density suburb), 5.4% (suburban center), 6.2% (urban) annual reduction in commute VMT (from [1])

### Assumptions:

Data based upon the following references:

# Transportation

## TRT-1

## Commute Trip Reduction

- Cambridge Systematics. *Moving Cooler: An Analysis of Transportation Strategies for Reducing Greenhouse Gas Emissions*. Technical Appendices. Prepared for the Urban Land Institute. (Table 5.13)  
[http://www.movingcooler.info/Library/Documents/Moving%20Cooler\\_Appendix%20B\\_Effectiveness\\_102209.pdf](http://www.movingcooler.info/Library/Documents/Moving%20Cooler_Appendix%20B_Effectiveness_102209.pdf)

### Emission Reduction Ranges and Variables:

| Pollutant         | Category Emissions Reductions <sup>56</sup> |
|-------------------|---|
| CO <sub>2</sub> e | 1.0 – 6.2% of running                       |
| PM                | 1.0 – 6.2% of running                       |
| CO                | 1.0 – 6.2% of running                       |
| NO <sub>x</sub>   | 1.0 – 6.2% of running                       |
| SO <sub>2</sub>   | 1.0 – 6.2% of running                       |
| ROG               | 0.6 –3.7% of total                          |

### Discussion:

This set of strategies typically serves as a complement to the more effective workplace CTR strategies such as pricing and parking cash out.

### Example:

Sample calculations are provided below:

- Low Range % VMT Reduction (low density suburb and 20% eligible) = 5.2% \* 0.2 = 1.0%
- High Range % VMT Reduction (urban and 100% eligible) = 6.2% \* 1 = 6.2%

### Preferred Literature:

- 5.2 - 6.2% commute VMT reduction

*Moving Cooler* assumes the employer support program will include: carpooling, ride-matching, preferential carpool parking, flexible work schedules for carpools, a half-time transportation coordinator, vanpool assistance, bicycle parking, showers, and locker facilities. The report assigns 5.2% reduction to large metropolitan areas, 5.4% to medium metropolitan areas, and 6.2% to small metropolitan areas.

<sup>56</sup> The percentage reduction reflects emission reductions from running emissions. The actual value will be less than this when starting and evaporative emissions are factored into the analysis. ROG emissions have been adjusted to reflect a ratio of 40% evaporative and 60% exhaust emissions based on a statewide EMFAC run of all vehicles.

# Transportation

## TRT-1

## Commute Trip Reduction

### Alternative Literature:

#### *Alternate:*

- 15-19% reduction in commute vehicle trips

*TCRP 95 Draft Chapter 19* [2] looked at a sample of 82 Transportation Demand Management (TDM) programs. Low support TDM programs had a 15% reduction, medium support programs 15.9%, and high support 19%. Low support programs had little employer effort. These programs may include rideshare matching, distribution of transit flyers, but have little employer involvement. With medium support programs, employers were involved with providing information regarding commute options and programs, a transportation coordinator (even if part-time), and assistance for ridesharing and transit pass purchases. With high support programs, the employer was providing most of the possible strategies. The sample of programs should not be construed as a random sample and probably represent above average results.

#### *Alternate:*

- 4.16 – 4.76% reduction in commute VMT

The Herzog study [3] compared a group of employees, who were eligible for comprehensive commuter benefits (with financial incentives, services such as guaranteed ride home and carpool matching, and informational campaigns) and general marketing information, to a reference group of employees not eligible for commuter benefits. The study showed a 4.79% reduction in VMT, assuming 75% of the carpoolers were traveling to the same worksite. There was a 4.16% reduction in VMT, assuming only 50% of carpoolers were traveling to the same worksite.

#### *Alternate:*

- 8.5% reduction in vehicle commute trips

Employer survey results [4] showed that employees at the surveyed companies made 8.5% fewer vehicle trips to work than had been found in the baseline surveys conducted by large employers under the area's trip reduction regulation (i.e. comparing voluntary program with a mandatory regulation). This implied that the 8.5% reduction is a conservative estimate as it is compared to another trip reduction strategy, rather than comparing to a baseline with no reduction strategies implemented. Another survey also showed that 68% of commuters drove alone to work when their employer did not encourage trip reduction. It revealed that with employer encouragement, the drive-alone rate fell 5 percentage points to 63%.

This strategy assumes a companion strategy of employer encouragement. The literature did not specify what commute options each employer provided as part of the program. Options provided may have ranged from simply providing public transit

information to implementing a full TDM program with parking cash out, flex hours, emergency ride home, etc. This San Francisco Bay Area survey worked to determine the extent and impact of the emissions saved through voluntary trip reduction efforts ([www.cleanairpartnership.com](http://www.cleanairpartnership.com)). It identified 454 employment sites with voluntary trip reduction programs and conducted a selected random survey of the more than 400,000 employees at those sites. The study concluded that employer encouragement makes a significant difference in employees' commute choices.

### Alternative Literature References:

- [2] Pratt, Dick. Personal Communication Regarding the Draft of TCRP 95 Traveler Response to Transportation System Changes – Chapter 19 Employer and Institutional TDM Strategies.
  
- [3] Herzog, Erik, Stacey Bricka, Lucie Audette, and Jeffra Rockwell. 2006. "Do Employee Commuter Benefits Reduce Vehicle Emissions and Fuel Consumption? Results of Fall 2004 Survey of Best Workplaces for Commuters." *Transportation Research Record 1956*, 34-41. (Table 8)
  
- [4] Transportation Demand Management Institute of the Association for Commuter Transportation. *TDM Case Studies and Commuter Testimonials*. Prepared for the US EPA. 1997. (p. 25-28)  
<http://www.epa.gov/OMS/stateresources/rellinks/docs/tmcases.pdf>

### Other Literature Reviewed:

None

# Transportation

CEQA# T-19  
MP# MO-3.1

## TRT-2

### Commute Trip Reduction

#### 3.4.2 Implement Commute Trip Reduction Program – Required Implementation/Monitoring

Commute Trip Reduction Program – Required, is a multi-strategy program that encompasses a combination of individual measures described in sections 3.4.3 through 3.4.9. It is presented as a means of preventing double-counting of reductions for individual measures that are included in this strategy. It does so by setting a maximum level of reduction that should be permitted for a combined set of strategies within a program that is contractually required of the development sponsors and managers and accompanied by a regular performance monitoring and reporting program.

**Range of Effectiveness:** 4.2 – 21.0% commute vehicle miles traveled (VMT) reduction and therefore 4.2 – 21.0% reduction in commute trip GHG emissions.

#### Measure Description:

The jurisdiction will implement a Commute Trip Reduction (CTR) ordinance. The intent of the ordinance will be to reduce drive-alone travel mode share and encourage alternative modes of travel. The critical components of this strategy are:

- Established performance standards (e.g. trip reduction requirements)
- Required implementation
- Regular monitoring and reporting

Regular monitoring and reporting will be required to assess the project's status in meeting the ordinance goals. The project should use existing ordinances, such as those in the cities of Tucson, Arizona and South San Francisco, California, as examples of successful CTR ordinance implementations. The City of Tucson requires employers with 100+ employees to participate in the program. An Alternative Mode Usage (AMU) goal and VMT reduction goal is established and each year the goal is increased. Employers persuade employees to commute via an alternative mode of transportation at least one day a week (including carpooling, vanpooling, transit, walking, bicycling, telecommuting, compressed work week, or alternatively fueled vehicle). The Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Ordinance in South San Francisco requires all non-residential developments that produce 100 average daily vehicle trips or more to meet a 35% non-drive-alone peak hour requirement with fees assessed for non-compliance. Employers have established significant CTR programs as a result.

#### Measure Applicability:

- Urban and suburban context
- Negligible in a rural context, unless large employers exist, and suite of strategies implemented are relevant in rural settings
- Jurisdiction level only
- Strategies in this case study calculations included:

# Transportation

CEQA# T-19  
MP# MO-3.1

## TRT-2

### Commute Trip Reduction

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○</li> <li>○</li> <li>shuttles to transit station</li> <li>○</li> <li>servicing the Bay Area</li> <li>○</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Parking cash out<br/>Employer sponsored</li> <li>Employer sponsored bus</li> <li>Transit subsidies</li> </ul> |
|---|--|

**Baseline Method:**

See introduction to transportation section for a discussion of how to estimate trip rates and VMT. The CO<sub>2</sub> emissions are calculated from VMT as follows:

$$CO_2 = VMT \times EF_{\text{running}}$$

Where:

|                       |   |
|-----------------------|---|
| traveled              | VMT = vehicle miles                     |
| for running emissions | EF <sub>running</sub> = emission factor |

**Inputs:**

The following information needs to be provided by the Project Applicant:

- Percentage of employees eligible

**Mitigation Method:**

$$\% \text{ VMT Reduction} = A * B$$

Where

A = % shift in vehicle mode share of commute trips (from [1])  
 B = % employees eligible  
 C = Adjustment from vehicle mode share to commute VMT

Detail:

- A: 21% reduction in vehicle mode share (from [1])
- C: 1.0 (see Appendix C for detail)

# Transportation

CEQA# T-19  
MP# MO-3.1

## TRT-2

### Commute Trip Reduction

#### Assumptions:

Data based upon the following references:

[1] Nelson/Nygaard (2008). *South San Francisco Mode Share and Parking Report for Genentech, Inc.*(p. 8)

#### Emission Reduction Ranges and Variables:

| Pollutant         | Category Emissions Reductions <sup>57</sup> |
|-------------------|---|
| CO <sub>2</sub> e | 4.2 – 21.0% of running                      |
| PM                | 4.2 – 21.0% of running                      |
| CO                | 4.2 – 21.0% of running                      |
| NO <sub>x</sub>   | 4.2 – 21.0% of running                      |
| SO <sub>2</sub>   | 4.2 – 21.0% of running                      |
| ROG               | 2.5 – 12.6% of total                        |

#### Discussion:

#### Example:

Sample calculations are provided below:

- Low Range % VMT Reduction (20% eligibility) = 21% \* 20% = 4.2%
- High Range % VMT Reduction (100% eligibility) = 21% \* 100% = 21%

#### Preferred Literature:

- 21% reduction in vehicle mode share

Genentech, in South San Francisco [1], achieved a 34% non-single-occupancy vehicle (non-SOV) mode share (66% SOV) in 2008. Since 2006 when SOV mode share was 74% (26% non-SOV), there has been a reduction of over 10% in drive alone share. Carpool share was 12% in 2008, compared to 11.57% in 2006. Genentech has a significant TDM program including parking cash out (\$4/day), express GenenBus service around the Bay Area, free shuttles to Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) and Caltrain, and transit subsidies. The Genentech campus surveyed for this study is a large, single-tenant campus. Taking an average transit mode share in a suburban development of 1.3% (NHTS,

<sup>57</sup> The percentage reduction reflects emission reductions from running emissions. The actual value will be less than this when starting and evaporative emissions are factored into the analysis. ROG emissions have been adjusted to reflect a ratio of 40% evaporative and 60% exhaust emissions based on a statewide EMFAC run of all vehicles.

# Transportation

CEQA# T-19

MP# MO-3.1

## TRT-2

### Commute Trip Reduction

[http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tsip/tab/documents/travelsurveys/Final2001\\_Stw\\_Travel\\_Survey\\_WkdayRpt.pdf](http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tsip/tab/documents/travelsurveys/Final2001_Stw_Travel_Survey_WkdayRpt.pdf) (SCAG, SANDAG, Fresno County)), this is an estimated decrease from 98.7% to 78% vehicle mode share (66% SOV + 12% carpool), a 21% reduction in vehicle mode share.

#### Alternative Literature:

*Alternate:*

- 10.7% average annual increase in use of non-SOV commute modes

For the City of Tucson [2], use of alternative commute modes increased 64.3% between 1989 and 1995. Employers integrated several key activities into their TDM plans: disseminating information, developing company policies to support TDM, investing in facility enhancements, conducting promotional campaigns, and offering subsidies or incentives to encourage AMU.

#### Alternative Literature References:

[2] Transportation Demand Management Institute of the Association for Commuter Transportation. *TDM Case Studies and Commuter Testimonials*. Prepared for the US EPA. 1997. (p. 17-19)

<http://www.epa.gov/OMS/stateresources/rellinks/docs/tmccases.pdf>

#### Other Literature Reviewed:

None

# Transportation

MP# MO-3.1 **TRT-3** **Commute Trip Reduction**

### 3.4.3 Provide Ride-Sharing Programs

**Range of Effectiveness:** 1 – 15% commute vehicle miles traveled (VMT) reduction and therefore 1 - 15% reduction in commute trip GHG emissions.

**Measure Description:**

Increasing the vehicle occupancy by ride sharing will result in fewer cars driving the same trip, and thus a decrease in VMT. The project will include a ride-sharing program as well as a permanent transportation management association membership and funding requirement. Funding may be provided by Community Facilities, District, or County Service Area, or other non-revocable funding mechanism. The project will 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 a web site or message board for coordinating rides

**Measure Applicability:**

- Urban and suburban context
- Negligible impact in many rural contexts, but can be effective when a large employer in a rural area draws from a workforce in an urban or suburban area, such as when a major employer moves from an urban location to a rural location.
- Appropriate for residential, retail, office, industrial, and mixed-use projects

**Baseline Method:**

See introduction to transportation section for a discussion of how to estimate trip rates and VMT. The CO<sub>2</sub> emissions are calculated from VMT as follows:

$$CO_2 = VMT \times EF_{\text{running}}$$

Where:

traveled VMT = vehicle miles  
 for running emissions EF<sub>running</sub> = emission factor

**Inputs:**

The following information needs to be provided by the Project Applicant:

- Percentage of employees eligible

# Transportation

MP# MO-3.1

## TRT-3

### Commute Trip Reduction

- Location of project site: low density suburb, suburban center, or urban location

#### Mitigation Method:

$$\% \text{ VMT Reduction} = \text{Commute} * \text{Employee}$$

Where

Commute = % reduction in commute VMT (from [1])

Employee = % employees eligible

Detail:

- Commute: 5% (low density suburb), 10% (suburban center), 15% (urban) annual reduction in commute VMT (from [1])

#### Assumptions:

Data based upon the following references:

[1] VTPI. *TDM Encyclopedia*. <http://www.vtpi.org/tdm/tdm34.htm>; Accessed 3/5/2010.

#### Emission Reduction Ranges and Variables:

| Pollutant         | Category Emissions Reductions <sup>58</sup> |
|-------------------|---|
| CO <sub>2</sub> e | 1 – 15% of running                          |
| PM                | 1 – 15% of running                          |
| CO                | 1 – 15% of running                          |
| NO <sub>x</sub>   | 1 – 15% of running                          |
| SO <sub>2</sub>   | 1 – 15% of running                          |
| ROG               | 0.6 – 9% of total                           |

#### Discussion:

This strategy is often part of Commute Trip Reduction (CTR) Program, another strategy documented separately (see TRT-1 and TRT-2). The Project Applicant should take care not to double count the impacts.

#### Example:

Sample calculations are provided below:

<sup>58</sup> The percentage reduction reflects emission reductions from running emissions. The actual value will be less than this when starting and evaporative emissions are factored into the analysis. ROG emissions have been adjusted to reflect a ratio of 40% evaporative and 60% exhaust emissions based on a statewide EMFAC run of all vehicles.

# Transportation

MP# MO-3.1

**TRT-3**

**Commute Trip Reduction**

- Low Range % VMT Reduction (low density suburb and 20% eligible) =  $5\% * 20\% = 1\%$
- High Range % VMT Reduction (urban and 100% eligible) =  $15\% * 1 = 15\%$

## Preferred Literature:

- 5 – 15% reduction of commute VMT

The *Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Encyclopedia* notes that because rideshare passengers tend to have relatively long commutes, mileage reductions can be relatively large with rideshare. If ridesharing reduces 5% of commute trips it may reduce 10% of vehicle miles because the trips that are reduced are twice as long as average. Rideshare programs can reduce up to 8.3% of commute VMT, up to 3.6% of total regional VMT, and up to 1.8% of regional vehicle trips (Apogee, 1994; TDM Resource Center, 1996). Another study notes that ridesharing programs typically attract 5-15% of commute trips if they offer only information and encouragement, and 10-30% if they also offer financial incentives such as parking cash out or vanpool subsidies (York and Fabricatore, 2001).

## Alternative Literature:

- Up to 1% reduction in VMT (if combined with two other strategies)

Per the Nelson\Nygaard report [2], ride-sharing would fall under the category of a minor TDM program strategy. The report allows a 1% reduction in VMT for projects with at least three minor strategies.

## Alternative Literature References:

[2] Nelson\Nygaard, 2005. *Crediting Low-Traffic Developments* (p.12).

<http://www.montgomeryplanning.org/transportation/documents/TripGenerationAnalysisUsingURBEMIS.pdf>

Criterion Planner/Engineers and Fehr & Peers Associates (2001). Index 4D Method. *A Quick-Response Method of Estimating Travel Impacts from Land-Use Changes*. Technical Memorandum prepared for US EPA, October 2001.

## Other Literature Reviewed:

None

# Transportation

MP# MO-3.1

**TRT-4**

**Commute Trip Reduction**

### 3.4.4 Implement Subsidized or Discounted Transit Program

**Range of Effectiveness:** 0.3 – 20.0% commute vehicle miles traveled (VMT) reduction and therefore a 0.3 – 20.0% reduction in commute trip GHG emissions.

**Measure Description:**

This project will provide subsidized/discounted daily or monthly public transit passes. The project may also provide free transfers between all shuttles and transit to participants. These passes can be partially or wholly subsidized by the employer, school, or development. Many entities use revenue from parking to offset the cost of such a project.

**Measure Applicability:**

- Urban and suburban context
- Negligible in a rural context
- Appropriate for residential, retail, office, industrial, and mixed-use projects

**Baseline Method:**

See introduction to transportation section for a discussion of how to estimate trip rates and VMT. The CO<sub>2</sub> emissions are calculated from VMT as follows:

$$CO_2 = VMT \times EF_{\text{running}}$$

Where:

traveled

for running emissions

VMT = vehicle miles

EF<sub>running</sub> = emission factor

**Inputs:**

The following information needs to be provided by the Project Applicant:

- Percentage of project employees eligible
- Transit subsidy amount
- Location of project site: low density suburb, suburban center, or urban location

**Mitigation Method:**

$$\% \text{ VMT Reduction} = A * B * C$$

Where

A = % reduction in commute vehicle trips (VT) (from [1])

# Transportation

MP# MO-3.1

**TRT-4**

**Commute Trip Reduction**

B = % employees eligible

C = Adjustment from commute VT to commute VMT

Detail:

- A:
 

|  | Daily Transit Subsidy            |              |               |               |
|--|----------------------------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|
|  | \$0.75                           | \$1.49       | \$2.98        | \$5.96        |
| Worksite Setting   | <b>% Reduction in Commute VT</b> |              |               |               |
| Low density suburb   | <b>1.5%</b>                      | <b>3.3%</b>  | <b>7.9%</b>   | <b>20.0%*</b> |
| Suburban center  | <b>3.4%</b>                      | <b>7.3%</b>  | <b>16.4%</b>  | <b>20.0%*</b> |
| Urban location   | <b>6.2%</b>                      | <b>12.9%</b> | <b>20.0%*</b> | <b>20.0%*</b> |
| * Discounts greater than 20% will be capped, as they exceed levels recommended by TCRP 95 Draft Chapter 19 and other literature. |                                  |              |               |               |
- C: 1.0 (see Appendix C for detail)

**Assumptions:**

Data based upon the following references:

[1] Nelson\Nygaard, 2010. *City of Santa Monica Land Use and Circulation Element EIR Report, Appendix – Santa Monica Luce Trip Reduction Impacts Analysis* (p.401).

[2] Nelson\Nygaard used the following literature sources: VTPI, Todd Litman, *Transportation Elasticities*, <http://www.vtpi.org/elasticities.pdf>. Comsis Corporation (1993), *Implementing Effective Travel Demand Management Measures: Inventory of Measures and Synthesis of Experience*, USDOT and Institute of Transportation Engineers ([www.ite.org](http://www.ite.org)); [www.bts.gov/ntl/DOCS/474.html](http://www.bts.gov/ntl/DOCS/474.html).

**Emission Reduction Ranges and Variables:**

| Pollutant         | Category Emissions Reductions <sup>59</sup> |
|-------------------|---|
| CO <sub>2</sub> e | 0.3 - 20% of running                        |
| PM                | 0.3 - 20% of running                        |
| CO                | 0.3 - 20% of running                        |
| NOx               | 0.3 - 20% of running                        |
| SO <sub>2</sub>   | 0.3 - 20% of running                        |
| ROG               | 0.18 - 12% of total                         |

<sup>59</sup> The percentage reduction reflects emission reductions from running emissions. The actual value will be less than this when starting and evaporative emissions are factored into the analysis. ROG emissions have been adjusted to reflect a ratio of 40% evaporative and 60% exhaust emissions based on a statewide EMFAC run of all vehicles.

# Transportation

MP# MO-3.1

## TRT-4

### Commute Trip Reduction

**Discussion:**

This strategy is often part of a Commute Trip Reduction (CTR), another strategy documented separately (see TRT-1 and TRT-2). The Project Applicant should take care not to double count the impacts.

The literature evaluates this strategy in relation to the employer, but keep in mind that this strategy can also be implemented by a school or the development as a whole.

**Example:**

Sample calculations are provided below:

- Low Range % VMT Reduction (\$0.75, low density suburb, 20% eligible) = 1.5% \* 20% = 0.3%
- High Range % VMT Reduction (\$5.96, urban, 100% eligible) = 20% \* 100% = 20%

**Preferred Literature:**

| Commute Vehicle Trip Reduction<br><b>Worksite Setting</b> | <b>Daily Transit Subsidy</b> |               |               |               |
|---|------------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
|   | <b>\$0.75</b>                | <b>\$1.49</b> | <b>\$2.98</b> | <b>\$5.96</b> |
| Low density suburb, rideshare oriented                    | 0.1%                         | 0.2%          | 0.6%          | 1.9%          |
| Low density suburb, mode neutral                          | 1.5%                         | 3.3%          | 7.9%          | 21.7%*        |
| Low density suburb, transit oriented                      | 2.0%                         | 4.2%          | 9.9%          | 23.2%*        |
| Activity center, rideshare oriented                       | 1.1%                         | 2.4%          | 5.8%          | 16.5%         |
| Activity center, mode neutral                             | 3.4%                         | 7.3%          | 16.4%         | 38.7%*        |
| Activity center, transit oriented                         | 5.2%                         | 10.9%         | 23.5%*        | 49.7%*        |
| Regional CBD/Corridor, rideshare oriented                 | 2.2%                         | 4.7%          | 10.9%         | 28.3%*        |
| Regional CBD/Corridor, mode neutral                       | 6.2%                         | 12.9%         | 26.9%*        | 54.3%*        |
| Regional CBD/Corridor, transit oriented                   | 9.1%                         | 18.1%         | 35.5%*        | 64.0%*        |

\* Discounts greater than 20% will be capped, as they exceed levels recommended by *TCRP 95 Draft Chapter 19* and other literature.

Nelson\Nygaard (2010) updated a commute trip reduction table from VTPI Transportation Elasticities to account for inflation since the data was compiled. Data regarding commute vehicle trip reductions was originally from a study conducted by Comsis Corporation and the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE).

**Alternative Literature:**

*Alternate:*

- 2.4-30.4% commute vehicle trip reduction (VTR)

# Transportation

MP# MO-3.1

TRT-4

Commute Trip Reduction

*TCRP 95 Draft Chapter 19* [2] indicates transit subsidies in areas with good transit and restricted parking have a commute VTR of 30.4%; good transit but free parking, a commute VTR of 7.6%; free parking and limited transit 2.4%. Programs with transit subsidies have an average commute VTR of 20.6% compared with an average commute VTR of 13.1% for sites with non-transit fare subsidies.

*Alternate:*

- 0.03-0.12% annual greenhouse gas (GHG) reduction

*Moving Cooler* [3] assumed price elasticities of -0.15, -0.2, and -0.3 for lower fares 25%, 33%, and 50%, respectively. *Moving Cooler* assumes average vehicle occupancy of 1.43 and a VMT/trip of 5.12.

**Alternative Literature References:**

[2] Pratt, Dick. Personal Communication Regarding the Draft of TCRP 95 Traveler Response to Transportation System Changes – Chapter 19 Employer and Institutional TDM Strategies.

[3] Cambridge Systematics. *Moving Cooler: An Analysis of Transportation Strategies for Reducing Greenhouse Gas Emissions*. Technical Appendices. Prepared for the Urban Land Institute. (Table D.3)  
[http://www.movingcooler.info/Library/Documents/Moving%20Cooler\\_Appendix%20B\\_Effectiveness\\_102209.pdf](http://www.movingcooler.info/Library/Documents/Moving%20Cooler_Appendix%20B_Effectiveness_102209.pdf)

**Other Literature Reviewed:**

None

## Transportation

CEQA# MM T-2

MP# MO-3.2

### TRT-5

### Commute Trip Reduction

#### 3.4.5 Provide End of Trip Facilities

**Range of Effectiveness:** Grouped strategy (see TRT-1 through TRT-3)

**Measure Description:**

Non-residential projects will provide "end-of-trip" facilities for bicycle riders including showers, secure bicycle lockers, and changing spaces. End-of-trip facilities encourage the use of bicycling as a viable form of travel to destinations, especially to work. End-of-trip facilities provide the added convenience and security needed to encourage bicycle commuting.

End-of-trip facilities have minimal impacts when implemented alone. This strategy's effectiveness in reducing vehicle miles traveled (VMT) depends heavily on the suite of other transit, pedestrian/bicycle, and demand management measures offered. End-of-trip facilities should be grouped with Commute Trip Reduction (CTR) Programs (TRT-1 through TRT-2).

**Measure Applicability:**

- Urban, suburban, and rural context
- Appropriate for residential, retail, office, industrial, and mixed-use projects

**Alternative Literature:**

*Alternate:*

- 22% increase in bicycle mode share

The bicycle study documents a multivariate analysis of UK National Travel Survey (Wardman et al. 2007) which found significant impacts on bicycling to work. Compared to base bicycle mode share of 5.8% for work trips, outdoor parking would raise the share to 6.3%, indoor secure parking to 6.6%, and indoor parking plus showers to 7.1%. This results in an estimate 22% increase in bicycle mode share  $((7.1\% - 5.8\%) / 5.8\% = 22\%)$ . This suggests that such end of trip facilities have an important impact on the decision to bicycle to work. However, these effects represent reductions in VMT no greater than 0.02% (see Appendix C for calculation detail).

*Alternate:*

- 2 - 5% reduction in commute vehicle trips

The *Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Encyclopedia*, citing Ewing (1993), documents Sacramento's TDM ordinance. The City allows developers to claim trip reduction credits for worksite showers and lockers of 5% in central business districts, 2% within 660 feet of a transit station, and 2% elsewhere.

# Transportation

CEQA# MM T-2

MP# MO-3.2

**TRT-5**

**Commute Trip Reduction**

*Alternate:*

- 0.625% reduction in VMT

The *Center for Clean Air Policy (CCAP) Guidebook* attributes a 1% to 5% reduction associated with the use of bicycles, which reflects the assumption that their use is typically for shorter trips. Based on the *CCAP Guidebook*, a 2.5% reduction is allocated for all bicycle-related measures and a 1/4 of that for this measure alone. (This information is based on a TIAX review for SMAQMD).

**Alternative Literature References:**

[1] Pucher J., Dill, J., and Handy, S. *Infrastructure, Programs and Policies to Increase Bicycling: An International Review*. February 2010. (Table 2, pg. S111)  
[http://policy.rutgers.edu/faculty/pucher/Pucher\\_Dill\\_Handy10.pdf](http://policy.rutgers.edu/faculty/pucher/Pucher_Dill_Handy10.pdf)

[2] Victoria Transportation Policy Institute (VTPI). *TDM Encyclopedia*,  
<http://www.vtpi.org/tdm/tdm9.htm>; accessed 3/4/2010; last update 1/25/2010).  
 VTPI citing: Reid Ewing (1993), "TDM, Growth Management, and the Other Four Out of Five Trips," *Transportation Quarterly*, Vol. 47, No. 3, Summer 1993, pp. 343-366.

[3] Center for Clean Air Policy (CCAP), *CCAP Transportation Emission Guidebook*.  
[http://www.ccap.org/safe/guidebook/guide\\_complete.html](http://www.ccap.org/safe/guidebook/guide_complete.html); TIAX Results of 2005 Literature Search Conducted by TIAX on behalf of SMAQMD

**Other Literature Reviewed:**

None

# Transportation

MP# TR-3.5 **TRT-6** **Commute Trip Reduction**

**3.4.6 Encourage Telecommuting and Alternative Work Schedules**

**Range of Effectiveness:** 0.07 – 5.50% commute vehicle miles traveled (VMT) reduction and therefore 0.07 – 5.50% reduction in commute trip GHG emissions.

**Measure Description:**

Encouraging telecommuting and alternative work schedules reduces the number of commute trips and therefore VMT traveled by employees. Alternative work schedules could take the form of staggered starting times, flexible schedules, or compressed work weeks.

**Measure Applicability:**

- Urban, suburban, and rural context
- Appropriate for retail, office, industrial, and mixed-use projects

**Baseline Method:**

See introduction to transportation section for a discussion of how to estimate trip rates and VMT. The CO<sub>2</sub> emissions are calculated from VMT as follows:

$$CO_2 = VMT \times EF_{\text{running}}$$

Where:

traveled VMT = vehicle miles  
 for running emissions EF<sub>running</sub> = emission factor

**Inputs:**

The following information needs to be provided by the Project Applicant:

- Percentage of employees participating (1 – 25%)
- Strategy implemented: 9-day/80-hour work week, 4-day/40-hour work week, or 1.5 days of telecommuting

**Mitigation Method:**

$$\% \text{ Commute VMT Reduction} = \text{Commute}$$

Where

Commute = % reduction in commute VMT (See table below)

# Transportation

MP# TR-3.5

## TRT-6

### Commute Trip Reduction

|  | Employee Participation     |       |       |       |       |
|--|----------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
|  | 1%                         | 3%    | 5%    | 10%   | 25%   |
|  | % Reduction in Commute VMT |       |       |       |       |
| 9-day/80-hour work week  | 0.07%                      | 0.21% | 0.35% | 0.70% | 1.75% |
| 4-day/40-hour work week  | 0.15%                      | 0.45% | 0.75% | 1.50% | 3.75% |
| telecommuting 1.5 days   | 0.22%                      | 0.66% | 1.10% | 2.20% | 5.5%  |
| Source: Moving Cooler Technical Appendices, Fehr & Peers   |                            |       |       |       |       |
| Notes: The percentages from Moving Cooler incorporate a discount of 25% for rebound effects. The percentages beyond 1% employee participation are linearly extrapolated. |                            |       |       |       |       |

### Assumptions:

Data based upon the following references:

[1] Cambridge Systematics. *Moving Cooler: An Analysis of Transportation Strategies for Reducing Greenhouse Gas Emissions*. Technical Appendices. Prepared for the Urban Land Institute. (p. B-54)

[http://www.movingcooler.info/Library/Documents/Moving%20Cooler\\_Appendix%20B\\_Effectiveness\\_102209.pdf](http://www.movingcooler.info/Library/Documents/Moving%20Cooler_Appendix%20B_Effectiveness_102209.pdf)

### Emission Reduction Ranges and Variables:

| Pollutant         | Category Emissions Reductions <sup>60</sup> |
|-------------------|---|
| CO <sub>2</sub> e | 0.07 – 5.50% of running                     |
| PM                | 0.07 – 5.50% of running                     |
| CO                | 0.07 – 5.50% of running                     |
| NO <sub>x</sub>   | 0.07 – 5.50% of running                     |
| SO <sub>2</sub>   | 0.07 – 5.50% of running                     |
| ROG               | 0.04 – 3.3% of total                        |

### Discussion:

This strategy is often part of a Commute Trip Reduction Program, another strategy documented separately (see TRT-1 and TRT-2). The Project Applicant should take care not to double count the impacts.

The employee participation rate should be capped at a maximum of 25%. *Moving Cooler* [1] notes that roughly 50% of a typical workforce could participate in alternative

<sup>60</sup> The percentage reduction reflects emission reductions from running emissions. The actual value will be less than this when starting and evaporative emissions are factored into the analysis. ROG emissions have been adjusted to reflect a ratio of 40% evaporative and 60% exhaust emissions based on a statewide EMFAC run of all vehicles.

# Transportation

MP# TR-3.5

## TRT-6

### Commute Trip Reduction

work schedules (based on job requirements) and roughly 50% of those would choose to participate.

The 25% discount for rebound effects is maintained to provide a conservative estimate and support the literature results. The project may consider removing this discount from their calculations if deemed appropriate.

#### Example:

N/A – no calculations are needed.

#### Preferred Literature:

- 0.07% - 0.22% reduction in commuting VMT

*Moving Cooler* [1] estimates that if 1% of employees were to participate in a 9 day/80 hour compressed work week, commuting VMT would be reduced by 0.07%. If 1% of employees were to participate in a 4 day/40 hour compressed work week, commuting VMT would reduce by 0.15%; and 1% of employees participating in telecommuting 1.5 days per week would reduce commuting VMT by 0.22%. These percentages incorporate a discounting of 25% to account for rebound effects (i.e., travel for other purposes during the day while not at the work site). The percentages beyond 1% employee participation are linearly extrapolated (see table above).

#### Alternative Literature:

*Alternate:*

- 9-10% reduction in VMT for participating employees

As documented in *TCRP 95 Draft Chapter 19* [2], a Denver federal employer's implementation of compressed work week resulted in a 14-15% reduction in VMT for participating employees. This is equivalent to the 0.15% reduction for each 1% participation cited in the preferred literature above. In the Denver example, there was a 65% participation rate out of a total of 9,000 employees. *TCRP 95* states that the compressed work week experiment has no adverse effect on ride-sharing or transit use. Flexible hours have been shown to work best in the presence of medium or low transit availability.

*Alternate:*

- 0.5 vehicle trips reduced per employee per week
- 13 – 20 VMT reduced per employee per week

## Transportation

MP# TR-3.5

**TRT-6**

**Commute Trip Reduction**

As documented in *TCRP 95 Draft Chapter 19* [2], a study of compressed work week for 2,600 Southern California employees resulted in an average reduction of 0.5 trips per week (per participating employee). Participating employees also reduced their VMT by 13-20 miles per week. This translates to a reduction of between 5% and 10% in commute VMT, and so is lower than the 15% reduction cited for Denver government employees.

### **Alternative Literature References:**

[2] Pratt, Dick. Personal Communication Regarding the Draft of TCRP 95 Traveler Response to Transportation System Changes – Chapter 19 Employer and Institutional TDM Strategies.

### **Other Literature Reviewed:**

None

#### 3.4.7 Implement Commute Trip Reduction Marketing

**Range of Effectiveness:** 0.8 – 4.0% commute vehicle miles traveled (VMT) reduction and therefore 0.8 – 4.0% reduction in commute trip GHG emissions.

**Measure Description:**

The project will implement marketing strategies to reduce commute trips. Information sharing and marketing are important components to successful commute trip reduction strategies. Implementing commute trip reduction strategies without a complementary marketing strategy will result in lower VMT reductions. Marketing strategies may include:

- New employee orientation of trip reduction and alternative mode options
- Event promotions
- Publications

CTR marketing is often part of a CTR program, voluntary or mandatory. CTR marketing is discussed separately here to emphasize the importance of not only providing employees with the options and monetary incentives to use alternative forms of transportation, but to clearly and deliberately promote and educate employees of the various options. This will greatly improve the impact of the implemented trip reduction strategies.

**Measure Applicability:**

- Urban and suburban context
- Negligible in a rural context
- Appropriate for residential, retail, office, industrial and mixed-use projects

**Baseline Method:**

See introduction to transportation section for a discussion of how to estimate trip rates and VMT. The CO<sub>2</sub> emissions are calculated from VMT as follows:

$$CO_2 = VMT \times EF_{\text{running}}$$

Where:

- VMT = vehicle miles traveled
- EF<sub>running</sub> = emission factor for running emissions

# Transportation

## TRT-7

## Commute Trip Reduction

### Inputs:

The following information needs to be provided by the Project Applicant:

- Percentage of project employees eligible (i.e. percentage of employers choosing to participate)

### Mitigation Method:

$$\% \text{ Commute VMT Reduction} = A * B * C$$

Where

A = % reduction in commute vehicle trips (from [1])

B = % employees eligible

C = Adjustment from commute VT to commute VMT

Detail:

- A: 4% (per [1])
- C: 1.0 (see Appendix C for detail)

### Assumptions:

Data based upon the following references:

[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.

### Emission Reduction Ranges and Variables:

| Pollutant         | Category Emissions Reductions <sup>61</sup> |
|-------------------|---|
| CO <sub>2</sub> e | 0.8 – 4.0% of running                       |
| PM                | 0.8 – 4.0% of running                       |
| CO                | 0.8 – 4.0% of running                       |
| NO <sub>x</sub>   | 0.8 – 4.0% of running                       |
| SO <sub>2</sub>   | 0.8 – 4.0% of running                       |
| ROG               | 0.5 – 2.4% of total                         |

<sup>61</sup> The percentage reduction reflects emission reductions from running emissions. The actual value will be less than this when starting and evaporative emissions are factored into the analysis. ROG emissions have been adjusted to reflect a ratio of 40% evaporative and 60% exhaust emissions based on a statewide EMFAC run of all vehicles.

#### Discussion:

The effectiveness of commute trip reduction marketing in reducing VMT depends on which commute reduction strategies are being promoted. The effectiveness levels provided below should only be applied if other programs are offered concurrently, and represent the total effectiveness of the full suite of measures.

This strategy is often part of a CTR Program, another strategy documented separately (see strategy T# E1). Take care not to double count the impacts.

#### Example:

Sample calculations are provided below:

- Low Range % VMT Reduction (20% eligible) =  $4\% * 20\% = 0.8\%$
- High Range % VMT Reduction (100% eligible) =  $4\% * 100\% = 4.0\%$

#### Preferred Literature:

- 4-5% commute vehicle trips reduced with full-scale employer support

*TCRP 95 Draft Chapter 19* notes the average empirically-based estimate of reductions in vehicle trips for full-scale, site-specific employer support programs alone is 4-5%. This effectiveness assumes there are alternative commute modes available which have on-going employer support. For a program to receive credit for such outreach and marketing efforts, it should contain guarantees that the program will be maintained permanently, with promotional events delivered regularly and with routine performance monitoring.

#### Alternative Literature:

- 5-15% reduction in commute vehicle trips
- 3% increase in effectiveness of marketed transportation demand management (TDM) strategies

VTPI [2] notes that providing information on alternative travel modes by employers was one of the most important factors contributing to mode shifting. One study (Shadoff, 1993) estimates that marketing increases the effectiveness of other TDM strategies by up to 3%. Given adequate resources, marketing programs may reduce vehicle trips by 5-15%. The 5 – 15% range comes from a variety of case studies across the world. U.S. specific case studies include: 9% reduction in vehicle trips with TravelSmart in Portland (12% reduction in VMT), 4-8% reduction in vehicle trips from four cities with individualized marketing pilot projects from the Federal Transit Administration (FTA). Averaged across the four pilot projects, there was a 6.75% reduction in VMT.

## Transportation

### TRT-7

### Commute Trip Reduction

#### **Alternative Literature References:**

[2] VTPI, TDM Encyclopedia – TDM Marketing; <http://www.vtpi.org/tdm/tdm23.htm>;  
accessed 3/5/2010. Table 7 (citing FTA, 2006)

#### **Other Literature Reviewed:**

None

# Transportation

MP# TR-3.1

## TRT-8

Commute Trip Reduction

### 3.4.8 Implement Preferential Parking Permit Program

**Range of Effectiveness:** Grouped strategy (see TRT-1 through TRT-3)

**Measure Description:**

The project will provide preferential parking in convenient locations (such as near public transportation or building front doors) in terms of free or reduced parking fees, priority parking, or reserved parking for commuters who carpool, vanpool, ride-share or use alternatively fueled vehicles. The project will provide wide parking spaces to accommodate vanpool vehicles.

The impact of preferential parking permit programs has not been quantified by the literature and is likely to have negligible impacts when implemented alone. This strategy should be grouped with Commute Trip Reduction (CTR) Programs (TRT-1 and TRT-2) as a complementary strategy for encouraging non-single occupant vehicle travel.

**Measure Applicability:**

- Urban, suburban context
- Appropriate for residential, retail, office, mixed use, and industrial projects

**Alternative Literature:**

No quantitative results are available. The case study in the literature implemented a preferential parking permit program as a companion strategy to a comprehensive TDM program. Employees who carpooled at least three times a week qualified to use the spaces.

**Alternative Literature References:**

[1] Transportation Demand Management Institute of the Association for Commuter Transportation. *TDM Case Studies and Commuter Testimonials*. Prepared for the US EPA. 1997.  
<http://www.epa.gov/OMS/stateresources/rellinks/docs/tmccases.pdf>

**Other Literature Reviewed:**

None

# Transportation

## TRT-9 Commute Trip Reduction

### 3.4.9 Implement Car-Sharing Program

**Range of Effectiveness:** 0.4 – 0.7% vehicle miles traveled (VMT) reduction and therefore 0.4 – 0.7% reduction in GHG emissions.

**Measure Description:**

This project will implement a car-sharing project to allow people to have on-demand access to a shared fleet of vehicles on an as-needed basis. User costs are typically determined through mileage or hourly rates, with deposits and/or annual membership fees. The car-sharing program could be created through a local partnership or through one of many existing car-share companies. Car-sharing programs may be grouped into three general categories: residential- or citywide-based, employer-based, and transit station-based. 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.

**Measure Applicability:**

- Urban and suburban context
- Negligible in a rural context
- Appropriate for residential, retail, office, industrial, and mixed-use projects

**Baseline Method:**

See introduction to transportation section for a discussion of how to estimate trip rates and VMT. The CO<sub>2</sub> emissions are calculated from VMT as follows:

$$CO_2 = VMT \times EF_{\text{running}}$$

Where:

|                       |   |
|-----------------------|---|
| traveled              | VMT = vehicle miles                     |
| for running emissions | EF <sub>running</sub> = emission factor |

**Inputs:**

The following information needs to be provided by the Project Applicant:

- Urban or suburban context

# Transportation

## TRT-9

### Commute Trip Reduction

#### Mitigation Method:

$$\% \text{ VMT Reduction} = A * B / C$$

Where

A = % reduction in car-share member annual VMT (from the literature)

B = number of car share members per shared car (from the literature)

C = deployment level based on urban or suburban context

Detail:

- A: 37% (per [1])
- B: 20 (per [2])
- C:

|                              |                               |
|------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Project setting              | 1 shared car per X population |
| Urban                        | 1,000                         |
| Suburban                     | 2,000                         |
| Source: <i>Moving Cooler</i> |                               |

#### Assumptions:

Data based upon the following references:

- [1] Millard-Ball, Adam. "Car-Sharing: Where and How it Succeeds," (2005) Transit Cooperative Research Program (108). P. 4-22
- [2] Cambridge Systematics. *Moving Cooler: An Analysis of Transportation Strategies for Reducing Greenhouse Gas Emissions*. Technical Appendices. Prepared for the Urban Land Institute. (p. B-52, Table D.3)  
[http://www.movingcooler.info/Library/Documents/Moving%20Cooler\\_Appendices\\_Complete\\_102209.pdf](http://www.movingcooler.info/Library/Documents/Moving%20Cooler_Appendices_Complete_102209.pdf)

#### Emission Reduction Ranges and Variables:

| Pollutant         | Category Emissions Reductions <sup>62</sup> |
|-------------------|---|
| CO <sub>2</sub> e | 0.4 – 0.7% of running                       |
| PM                | 0.4 – 0.7% of running                       |
| CO                | 0.4 – 0.7% of running                       |
| NO <sub>x</sub>   | 0.4 – 0.7% of running                       |
| SO <sub>2</sub>   | 0.4 – 0.7% of running                       |
| ROG               | 0.24 – 0.42% of total                       |

<sup>62</sup> The percentage reduction reflects emission reductions from running emissions. The actual value will be less than this when starting and evaporative emissions are factored into the analysis. ROG emissions have been adjusted to reflect a ratio of 40% evaporative and 60% exhaust emissions based on a statewide EMFAC run of all vehicles.

# Transportation

## TRT-9

### Commute Trip Reduction

#### Discussion:

Variable C in the mitigation method section represents suggested levels of deployment based on the literature. Levels of deployment may vary based on the characteristics of the project site and the needs of the project residents and employees. This variable should be adjusted accordingly.

The methodology for calculation of VMT reduction utilizes *Moving Cooler's* rule of thumb<sup>63</sup> for the estimated number of car share members per vehicle. An estimate of 50% reduction in car-share member annual VMT (from *Moving Cooler*) was high compared to other literature sources, and *TCRP 108's* 37% reduction was used in the calculations instead.

#### Example:

Sample calculations are provided below:

- Low Range % VMT Reduction (suburban) =  $37\% * 20 / 2000 = 0.4\%$
- High Range % VMT Reduction (urban) =  $37\% * 20 / 1000 = 0.7\%$

#### Preferred Literature:

- 37% reduction in car-share member VMT

The *TCRP 108* [1] report conducted a survey of car-share members in the United States and Canada in 2004. The results of the survey showed that respondents, on average, drove only 63% of the average mileage they previously drove when not car-share members.

#### Alternative Literature:

*Alternate – Residential or Citywide Based:*

- 0.05-0.27% reduction in GHG
- 0.33% reduction in VMT in urban areas

*Moving Cooler* [2] assumed an aggressive deployment of one car per 2,000 inhabitants of medium-density census tracts and of one car per 1,000 inhabitants of high-density census tracts. This strategy assumes providing a subsidy to a public, private, or nonprofit car-sharing organization and providing free or subsidized lease for usage of public street parking. *Moving Cooler* assumed 20 members per shared car and 50% reduction in VMT per equivalent car. The percent reduction calculated assumes a percentage of urban areas are low, medium, and high density, thus resulting in a lower

<sup>63</sup> See discussion in Alternative Literature section for “rule of thumb” detail.

## Transportation

### TRT-9

### Commute Trip Reduction

than expected reduction in VMT assuming an aggressive deployment in medium and high density areas.

#### *Alternate – Transit Station and Employer Based:*

- 23-44% reduction in drive-alone mode share
- Average daily VMT reduction of 18 – 23 miles

*TCRP 95 Draft Chapter 19* [3] looked at two demonstrations, CarLink I and CarLink II, in the San Francisco Bay Area. CarLink I ran from January to November 1999. It involved 54 individuals and 12 rental cars stationed at the Dublin-Pleasanton BART station. CarLink II ran from July 2001 to June 2002 and involved 107 individuals and 19 rental cars. CarLink II was based in Palo Alto in conjunction with Caltrain commuter rail service and several employers in the Stanford Research Park. Both CarLink demonstrations were primarily targeted for commuters. CarLink I had a 23% increase in rail mode share, a reduction in drive-alone mode share of 44%, and a decrease in Average Daily VMT of 18 miles. CarLink II had a VMT for round-trip commuters decrease of 23 miles per day and a mode share for drive alone decrease of 22.9%.

#### *Alternate:*

- 50% reduction in driving for car-share members

A UC Berkeley study of San Francisco's City CarShare [4] found that members drive nearly 50% less after joining. The study also found that when people joined the car-sharing organization, nearly 30% reduced their household vehicle ownership and two-thirds avoided purchasing another car. The UC Berkeley study found that almost 75% of vehicle trips made by car-sharing members were for social trips such as running errands and visiting friends. Only 25% of trips were for commuting to work or for recreation. Most trips were also made outside of peak periods. Therefore, car-sharing may generate limited impact on peak period traffic.

#### **Alternative Literature References:**

[3] Cambridge Systematics. *Moving Cooler: An Analysis of Transportation Strategies for Reducing Greenhouse Gas Emissions*. Technical Appendices. Prepared for the Urban Land Institute. (p. B-52, Table D.3)

[http://www.movingcooler.info/Library/Documents/Moving%20Cooler\\_Appendices\\_Complete\\_102209.pdf](http://www.movingcooler.info/Library/Documents/Moving%20Cooler_Appendices_Complete_102209.pdf)

[4] 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.

# Transportation

## TRT-9

### Commute Trip Reduction

Cervero, Robert and Yu-Hsin Tsai. *San Francisco City CarShare: Travel-Demand Trends and Second-Year Impacts*, 2005. (Figure 7, p. 35, Table 7, Table 12)  
<http://escholarship.org/uc/item/4f39b7b4>

**Other Literature Reviewed:**

None

# Transportation

## TRT-10 Commute Trip Reduction

### 3.4.10 Implement a School Pool Program

**Range of Effectiveness:** 7.2 – 15.8% school vehicle miles traveled (VMT) Reduction and therefore 7.2 – 15.8% reduction in school trip GHG emissions.

**Measure Description:**

This project will create a ridesharing program for school children. Most school districts provide bussing services to public schools only. SchoolPool helps match parents to transport students to private schools, or to schools where students cannot walk or bike but do not meet the requirements for bussing.

**Measure Applicability:**

- Urban, suburban, and rural context
- Appropriate for residential and mixed-use projects

**Baseline Method:**

See introduction to transportation section for a discussion of how to estimate trip rates and VMT. The CO<sub>2</sub> emissions are calculated from VMT as follows:

$$CO_2 = VMT \times EF_{\text{running}}$$

Where:

traveled VMT = vehicle miles  
 for running emissions EF<sub>running</sub> = emission factor

**Inputs:**

The following information needs to be provided by the Project Applicant:

- Degree of implementation of SchoolPool Program(moderate to aggressive)

**Mitigation Method:**

$$\% \text{ VMT Reduction} = \text{Families} * B$$

Where

Families = % families that participate (from [1] and [2])

B = adjustments to convert from participation to daily VMT to annual school VMT

# Transportation

## TRT-10

### Commute Trip Reduction

#### Detail:

- Families: 16% (moderate implementation), 35% (aggressive implementation), (from [1] and [2])
- B: 45% (see Appendix C for detail)

#### Assumptions:

Data based upon the following references:

- [1] 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)  
<http://www.epa.gov/OMS/stateresources/rellinks/docs/tmccases.pdf>
- [2] Denver Regional Council of Governments (DRCOG). *Survey of Schoolpool Participants, April 2008*. <http://www.drcog.org/index.cfm?page=SchoolPool>.  
 Obtained from Schoolpool Coordinator, Mia Bemelen.

#### Emission Reduction Ranges and Variables:

| Pollutant         | Category Emissions Reductions <sup>64</sup> |
|-------------------|---|
| CO <sub>2</sub> e | 7.2 – 15.8% of running                      |
| PM                | 7.2 – 15.8% of running                      |
| CO                | 7.2 – 15.8% of running                      |
| NO <sub>x</sub>   | 7.2 – 15.8% of running                      |
| SO <sub>2</sub>   | 7.2 – 15.8% of running                      |
| ROG               | 4.3 – 9.5% of total                         |

#### Discussion:

This strategy reflects the findings from only one case study.

#### Example:

Sample calculations are provided below:

- Low Range % School VMT Reduction (moderate implementation) = 16% \* 45% = 7.2%
- High Range % School VMT Reduction (aggressive implementation) = 35% \* 45% = 15.8%

<sup>64</sup> The percentage reduction reflects emission reductions from running emissions. The actual value will be less than this when starting and evaporative emissions are factored into the analysis. ROG emissions have been adjusted to reflect a ratio of 40% evaporative and 60% exhaust emissions based on a statewide EMFAC run of all vehicles.

## Transportation

### TRT-10

### Commute Trip Reduction

#### Preferred Literature:

- 7,711 – 18,659 daily VMT reduction

As presented in the TDM Case Studies [1] compilation, the SchoolPool program in Denver saved 18,659 VMT per day in 1995, compared with 7,711 daily in 1994 – a 142% increase. The Denver Regional Council of Governments (DRCOG) [2] enrolled approximately 7,000 families and 32 private schools in the program. The DRCOG staff surveyed a school or interested families to collect home location and schedules of the students. The survey also identified prospective drivers. DRCOG then used carpool-matching software and GIS to match families. These match lists were sent to the parents for them to form their own school pools. 16% of families in the database formed carpools. The average carpool carried 3.1 students.

The SchoolPool program is still in effect and surveys are conducted every few years to monitor the effectiveness of the program. The latest survey report received was in 2008. The report showed that the participant database had increased to over 10,000 families, an 18% increase from 2005. 29% of participants used the list to form a school carpool. This percentage was lower than 35% in 2005 but higher than prior to 2005, at 24%. The average number of families in each carpool ranged from 2.1 prior to 2005 to 2.8 in 2008. The average number of carpool days per week was roughly 4.7. The number of school weeks per year was 39. Per discussions with the Schoolpool Coordinator, a main factor of success was establishing a large database. This was achieved by having parents opt-out of the database versus opting-in.

#### Alternative Literature:

None

#### Alternative Literature References:

None

#### Other Literature Reviewed:

None

# Transportation

MP# MO-3.1 **TRT-11** **Commute Trip Reduction**

### 3.4.11 Provide Employer-Sponsored Vanpool/Shuttle

**Range of Effectiveness:** 0.3 – 13.4% commute vehicle miles traveled (VMT) reduction and therefore 0.3 – 13.4% reduction in commute trip GHG emissions.

**Measure Description:**

This project will implement an employer-sponsored vanpool or shuttle. A vanpool will usually service employees’ commute to work while a shuttle will service nearby transit stations and surrounding commercial centers. Employer-sponsored vanpool programs entail an employer purchasing or leasing vans for employee use, and often subsidizing the cost of at least program administration, if not more. The driver usually receives personal use of the van, often for a mileage fee. Scheduling is within the employer’s purview, and rider charges are normally set on the basis of vehicle and operating cost.

**Measure Applicability:**

- Urban, suburban, and rural context
- Appropriate for office, industrial, and mixed-use projects

**Baseline Method:**

See introduction to transportation section for a discussion of how to estimate trip rates and VMT. The CO<sub>2</sub> emissions are calculated from VMT as follows:

$$CO_2 = VMT \times EF_{\text{running}}$$

Where:

VMT = vehicle miles traveled  
 EF<sub>running</sub> = emission factor for running emissions

**Inputs:**

The following information needs to be provided by the Project Applicant:

- Percentage of employees eligible

**Mitigation Method:**

$$\% \text{ VMT Reduction} = A * B * C$$

Where

A = % shift in vanpool mode share of commute trips (from [1])  
 B = % employees eligible  
 C = adjustments from vanpool mode share to commute VMT

# Transportation

MP# MO-3.1

TRT-11

Commute Trip Reduction

**Detail:**

- A: 2-20% annual reduction in vehicle mode share (*from [1]*)
  - Low range: low degree of implementation, smaller employers
  - High range: high degree of implementation, larger employers
- C: 0.67 (See Appendix C for detail)

**Assumptions:**

Data based upon the following references:

[1] TCRP Report 95. *Chapter 5: Vanpools and Buspools - Traveler Response to Transportation System Changes.*

[http://onlinepubs.trb.org/onlinepubs/tcrp/tcrp\\_rpt\\_95c5.pdf](http://onlinepubs.trb.org/onlinepubs/tcrp/tcrp_rpt_95c5.pdf). (p.5-8)

**Emission Reduction Ranges and Variables:**

| Pollutant         | Category Emissions Reductions <sup>65</sup> |
|-------------------|---|
| CO <sub>2</sub> e | 0.3 – 13.4% of running                      |
| PM                | 0.3 – 13.4% of running                      |
| CO                | 0.3 – 13.4% of running                      |
| NO <sub>x</sub>   | 0.3 – 13.4% of running                      |
| SO <sub>2</sub>   | 0.3 – 13.4% of running                      |
| ROG               | 0.18 – 8.0% of total                        |

**Discussion:**

Vanpools are generally more successful with the largest of employers, as large employee counts create the best opportunities for employees to find a suitable number of travel companions to form a vanpool. In the San Francisco Bay Area several large companies (such as Google, Apple, and Genentech) provide regional bus transportation for their employees. No specific studies of these large buspools were identified in the literature. However, the GenenBus serves as a key element of the overall commute trip reduction (CTR) program for Genentech, as discussed in the CTR Program – Required strategy.

This strategy is often part of a CTR Program, another strategy documented separately (see strategy T# E1). Take care not to double count the impacts.

**Example:**

Sample calculations are provided below:

<sup>65</sup> The percentage reduction reflects emission reductions from running emissions. The actual value will be less than this when starting and evaporative emissions are factored into the analysis. ROG emissions have been adjusted to reflect a ratio of 40% evaporative and 60% exhaust emissions based on a statewide EMFAC run of all vehicles.

# Transportation

MP# MO-3.1

TRT-11

Commute Trip Reduction

- Low Range % VMT Reduction (low implementation/small employer, 20% eligible)  
=  $2\% * 20\% * 0.67 = 0.3\%$
- High Range % VMT Reduction (high implementation/large employer, 100% eligible) =  $20\% * 100\% * 0.67 = 13.4\%$

## Preferred Literature:

- 2-20% vanpool mode share

*TCRP Report 95* [1] notes that vanpools can capture 2 to 20% mode share. This range can be attributed to differences in programs, access to high-occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes, and geographic range. The *TCRP Report* highlights a case study of the 3M Corporation, which with the implementation of a vanpooling program saw drive alone mode share decrease by 10 percentage points and vanpooling mode share increase to 7.8 percent. The *TCRP Report* notes most vanpools programs do best where one-way trip lengths exceed 20 miles, where work schedules are fixed and regular, where employer size is sufficient to allow matching of 5 to 12 people from the same residential area, where public transit is inadequate, and where some congestion or parking problems exist.

## Alternative Literature:

In *TDM Case Studies* [2], a case study of Kaiser Permanente Hospital has shown their employer-sponsored shuttle service eliminated 380,100 miles per month, or nearly 4 million miles of travel per year, and four tons of smog precursors annually.

## Alternative Literature References:

[2] Transportation Demand Management Institute of the Association for Commuter Transportation. *TDM Case Studies and Commuter Testimonials*. Prepared for the US EPA. 1997.

<http://www.epa.gov/OMS/stateresources/rellinks/docs/tmccases.pdf>

## Other Literature Reviewed:

None

#### 3.4.12 Implement Bike-Sharing Programs

**Range of Effectiveness:** Grouped strategy (see SDT-5 and LUT-9)

**Measure Description:**

This project will establish a bike sharing program. Stations should be at regular intervals throughout the project site. The number of bike-share kiosks throughout the project area should vary depending on the density of the project and surrounding area. Paris' bike-share program places a station every few blocks throughout the city (approximately 28 bike stations/square mile). Bike-station density should increase around commercial and transit hubs.

Bike sharing programs have minimal impacts when implemented alone. This strategy's effectiveness is heavily dependent on the location and context. Bike-sharing programs have worked well in densely populated areas (examples in Barcelona, London, Lyon, and Paris) with existing infrastructure for bicycling. Bike sharing programs should be combined with **Bike Lane Street Design (SDT-5)** and **Improve Design of Development (LUT-9)**.

Taking evidence from the literature, a 135-300% increase in bicycling (of which roughly 7% are shifting from vehicle travel) results in a negligible impact (around 0.03% vehicle miles traveled (VMT) reduction (see Appendix C for calculations)).

**Measure Applicability:**

- Urban and suburban-center context only
- Negligible in a rural context
- Appropriate for residential, retail, office, industrial, and mixed-use projects

**Alternative Literature:**

*Alternate:*

The International Review [1] found bike mode share increases:

- from 0.75% in 2005 to 1.76% in 2007 in Barcelona (Romero, 2008) (135% increase)
- From 1% in 2001 to 2.5% in 2007 in Paris (Nadal, 2007; City of Paris, 2007) (150% increase)
- From 0.5% in 1995 to 2% in 2006 in Lyon (Bonnette, 2007; Velo'V, 2009) (300% increase)

London [2] is the only study that reports the breakdown of the prior mode In London: 6% of users reported shifting from driving, 34% from transit, 23% said they would not have

# Transportation

## TRT-12

### Commute Trip Reduction

travelled (Noland and Ishaque, 2006). Additionally, 68% of the bike trips were for leisure or recreation. Companion strategies included concurrent improvements in bicycle facilities.

The London program was implemented west of Central London in a densely populated area, mainly residential, with several employment centers. A relatively well developed bike network existed, including over 1,000 bike racks. The program implemented 25 locker stations with 70 bikes total.

#### Alternate:

- 1/3 vehicle trip reduced per day per bicycle (1,000 vehicle trips reduced per day in Lyon)

The Bike Share Opportunities [3] report looks at two case studies of bike-sharing implementation in France. In Lyon, the 3,000 bike-share system shifts 1,000 car trips to bicycle each day. Surveys indicate that 7% of the bike share trips would have otherwise been made by car. Lyon saw a 44% increase in bicycle riding within the first year of their program while Paris saw a 70% increase in bicycle riding and a 5% reduction in car use and congestion within the first year and a half of their program. The Bike Share Opportunities report found that population density is an important part of a successful program. Paris' bike share subscription rates range between 6% and 9% of the total population. This equates to an average of 75,000 rentals per day. The effectiveness of bike share programs at sub-city scales are not addressed in the literature.

#### Alternative Literature References:

- [1] Pucher J., Dill, J., and Handy, S. Infrastructure, Programs and Policies to Increase Bicycling: An International Review. February 2010. (Table 4)
- [2] Noland, R.B., Ishaque, M.M., 2006. "Smart Bicycles in an urban area: Evaluation of a pilot scheme in London." *Journal of Public Transportation*. 9(5), 71-95.  
<http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.117.8173&rep=rep1&type=pdf#page=76>
- [3] NYC Department of City Planning, *Bike-Share Opportunities in New York City*, 2009. (p. 11, 14, 24, 68)  
[http://www.nyc.gov/html/dcp/html/transportation/td\\_bike\\_share.shtml](http://www.nyc.gov/html/dcp/html/transportation/td_bike_share.shtml)

#### Other Literature Reviewed:

None

# Transportation

MP# TR-3.4 **TRT-13** **Commute Trip Reduction**

**3.4.13 Implement School Bus Program**

**Measure Effectiveness Range:** 38 – 63% School VMT Reduction and therefore 38 – 63% reduction in school trip GHG emissions<sup>66</sup>

**Measure Description:**

The project will work with the school district to restore or expand school bus services in the project area and local community.

**Measure Applicability:**

- Urban, suburban, and rural context
- Appropriate for residential and mixed-use projects

**Baseline Method:**

See introduction to transportation section for a discussion of how to estimate trip rates and VMT. The CO<sub>2</sub> emissions are calculated from VMT as follows:

$$CO_2 = VMT \times EF_{\text{running}}$$

Where:

traveled VMT = vehicle miles  
 for running emissions EF<sub>running</sub> = emission factor

**Inputs:**

The following information needs to be provided by the Project Applicant:

- Percentage of families expected to use/using school bus program

**Mitigation Method:**

$$\% \text{ VMT Reduction} = A * B$$

Where

A = % families expected to use/using school bus program  
 B = adjustments to convert from participation to school day VMT to annual school VMT

---

<sup>66</sup> Transit vehicles may also result in increases in emissions that are associated with electricity production or fuel use. The Project Applicant should consider these potential additional emissions when estimating mitigation for these measures.

# Transportation

MP# TR-3.4 **TRT-13** **Commute Trip Reduction**

Detail:

- A: a typical range of 50 – 84% (see discussion section)
- B: 75% (see Appendix C for detail)

**Assumptions:**

Data based upon the following references:

[1] JD Franz Research, Inc.; *Lamorinda School Bus Program, 2003 Parent Survey, Final Report*; January 2004; obtained from Juliet Hansen, Program Manager. (p. 5)

**Emission Reduction Ranges and Variables:**

| Pollutant        | Category Emissions Reductions <sup>67</sup> |
|------------------|---|
| CO <sub>2e</sub> | 38 – 63% of running                         |
| PM               | 38 – 63% of running                         |
| CO               | 38 – 63% of running                         |
| NO <sub>x</sub>  | 38 – 63% of running                         |
| SO <sub>2</sub>  | 38 – 63% of running                         |
| ROG              | 23 – 38% of total                           |

**Discussion:**

The literature presents a high range of effectiveness showing 84% participation by families. 50% is an estimated low range assuming the project has a minimum utilization goal. Note that the literature presents results from a single case study.

**Example:**

Sample calculations are provided below:

- Low Range % VMT Reduction (50% participation) = 50% \* 75% = 38%
- High Range % VMT Reduction (85% participation) = 84% \* 75% = 63%

**Preferred Literature:**

- 84% penetration rate
- 2,451 – 2,677 daily vehicle trips reduced
- 441,180 – 481,860 annual vehicle trips reduced

---

<sup>67</sup> The percentage reduction reflects emission reductions from running emissions. The actual value will be less than this when starting and evaporative emissions are factored into the analysis. ROG emissions have been adjusted to reflect a ratio of 40% evaporative and 60% exhaust emissions based on a statewide EMFAC run of all vehicles.

# Transportation

MP# TR-3.4

**TRT-13**

**Commute Trip Reduction**

The Lamorinda School Bus Program was implemented to reduce traffic congestion in the communities of Lafayette, Orinda, and Moraga, California. In 2003, a parent survey was conducted to determine the extent to which the program diverted or eliminated vehicle trips. This survey covered a representative sample of all parents (not just those signed up for the school bus program). The range of morning trips prevented is 1,266 to 1,382; the range of afternoon trips prevented is 1,185 to 1,295. Annualized, the estimated total trip prevention is between 441,180 to 481,860. 83% of parents surveyed reported that their child usually rides the bus to school in the morning. 84% usually rode the bus back home in the afternoons. The data came from surveys and the results are unique to the location and extent of the program. The report did not indicate the number of school buses in operation during the time of the survey.

**Alternative Literature:**

None

**Alternative Literature References:**

None

**Other Literature Reviewed:**

None

# Transportation

## TRT-14 Commute Trip Reduction

### 3.4.14 Price Workplace Parking

**Range of Effectiveness:** 0.1 – 19.7% commute vehicle miles traveled (VMT) reduction and therefore 0.1 -19.7% reduction in commute trip GHG emissions.

**Measure Description:**

The project will implement workplace parking pricing at its employment centers. This may include: explicitly charging for parking for its employees, implementing above market rate pricing, validating parking only for invited guests, not providing employee parking and transportation allowances, and educating employees about available alternatives.

Though similar to the Employee Parking “Cash-Out” strategy, this strategy focuses on implementing market rate and above market rate pricing to provide a price signal for employees to consider alternative modes for their work commute.

**Measure Applicability:**

- Urban and suburban context
- Negligible impact in a rural context
- Appropriate for retail, office, industrial, and mixed-use projects
- Reductions applied only if complementary strategies are in place:
  - Residential parking permits and market rate public on-street parking - to prevent spill-over parking
  - Unbundled parking - is not required but provides a market signal to employers to transfer over the, now explicit, cost of parking to the employees. In addition, unbundling parking provides a price with which employers can utilize as a means of establishing workplace parking prices.

**Baseline Method:**

See introduction to transportation section for a discussion of how to estimate trip rates and VMT. The CO<sub>2</sub> emissions are calculated from VMT as follows:

$$CO_2 = VMT \times EF_{\text{running}}$$

Where:

traveled VMT = vehicle miles

for running emissions EF<sub>running</sub> = emission factor

# Transportation

## TRT-14 Commute Trip Reduction

**Inputs:**

The following information needs to be provided by the Project Applicant:

- Location of project site: low density suburb, suburban center, or urban location
- Daily parking charge (\$1 - \$6)
- Percentage of employees subject to priced parking

**Mitigation Method:**

$$\% \text{ VMT Reduction} = A * B$$

Where

A = Percentage reduction in commute VMT (from [1] and [2])

B = Percent of employees subject to priced parking

Detail:

| Project Location  | A:<br>Daily Parking Charge |       |       |       |
|---|----------------------------|-------|-------|-------|
|   | \$1                        | \$2   | \$3   | \$6   |
| Low density suburb  | 0.5%                       | 1.2%  | 1.9%  | 2.8%  |
| Suburban center   | 1.8%                       | 3.7%  | 5.4%  | 6.8%  |
| Urban Location  | 6.9%                       | 12.5% | 16.8% | 19.7% |
| Moving Cooler, VTPI, Fehr & Peers.<br>Note: 2009 dollars. |                            |       |       |       |

**Assumptions:**

Data based upon the following references:

[1] Cambridge Systematics. *Moving Cooler: An Analysis of Transportation Strategies for Reducing Greenhouse Gas Emissions*. Technical Appendices. Prepared for the Urban Land Institute. (Table 5.13, Table D.3)

[http://www.movingcooler.info/Library/Documents/Moving%20Cooler\\_Appendices\\_Complete\\_102209.pdf](http://www.movingcooler.info/Library/Documents/Moving%20Cooler_Appendices_Complete_102209.pdf)

[2] VTPI, Todd Litman, *Transportation Elasticities*, (Table 15)

<http://www.vtpi.org/elasticities.pdf>.

Cosis Corporation (1993), *Implementing Effective Travel Demand Management Measures: Inventory of Measures and Synthesis of Experience*, USDOT and Institute of Transportation Engineers (www.ite.org);

[www.bts.gov/ntl/DOCS/474.html](http://www.bts.gov/ntl/DOCS/474.html).

# Transportation

## TRT-14

### Commute Trip Reduction

#### Emission Reduction Ranges and Variables:

| Pollutant         | Category Emissions Reductions <sup>68</sup> |
|-------------------|---|
| CO <sub>2</sub> e | 0.1 – 19.7% of running                      |
| PM                | 0.1 – 19.7% of running                      |
| CO                | 0.1 – 19.7% of running                      |
| NO <sub>x</sub>   | 0.1 – 19.7% of running                      |
| SO <sub>2</sub>   | 0.1 – 19.7% of running                      |
| ROG               | 0.06 – 11.8% of total                       |

#### Discussion:

Priced parking can result in parking spillover concerns. The highest VMT reductions should be given only with complementary strategies such as parking time limits or neighborhood parking permits are in place in surrounding areas.

#### Example:

Sample calculations are provided below:

- Low Range % Commute VMT Reduction (low density suburb, \$1/day, 20% priced) =  $0.5\% * 20\% = 0.1\%$
- High Range % Commute VMT Reduction (urban, \$6/day, 100% priced) =  $19.7\% * 100\% = 19.7\%$

#### Preferred Literature:

The table above (variable A) was calculated using the percent commute VMT reduction from *Moving Cooler* (0.5% - 6.9% reduction for \$1/day parking charge). The percentage reductions for \$2 - \$6 / day parking charges were extrapolated by multiplying the *Moving Cooler* percentages with the ratios from the VTPI table below (percentage increases). For example, to obtain a percent VMT reduction for a \$6/day parking charge for a low density suburb,  $0.5\% * ((36.1\% - 6.5\%) / 6.5\%) = 2.3\%$ . The methodology was utilized to capture the non-linear effect of parking charges on trip reduction (VTPI) while maintaining a conservative estimate of percent reductions (*Moving Cooler*).

#### Preferred:

- 0.5-6.9% reduction in commuting VMT
- 0.44-2.07% reduction in greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions

<sup>68</sup> The percentage reduction reflects emission reductions from running emissions. The actual value will be less than this when starting and evaporative emissions are factored into the analysis. ROG emissions have been adjusted to reflect a ratio of 40% evaporative and 60% exhaust emissions based on a statewide EMFAC run of all vehicles.

# Transportation

## TRT-14

## Commute Trip Reduction

*Moving Cooler* Technical Appendices indicate that increasing employee parking costs \$1 per day (\$0.50 per vehicle for carpool and free for vanpools) can reduce GHG between 0.44% and 2.07% and reduce commuting VMT between 0.5% and 6.9%. The reduction in GHG varies based on how extensive the implementation of the program is. The reduction in commuting VMT differs for type of urban area as shown in the table below. Please note that these numbers are independent of results for employee parking cash-out strategy (discussed in its own fact sheet).

|                              |                           | Percent Change in Commuting VMT         |  |                       |                      |                      |                     |
|------------------------------|---------------------------|---|--|-----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|---------------------|
| Strategy                     | Description               | Large Metropolitan (higher transit use) | Large Metropolitan (lower transit use) | Medium Metro (higher) | Medium Metro (lower) | Small Metro (higher) | Small Metro (lower) |
| Parking Charges              | Parking charge of \$1/day | 6.9%                                    | 0.9%                                   | 1.8%                  | 0.5%                 | 1.3%                 | 0.5%                |
| Source: <i>Moving Cooler</i> |                           |   |  |                       |                      |                      |                     |

### Preferred:

| Commute Vehicle trip reduction | Daily Parking Charges |               |               |               |
|--------------------------------|-----------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
|                                | <b>\$0.75</b>         | <b>\$1.49</b> | <b>\$2.98</b> | <b>\$5.96</b> |
| <b>Worksite Setting</b>        |                       |               |               |               |
| Suburb                         | 6.5%                  | 15.1%         | 25.3%*        | 36.1%*        |
| Suburban Center                | 12.3%                 | 25.1%*        | 37.0%*        | 46.8%*        |
| Central Business District      | 17.5%                 | 31.8%*        | 42.6%*        | 50.0%*        |
| Source: VTPI [2]               |                       |               |               |               |

\* Discounts greater than 20% should be capped, as they exceed levels recommended by *TCRP 95* and other literature.

The reduction in commute trips varies by parking fee and worksite setting [2]. For daily parking fees between \$1.49 and \$5.96, worksites set in low-density suburbs could decrease vehicle trips by 6.5-36.1%, worksites set in activity centers could decrease vehicle trips by 12.3-46.8%, and worksites set in regional central business districts could decrease vehicles by 17.5-50%. (Note that adjusted parking fees (from 1993 dollars to 2009 dollars) were used. Adjustments were taken from the *Santa Monica General Plan EIR Report, Appendix, Nelson\Nygaard*).

### Alternative Literature:

#### Alternate:

- 1 percentage point reduction in auto mode share
- 12.3% reduction in commute vehicle trips

*TCRP 95 Draft Chapter 19* [4] found that an increase of \$8 per month in employee parking charges was necessary to decrease employee SOV mode split rates by one

# Transportation

## TRT-14

### Commute Trip Reduction

percentage point. *TCRP 95* compared 82 sites with TDM programs and found that programs with parking fees have an average commute vehicle trip reduction of 24.6%, compared with 12.3% for sites with free parking.

*Alternate:*

- 1% reduction in VMT (\$1 per day charge)
- 2.6% reduction in VMT (\$3 per day charge)

The Deakin, et al. report [5] for the California Air Resources Board (CARB) analyzed transportation pricing measures for the Los Angeles, Bay Area, San Diego, and Sacramento metropolitan areas.

**Alternative Literature References:**

[4] Pratt, Dick. Personal Communication Regarding the Draft of TCRP 95 Traveler Response to Transportation System Changes – Chapter 19 Employer and Institutional TDM Strategies. (Table 19-9)

[5] Deakin, E., Harvey, G., Pozdena, R., and Yarema, G., 1996. *Transportation Pricing Strategies for California: An Assessment of Congestion, Emissions, Energy and Equity Impacts*. Final Report. Prepared for California Air Resources Board (CARB), Sacramento, CA (Table 7.2)

**Other Literature Reviewed:**

None

# Transportation

CEQA# MM T-9  
MP# TR-5.3

## TRT-15

### Commute Trip Reduction

#### 3.4.15 Implement Employee Parking “Cash-Out”

**Range of Effectiveness:** 0.6 – 7.7% commute vehicle miles traveled (VMT) reduction and therefore 0.6 – 7.7% reduction in commute trip GHG emissions

#### Measure Description:

The project will require employers to offer employee parking “cash-out.” The term “cash-out” is used to describe the employer providing employees with a choice of forgoing their current subsidized/free parking for a cash payment equivalent to the cost of the parking space to the employer.

#### Measure Applicability:

- Urban and suburban context
- Not applicable in a rural context
- Appropriate for retail, office, industrial, and mixed-use projects
- Reductions applied only if complementary strategies are in place:
  - Residential parking permits and market rate public on-street parking -to prevent spill-over parking
  - Unbundled parking - is not required but provides a market signal to employers to forgo paying for parking spaces and “cash-out” the employee instead. In addition, unbundling parking provides a price with which employers can utilize as a means of establishing “cash-out” prices.

#### Baseline Method:

See introduction section.

#### Inputs:

The following information needs to be provided by the Project Applicant:

- Percentage of employees eligible
- Location of project site: low density suburb, suburban center, or urban location

#### Mitigation Method:

$$\% \text{ VMT Reduction} = A * B$$

Where

A = % reduction in commute VMT (from the literature)

B = % of employees eligible

# Transportation

CEQA# MM T-9  
MP# TR-5.3

## TRT-15

## Commute Trip Reduction

Detail:

- A: Change in Commute VMT: 3.0% (low density suburb), 4.5% (suburban center), 7.7% (urban) change in commute VMT (source: Moving Cooler)

### Assumptions:

Data based upon the following references:

- Cambridge Systematics. *Moving Cooler: An Analysis of Transportation Strategies for Reducing Greenhouse Gas Emissions*. Technical Appendices. Prepared for the Urban Land Institute. (Table 5.13, Table D.3)  
[http://www.movingcooler.info/Library/Documents/Moving%20Cooler\\_Appendix%20B\\_Effectiveness\\_102209.pdf](http://www.movingcooler.info/Library/Documents/Moving%20Cooler_Appendix%20B_Effectiveness_102209.pdf)

### Emission Reduction Ranges and Variables:

| Pollutant         | Category Emissions Reductions <sup>69</sup> |
|-------------------|---|
| CO <sub>2</sub> e | 0.6 – 7.7% of running                       |
| PM                | 0.6 – 7.7% of running                       |
| CO                | 0.6 – 7.7% of running                       |
| NO <sub>x</sub>   | 0.6 – 7.7% of running                       |
| SO <sub>2</sub>   | 0.6 – 7.7% of running                       |
| ROG               | 0.36 – 4.62% of running                     |

### Discussion:

Please note that these estimates are independent of results for workplace parking pricing strategy (see strategy number T# E5 for more information).

If work site parking is not unbundled, employers cannot utilize this unbundled price as a means of establishing “cash-out” prices. The table below shows typical costs for parking facilities in large urban and suburban areas in the US. This can be utilized as a reference point for establishing reasonable “cash-out” prices. Note that the table does not include external costs to parking such as added congestion, lost opportunity cost of land devoted to parking, and greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions.

|                           | Structured (urban) | Surface (suburban) |
|---------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| Land (Annualized)         | \$1,089            | \$215              |
| Construction (Annualized) | \$2,171            | \$326              |

<sup>69</sup> The percentage reduction reflects emission reductions from running emissions. The actual value will be less than this when starting and evaporative emissions are factored into the analysis. ROG emissions have been adjusted to reflect a ratio of 40% evaporative and 60% exhaust emissions based on a statewide EMFAC run of all vehicles.

# Transportation

CEQA# MM T-9  
MP# TR-5.3

## TRT-15

### Commute Trip Reduction

|   |         |       |
|---|---------|-------|
| O & M Costs   | \$575   | \$345 |
| Annual Total  | \$3,835 | \$885 |
| Monthly Costs   | \$320   | \$74  |
| Source: VTPI, <i>Transportation Costs and Benefit Analysis II – Parking Costs</i> , April 2010 (p.5.4-10) |         |       |

**Example:**

Sample calculations are provided below:

- Low Range % VMT Reduction (low density suburb and 20% eligible) =  $3\% * 0.2 = 0.6\%$
- High Range % VMT Reduction (urban and 100% eligible) =  $7.7\% * 1 = 7.7\%$

**Preferred Literature:**

- 0.44% - 2.07% reduction in GHG emissions
- 3.0% - 7.7% reduction in commute VMT

*Moving Cooler* Technical Appendices indicate that reimbursing “cash-out” participants \$1/day can reduce GHG between 0.44% and 2.07% and reduce commuting VMT between 3.0% and 7.7%. The reduction in GHG varies based on how extensive the implementation of the program is. The reduction in commuting VMT differs for type of urban area is shown in the table below.

| Strategy         | Description        | Percent Change in Commuting VMT         |  |                       |                      |                      |                     |
|------------------|--------------------|---|--|-----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|---------------------|
|                  |                    | Large Metropolitan (higher transit use) | Large Metropolitan (lower transit use) | Medium Metro (higher) | Medium Metro (lower) | Small Metro (higher) | Small Metro (lower) |
| Parking Cash-Out | Subsidy of \$1/day | 7.7%                                    | 3.7%                                   | 4.5%                  | 3.0%                 | 4.0%                 | 3.0%                |

**Alternative Literature:**

*Alternate:*

- 2-6% reduction in vehicle trips

VTPI used synthesis data to determine parking cash out could reduce commute vehicle trips by 10-30%. VTPI estimates that the portion of vehicle travel affected by parking cash-out would be about 20% and therefore there would be only about a 2-6% total reduction in vehicle trips attributed to parking cash-out.

*Alternate:*

# Transportation

CEQA# MM T-9

**TRT-15**

**Commute Trip Reduction**

MP# TR-5.3

- 12% reduction in VMT per year per employee
- 64% increase in carpooling
- 50% increase in transit mode share
- 39% increase in pedestrian/bike share

Shoup looked at eight California firms that complied with California's 1992 parking cash-out law, applicable to employers of 50 or more persons in regions that do not meet the state's clean air standards. To comply, a firm must offer commuters the option to choose a cash payment equal to any parking subsidy offered. Six of companies went beyond compliance and subsidized one or more alternatives to parking (more than the parking subsidy price). The eight companies ranged in size between 120 and 300 employees, and were located in downtown Los Angeles, Century City, Santa Monica, and West Hollywood. Shoup states that an average of 12% fewer VMT per year per employee is equivalent to removing one of every eight cars driven to work off the road.

**Alternative Literature Notes:**

Litman, T., 2009. "Win-Win Emission Reduction Strategies." Victoria Transport Policy Institute. Website: <http://www.vtpi.org/wwclimate.pdf>. Accessed March 2010. (p. 5)

Donald Shoup, "Evaluating the Effects of Cashing Out Employer-Paid Parking: Eight Case Studies." *Transport Policy*, Vol. 4, No. 4, October 1997, pp. 201-216. (Table 1, p. 204)

**Other Literature Reviewed:**

None

## 3.5 Transit System Improvements

### 3.5.1 Provide a Bus Rapid Transit System

**Range of Effectiveness:** 0.02 – 3.2% vehicle miles traveled (VMT) reduction and therefore 0.02 – 3% reduction in GHG emissions.

**Measure Description:**

The project will provide a Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) system with design features for high quality and cost-effective transit service. These include:

- Grade-separated right-of-way, including bus only lanes (for buses, emergency vehicles, and sometimes taxis), and other Transit Priority measures. Some systems use guideways which automatically steer the bus on portions of the route.
- Frequent, high-capacity service
- High-quality vehicles that are easy to board, quiet, clean, and comfortable to ride.
- Pre-paid fare collection to minimize boarding delays.
- Integrated fare systems, allowing free or discounted transfers between routes and modes.
- Convenient user information and marketing programs.
- High quality bus stations with Transit Oriented Development in nearby areas.
- Modal integration, with BRT service coordinated with walking and cycling facilities, taxi services, intercity bus, rail transit, and other transportation services.

BRT systems vary significantly in the level of travel efficiency offered above and beyond “identity” features and BRT branding. The following effectiveness ranges represent general guidelines. Each proposed BRT should be evaluated specifically based on its characteristics in terms of time savings, cost, efficiency, and way-finding advantages. These types of features encourage people to use public transit and therefore reduce VMT.

**Measure Applicability:**

- Urban and suburban context
- Negligible in a rural context. Other measures are more appropriate to rural areas, such as express bus service to urban activity centers with park-and-ride lots at system-efficient rural access points.
- Appropriate for specific or general plans

**Baseline Method:**

See introduction to transportation section for a discussion of how to estimate trip rates and VMT. The CO<sub>2</sub> emissions are calculated from VMT as follows:

# Transportation

CEQA# **MS-G3** **TST-1** **Transit System Improvements**

$$CO_2 = VMT \times EF_{\text{running}}$$

Where:

traveled for running emissions

VMT = vehicle miles  
EF<sub>running</sub> = emission factor

**Inputs:**

The following information needs to be provided by the Project Applicant:

- Existing transit mode share
- Percentage of lines serving Project converting to BRT

The following are optional inputs. Average (default) values are included in the calculations but can be updated to project specificity if desired. Please see Appendix C for calculation detail:

- Average vehicle occupancy

**Mitigation Method:**

$$\% \text{ VMT Reduction} = \text{Riders} * \text{Mode} * \text{Lines} * D$$

Where

Riders = % increase in transit ridership on BRT line (28% from [1])  
 Mode = Existing transit mode share (see table below)  
 Lines = Percentage of lines serving project converting to BRT  
 D = Adjustments from transit ridership increase to VMT (0.67, see Appendix C)

| Project setting  | Transit mode share |
|--|--------------------|
| Suburban   | 1.3%               |
| Urban  | 4%                 |
| Urban Center   | 17%                |
| Source: NHTS, 2001 <a href="http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tsip/tab/documents/travelsurveys/Final2001_StwTravelSurveyWkdayRpt.pdf">http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tsip/tab/documents/travelsurveys/Final2001_StwTravelSurveyWkdayRpt.pdf</a><br>(Urban – MTC, SACOG. Suburban – SCAG, SANDAG, Fresno County.)<br>Urban Center from San Francisco County Transportation Authority Countywide Transportation Plan, 2000. |                    |

# Transportation

CEQA# MS-G3

**TST-1**

**Transit System  
Improvements**

- D: 0.67 (see Appendix C for detail)

## Assumptions:

Data based upon the following references:

- [1] FTA, August 2005. “Las Vegas Metropolitan Area Express BRT Demonstration Project”, NTD, <http://www.ntdprogram.gov/ntdprogram/cs?action=showRegionAgencies&region=9>

## Emission Reduction Ranges and Variables:

| Pollutant         | Category Emissions Reductions <sup>70</sup> |
|-------------------|---|
| CO <sub>2</sub> e | 0.02 – 3.2% of running                      |
| PM                | 0.02 – 3.2% of running                      |
| CO                | 0.02 – 3.2% of running                      |
| NO <sub>x</sub>   | 0.02 – 3.2% of running                      |
| SO <sub>2</sub>   | 0.02 – 3.2% of running                      |
| ROG               | 0.012 – 1.9% of total                       |

## Discussion:

Increases in transit ridership due to shifts from other lines do not need to be addressed since it is already incorporated in the literature.

In general, transit operational strategies alone are not enough for a large modal shift [2], as evidenced by the low range in VMT reductions. Through case study analysis, the TCRP report [2] observed that strategies that focused solely on improving level of service or quality of transit were unsuccessful at achieving a significant shift. Strategies that reduce the attractiveness of vehicle travel should be implemented in combination to attract a larger shift in transit ridership. The three following factors directly impact the attractiveness of vehicle travel: urban expressway capacity, urban core density, and downtown parking availability.

## Example:

Sample calculations are provided below:

- Low Range % VMT Reduction (suburban, 10% of lines) =  $28\% * 1.3\% * 10\% * 0.67 = 0.02\%$

<sup>70</sup> The percentage reduction reflects emission reductions from running emissions. The actual value will be less than this when starting and evaporative emissions are factored into the analysis. ROG emissions have been adjusted to reflect a ratio of 40% evaporative and 60% exhaust emissions based on a statewide EMFAC run of all vehicles.

# Transportation

CEQA# MS-G3

**TST-1**

**Transit System  
Improvements**

- High Range % VMT Reduction (urban, 100% of lines) =  $28\% * 17\% * 100\% * 0.67 = 3.2\%$

## Preferred Literature:

- 28% increase in transit ridership in the existing corridor

The FTA study [1] looks at the implementation of the Las Vegas BRT system. The BRT supplemented an existing route along a 7.5 mile corridor. The existing route was scaled back. Total ridership on the corridor (both routes combined) increased 61,704 monthly riders, 28% increase on the existing corridor and 1.4% increase in system ridership. The route represented an increase in 2.1% of system service miles provided.

## Alternative Literature:

*Alternate:*

- 27-84% increase in total transit ridership

Various bus rapid transit systems obtained the following total transit ridership growth: Vancouver 96B (30%), Las Vegas Max (35-40%), Boston Silver Line (84%), Los Angeles (27-42%), and Oakland (66%). VTPI [3] obtained the BRT data from BC Transit's unpublished research. The effectiveness of a BRT strategy depends largely on the land uses the BRT serves and their design and density.

*Alternate:*

- 50% increase in weekly transit ridership
- 60 – 80% shorter travel time compared to vehicle trip

The Martin Luther King, Jr. East Busway in Pennsylvania opened in 1983 as a separate roadway exclusively for public buses. The busway was 6.8 miles long with six stations. Ridership has grown from 20,000 to 30,000 weekday riders over 10 years. The busway saves commuters significant time compared with driving: 12 minutes versus 30-45 minutes in the AM or an hour in the PM [4].

## Alternative Literature References:

[2] Transit Cooperative Research Program. TCRP 27 – Building Transit Ridership: An Exploration of Transit's Market Share and the Public Policies That Influence It (p.47-48). 1997. [cited in discussion section above]

[3] TDM Encyclopedia; Victoria Transport Policy Institute (2010). Bus Rapid Transit; (<http://www.vtpi.org/tdm/tdm120.htm>); updated 1/25/2010; accessed 3/3/2010.

# Transportation

CEQA# MS-G3

**TST-1**

**Transit System  
Improvements**

- [4] Transportation Demand Management Institute of the Association for Commuter Transportation. *TDM Case Studies and Commuter Testimonials*. Prepared for the US EPA. 1997. (p.55-56)  
<http://www.epa.gov/OMS/stateresources/rellinks/docs/tmccases.pdf>

# Transportation

MP# LU-3.4.3

**TST-2**

**Transit System  
Improvements**

## 3.5.2 Implement Transit Access Improvements

**Range of Effectiveness:** Grouped strategy. [See TST-3 and TST-4]

### Measure Description:

This project will improve access to transit facilities through sidewalk/ crosswalk safety enhancements and bus shelter improvements. The benefits of Transit Access Improvements alone have not been quantified and should be grouped with Transit Network Expansion (TST-3) and Transit Service Frequency and Speed (TST-4).

### Measure Applicability:

- Urban, suburban context
- Appropriate for residential, retail, office, mixed use, and industrial projects

### Alternative Literature:

No literature was identified that specifically looks at the quantitative impact of improving transit facilities as a standalone strategy.

### Alternative Literature References:

None

### Other Literature Reviewed:

None

# Transportation

CEQA# MS-G3 **TST-3** **Transit System Improvements**

### 3.5.3 Expand Transit Network

**Range of Effectiveness:** 0.1 – 8.2% vehicle miles travelled (VMT) reduction and therefore 0.1 – 8.2% reduction in GHG emissions<sup>71</sup>

**Measure Description:**

The project will expand the local transit network by adding or modifying existing transit service to enhance the service near the project site. This will encourage the use of transit and therefore reduce VMT.

**Measure Applicability:**

- Urban and suburban context
- May be applicable in a rural context but no literature documentation available (effectiveness will be case specific and should be based on specific assessment of levels of services and origins/destinations served)
- Appropriate for specific or general plans

**Baseline Method:**

See introduction to transportation section for a discussion of how to estimate trip rates and VMT. The CO<sub>2</sub> emissions are calculated from VMT as follows:

$$CO_2 = VMT \times EF_{\text{running}}$$

Where:

traveled VMT = vehicle miles  
 for running emissions EF<sub>running</sub> = emission factor

**Inputs:**

The following information needs to be provided by the Project Applicant:

- Percentage increase transit network coverage
- Existing transit mode share
- Project location: urban center, urban, or suburban

---

<sup>71</sup> Transit vehicles may also result in increases in emissions that are associated with electricity production or fuel use. The Project Applicant should consider these potential additional emissions when estimating mitigation for these measures.

# Transportation

CEQA# MS-G3 **TST-3** **Transit System Improvements**

The following are optional inputs. Average (default) values are included in the calculations but can be updated to project specificity if desired. Please see Appendix C for calculation detail:

- Average vehicle occupancy

**Mitigation Method:**

$$\% \text{ VMT Reduction} = \text{Coverage} * B * \text{Mode} * D$$

Where

- Coverage = % increase in transit network coverage
- B = elasticity of transit ridership with respect to service coverage (see Table below)
- Mode = existing transit mode share
- D = adjustments from transit ridership increase to VMT (0.67, from Appendix C)

B:

| Project setting             | Elasticity |
|-----------------------------|------------|
| Suburban                    | 1.01       |
| Urban                       | 0.72       |
| Urban Center                | 0.65       |
| Source: TCRP 95, Chapter 10 |            |

Mode: Provide existing transit mode share for project or utilize the following averages

| Project setting  | Transit mode share |
|--|--------------------|
| Suburban   | 1.3%               |
| Urban  | 4%                 |
| Urban Center   | 17%                |
| Source: NHTS, 2001 <a href="http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tsip/tab/documents/travelsurveys/Final2001_StwTravelSurveyWkdayRpt.pdf">http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tsip/tab/documents/travelsurveys/Final2001_StwTravelSurveyWkdayRpt.pdf</a><br>(Urban – MTC, SACOG. Suburban – SCAG, SANDAG, Fresno County.)<br>Urban Center from San Francisco County Transportation Authority Countywide Transportation Plan, 2000. |                    |

**Assumptions:**

Data based upon the following references:

# Transportation

CEQA# MS-G3

**TST-3**

**Transit System  
Improvements**

[1] Transit Cooperative Research Program. TCRP Report 95 Traveler Response to System Changes – Chapter 10: Bus Routing and Coverage. 2004. (p. 10-8 to 10-10)

## Emission Reduction Ranges and Variables:

| Pollutant         | Category Emissions Reductions <sup>72</sup> |
|-------------------|---|
| CO <sub>2</sub> e | 0.1 – 8.2% of running                       |
| PM                | 0.1 – 8.2% of running                       |
| CO                | 0.1 – 8.2% of running                       |
| NO <sub>x</sub>   | 0.1 – 8.2% of running                       |
| SO <sub>2</sub>   | 0.1 – 8.2% of running                       |
| ROG               | 0.06 – 4.9% of total                        |

## Discussion:

In general, transit operational strategies alone are not enough for a large modal shift [2], as evidenced by the low range in VMT reductions. Through case study analysis, the TCRP report [2] observed that strategies that focused solely on improving level of service or quality of transit were unsuccessful at achieving a significant shift. Strategies that reduce the attractiveness of vehicle travel should be implemented in combination to attract a larger shift in transit ridership. The three following factors directly impact the attractiveness of vehicle travel: urban expressway capacity, urban core density, and downtown parking availability.

## Example:

Sample calculations are provided below:

- Low Range % VMT Reduction (10% expansion, suburban) =  $10\% * 1.01 * 1.3\% * .67 = 0.1\%$
- High Range % VMT Reduction (100% expansion, urban) =  $100\% * 0.72 * 17\% * .67 = 8.2\%$

The low and high ranges are estimates and may vary based on the characteristics of the project.

<sup>72</sup> The percentage reduction reflects emission reductions from running emissions. The actual value will be less than this when starting and evaporative emissions are factored into the analysis. ROG emissions have been adjusted to reflect a ratio of 40% evaporative and 60% exhaust emissions based on a statewide EMFAC run of all vehicles.

# Transportation

CEQA# MS-G3

**TST-3**

**Transit System  
Improvements**

## Preferred Literature:

- 0.65 = elasticity of transit ridership with respect to service coverage/expansion (in radial routes to central business districts)
- 0.72 = elasticity of transit ridership with respect to service coverage/expansion (in central city routes)
- 1.01 = elasticity of transit ridership with respect to service coverage/expansion (in suburban routes)

*TCRP 95 Chapter 10* [1] documents the results of system-wide service expansions in San Diego. The least sensitivity to service expansion came from central business districts while the largest impacts came from suburban routes. Suburban locations, with traditionally low transit service, tend to have greater ridership increases compared to urban locations which already have established transit systems. In general, there is greater opportunity in suburban locations.

## Alternative Literature:

- -0.06 = elasticity of VMT with respect to transit revenue miles

*Growing Cooler* [3] modeled the impact of various urban variables (including transit revenue miles and transit passenger miles) on VMT, using data from 84 urban areas around the U.S.

## Alternative Literature References:

- [2] Transit Cooperative Research Program. TCRP 27 – Building Transit Ridership: An Exploration of Transit's Market Share and the Public Policies That Influence It (p.47-48). 1997. [cited in discussion section above]
- [3] Ewing, et al, 2008. *Growing Cooler – The Evidence on Urban Development and Climate Change*. Urban Land Institute.

# Transportation

CEQA# MS-G3 **TST-4** **Transit System Improvements**

### 3.5.4 Increase Transit Service Frequency/Speed

**Range of Effectiveness:** 0.02 – 2.5% vehicle miles traveled (VMT) reduction and therefore 0.02 – 2.5% reduction in GHG emissions<sup>73</sup>

**Measure Description:**

This project will reduce transit-passenger travel time through more reduced headways and increased speed and reliability. This makes transit service more attractive and may result in a mode shift from auto to transit which reduces VMT.

**Measure Applicability:**

- Urban and suburban context
- May be applicable in a rural context but no literature documentation available (effectiveness will be case specific and should be based on specific assessment of levels of services and origins/destinations served)
- Appropriate for specific or general plans

**Baseline Method:**

See introduction to transportation section for a discussion of how to estimate trip rates and VMT. The CO<sub>2</sub> emissions are calculated from VMT as follows:

$$CO_2 = VMT \times EF_{\text{running}}$$

Where:

traveled VMT = vehicle miles  
 for running emissions EF<sub>running</sub> = emission factor

**Inputs:**

The following information needs to be provided by the Project Applicant:

- Percentage reduction in headways (increase in frequency)
- Level of implementation
- Project setting: urban center, urban, suburban
- Existing transit mode share

---

<sup>73</sup> Transit vehicles may also result in increases in emissions that are associated with electricity production or fuel use. The Project Applicant should consider these potential additional emissions when estimating mitigation for these measures.

# Transportation

CEQA# MS-G3 **TST-4** **Transit System Improvements**

The following are optional inputs. Average (default) values are included in the calculations but can be updated to project-specific values if desired. Please see Appendix C for calculation detail:

- Average vehicle occupancy

**Mitigation Method:**

$$\% \text{ VMT Reduction} = \text{Headway} * B * C * \text{Mode} * E$$

Where

- Headway = % reduction in headways
- B = elasticity of transit ridership with respect to increased frequency of service (from [1])
- C = adjustment for level of implementation
- Mode = existing transit mode share
- E = adjustments from transit ridership increase to VMT

Detail:

- Headway: reasonable ranges from 15 – 80%
- B:

| Setting                          | Elasticity |
|----------------------------------|------------|
| Urban                            | 0.32       |
| Suburban                         | 0.36       |
| Source: TCRP Report 95 Chapter 9 |            |

- C:

| Level of implementation =<br>number of lines improved / total<br>number of lines serving project | Adjustment |
|--|------------|
| <50%   | 50%        |
| >=50%  | 85%        |
| Fehr & Peers, 2010.  |            |

- Mode: Provide existing transit mode share for project or utilize the following averages

| Project setting   | Transit mode share |
|---|--------------------|
| Suburban  | 1.3%               |
| Urban   | 4%                 |
| Urban Center  | 17%                |
| Source: NHTS, 2001 <a href="http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tsip/tab/documents/travelsurveys/Final2001_StwTravelSurveyWkdayRpt.pdf">http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tsip/tab/documents/travelsurveys/Final2001_StwTravelSurveyWkdayRpt.pdf</a><br>(Urban – MTC, SACOG. Suburban – SCAG, SANDAG, Fresno County.) |                    |

# Transportation

CEQA# MS-G3

**TST-4**

**Transit System  
Improvements**

Urban Center from San Francisco County Transportation Authority  
Countywide Transportation Plan, 2000.

- E: 0.67 (see Appendix C for detail)

**Assumptions:**

Data based upon the following references:

[1] Transit Cooperative Research Program. TCRP Report 95 Traveler Response to System Changes – Chapter 9: Transit Scheduling and Frequency (p. 9-14)

**Emission Reduction Ranges and Variables:**

| Pollutant         | Category Emissions Reductions <sup>74</sup> |
|-------------------|---|
| CO <sub>2</sub> e | 0.02 – 2.5% % of running                    |
| PM                | 0.02 – 2.5% % of running                    |
| CO                | 0.02 – 2.5% % of running                    |
| NOx               | 0.02 – 2.5% % of running                    |
| SO <sub>2</sub>   | 0.02 – 2.5% % of running                    |
| ROG               | 0.01 – 1.5% % of total                      |

**Discussion:**

Reasonable ranges for reductions were calculated assuming existing 30-minute headways reduced to 25 minutes and 5 minutes to establish the estimated low and high reductions, respectively.

The level of implementation adjustment is used to take into account increases in transit ridership due to shifts from other lines. If increases in frequency are only applied to a percentage of the lines serving the project, then we conservatively estimate that 50% of the transit ridership increase is a shift from the existing lines. If frequency increases are applied to a majority of the lines serving the project, we conservatively assume at least some of the transit ridership (15%) comes from existing riders.

In general, transit operational strategies alone are not enough for a large modal shift [2], as evidenced by the low range in VMT reductions. Through case study analysis, the TCRP report [2] observed that strategies that focused solely on improving level of service or quality of transit were unsuccessful at achieving a significant shift. Strategies that reduce the attractiveness of vehicle travel should be implemented in combination to attract a larger shift in transit ridership. The three following factors directly impact the

<sup>74</sup> The percentage reduction reflects emission reductions from running emissions. The actual value will be less than this when starting and evaporative emissions are factored into the analysis. ROG emissions have been adjusted to reflect a ratio of 40% evaporative and 60% exhaust emissions based on a statewide EMFAC run of all vehicles.

# Transportation

CEQA# MS-G3

TST-4

Transit System  
Improvements

attractiveness of vehicle travel: urban expressway capacity, urban core density, and downtown parking availability.

## Example:

Sample calculations are provided below:

- Low Range % VMT Reduction (15% reduction in headways, suburban, <50% implementation) =  $15\% * 0.36 * 50\% * 1.3\% * 0.67 = 0.02\%$
- High Range % VMT Reduction (80% reduction in headways, urban, >50% implementation) =  $80\% * 0.32 * 85\% * 17\% * 0.67 = 2.5\%$

## Preferred Literature:

- 0.32 = elasticity of transit ridership with respect to transit service (urban)
- 0.36 – 0.38 = elasticity of transit ridership with respect to transit service (suburban)

*TCRP 95 Chapter 9* [1] documents the results of frequency changes in Dallas. Increases in frequency are more sensitive in a suburban environment. Suburban locations, with traditionally low transit service, tend to have greater ridership increases compared to urban locations which already have established transit systems. In general, there is greater opportunity in suburban locations

## Alternative Literature:

- 0.5 = elasticity of transit ridership with respect to increased frequency of service
- 1.5 to 2.3% increase in annual transit trips due to increased frequency of service
- 0.4-0.5 = elasticity of ridership with respect to increased operational speed
- 4% - 15% increase in annual transit trips due to increased operational speed
- 0.03-0.09% annual GHG reduction (for bus service expansion, increased frequency, and increased operational speed)

For increased frequency of service strategy, *Moving Cooler* [3] looked at three levels of service increases, 3%, 3.5% and 4.67% increases in service, resulting in a 1.5 – 2.3% increase in annual transit trips. For increased speed and reliability, *Moving Cooler* looked at three levels of speed/reliability increases. Improving travel speed by 10% assumed implementing signal prioritization, limited stop service, etc. over 5 years. Improving travel speed by 15% assumed all above strategies plus signal synchronization and intersection reconfiguration over 5 years. Improving travel speed by 30% assumed all above strategies and an improved reliability by 40%, integrated fare system, and implementation of BRT where appropriate. *Moving Cooler* calculates estimated 0.04-0.14% annual GHG reductions in combination with bus service expansion strategy.

## Transportation

CEQA# MS-G3

TST-4

Transit System  
Improvements

### Alternative Literature References:

- [2] Transit Cooperative Research Program. TCRP 27 – Building Transit Ridership: An Exploration of Transit's Market Share and the Public Policies That Influence It (p.47-48). 1997. [cited in discussion section]
- [3] Cambridge Systematics. *Moving Cooler: An Analysis of Transportation Strategies for Reducing Greenhouse Gas Emissions*. Technical Appendices. Prepared for the Urban Land Institute. (p B-32, B-33, Table D.3)  
[http://www.movingcooler.info/Library/Documents/Moving%20Cooler\\_Appendices\\_Complete\\_102209.pdf](http://www.movingcooler.info/Library/Documents/Moving%20Cooler_Appendices_Complete_102209.pdf)

# Transportation

MP# TR-4.1.4

**TST-5**

**Transit System  
Improvements**

## 3.5.5 Provide Bike Parking Near Transit

**Range of Effectiveness:** Grouped strategy. [See TST-3 and TST-4]

### **Measure Description:**

Provide short-term and long-term bicycle parking near rail stations, transit stops, and freeway access points. The benefits of Station Bike Parking have no quantified impacts as a standalone strategy and should be grouped with Transit Network Expansion (TST-3) and Increase Transit Service Frequency and Speed (TST-4) to encourage multi-modal use in the area and provide ease of access to nearby transit for bicyclists.

### **Measure Applicability:**

- Urban, suburban context
- Appropriate for residential, retail, office, mixed use, and industrial projects

### **Alternative Literature:**

No literature was identified that specifically looks at the quantitative impact of including transit station bike parking.

### **Alternative Literature References:**

None

### **Other Literature Reviewed:**

None

# Transportation

## TST-6 Transit System Improvements

### 3.5.6 Provide Local Shuttles

**Range of Effectiveness:** Grouped strategy. [See TST-4 and TST-5]

**Measure Description:**

The project will provide local shuttle service through coordination with the local transit operator or private contractor. The local shuttles will provide service to transit hubs, commercial centers, and residential areas. The benefits of Local Shuttles alone have not been quantified and should be grouped with Transit Network Expansion (TST-4) and Transit Service Frequency and Speed (TST-5) to solve the “first mile/last mile” problem. In addition, many of the CommuteTrip Reduction Programs (Section 2.4, TRP 1-13) also included local shuttles.

**Measure Applicability:**

- Urban, suburban context
- Appropriate for large residential, retail, office, mixed use, and industrial projects

**Alternative Literature:**

No literature was identified to support the effectiveness of this strategy alone.

**Alternative Literature References:**

None

**Other Literature Reviewed:**

None

# Transportation

MP# TR-3.6

RPT-1

Road Pricing Management

## 3.6 Road Pricing/Management

### 3.6.1 Implement Area or Cordon Pricing

**Range of Effectiveness:** 7.9 – 22.0% vehicle miles traveled (VMT) reduction and therefore 7.9 – 22.0% reduction in GHG emissions.

**Measure Description:**

This project will implement a cordon pricing scheme. The pricing scheme will set a cordon (boundary) around a specified area to charge a toll to enter the area by vehicle. The cordon location is usually the boundary of a central business district (CBD) or urban center, but could also apply to substantial development projects with limited points of access, such as the proposed Treasure Island development in San Francisco. The cordon toll may be static/constant, applied only during peak periods, or be variable, with higher prices during congested peak periods. The toll price can be based on a fixed schedule or be dynamic, responding to real-time congestion levels. It is critical to have an existing, high quality transit infrastructure for the implementation of this strategy to reach a significant level of effectiveness. The pricing signals will only cause mode shifts if alternative modes of travel are available and reliable.

**Measure Applicability:**

- Central business district or urban center only

**Baseline Method:**

See introduction to transportation section for a discussion of how to estimate trip rates and VMT. The CO<sub>2</sub> emissions are calculated from VMT as follows:

$$CO_2 = VMT \times EF_{\text{running}}$$

Where:

|                       |   |
|-----------------------|---|
| traveled              | VMT = vehicle miles                     |
| for running emissions | EF <sub>running</sub> = emission factor |

**Inputs:**

The following information needs to be provided by the Project Applicant:

- Percentage increase in pricing for passenger vehicles to cross cordon
- Peak period variable price or static all-day pricing (London scheme)

# Transportation

MP# TR-3.6
**RPT-1**
Road Pricing Management

The following are optional inputs. Average (default) values are included in the calculations but can be updated to project-specific values if desired. Please see Appendix C for calculation detail:

- % (due to pricing) route shift, time-of-day shift, HOV shift, trip reduction, shift to transit/walk/bike

**Mitigation Method:**

$$\% \text{ VMT Reduction} = \text{Cordon\$} * B * C$$

Where

- Cordon\$ = % increase in pricing for passenger vehicles to cross cordon
- B = Elasticity of VMT with respect to price (from [1])
- C = Adjustment for % of VMT impacted by congestion pricing and mode shifts

Detail:

- Cordon\$: reasonable range of 100 – 500% (See Appendix C for detail)
- B: 0.45 [1]
- C:

| Cordon pricing scheme             | Adjustment |
|-----------------------------------|------------|
| Peak-period variable pricing      | 8.8%       |
| Static all-day pricing            | 21%        |
| Source: See Appendix C for detail |            |

**Assumptions:**

Data based upon the following references:

[1] Cambridge Systematics. *Moving Cooler: An Analysis of Transportation Strategies for Reducing Greenhouse Gas Emissions*. Technical Appendices. Prepared for the Urban Land Institute. (p. B-13, B-14)

[http://www.movingcooler.info/Library/Documents/Moving%20Cooler\\_Appendix%20B\\_Effectiveness\\_102209.pdf](http://www.movingcooler.info/Library/Documents/Moving%20Cooler_Appendix%20B_Effectiveness_102209.pdf)

- Referencing: VTPI, *Transportation Elasticities: How Prices and Other Factors Affect Travel Behavior*. July 2008. www.vtpi.org

# Transportation

MP# TR-3.6

RPT-1

Road Pricing Management

## Emission Reduction Ranges and Variables:

| Pollutant         | Category Emissions Reductions <sup>75</sup> |
|-------------------|---|
| CO <sub>2</sub> e | 7.9 - 22.0% of running                      |
| PM                | 7.9 - 22.0% of running                      |
| CO                | 7.9 - 22.0% of running                      |
| NO <sub>x</sub>   | 7.9 - 22.0% of running                      |
| SO <sub>2</sub>   | 7.9 - 22.0% of running                      |
| ROG               | 4.7 – 13.2% of total                        |

### Discussion:

The amount of pricing will vary on a case-by-case basis. The 100 – 500% increase is an estimated range of increases and should be adjusted to reflect the specificities of the pricing scheme implemented. Take care in calculating the percentage increase in price if baseline is \$0.00. An upper limit of 500% may be a good check point. If baseline is zero, the Project Applicant may want to conduct calculations with a low baseline such as \$1.00.

These calculations assume that the project is within the area cordon, essentially assuming that 100% of project trips will be affected. See Appendix C to make appropriate adjustments.

### Example:

Sample calculations are provided below:

- Low Range % VMT Reduction (100% increase in price, peak period pricing) =  $100\% * 0.45 * 8.8\% = 4.0\%$
- High Range % VMT Reduction (500% increase in price, all-day pricing) =  $500\% * 0.45 * 21\% = 47.3\% = 22\%$  (established maximum based on literature)

### Preferred Literature:

- -0.45 VMT elasticity with regard to pricing
- 0.04-0.08% greenhouse gas (GHG) reduction

*Moving Cooler* [1] assumes an average of 3% of regional VMT would cross the CBD cordon. A VMT reduction of 20% was estimated to require an average of 65 cents/mile applied to all congested VMT in the CBD, major employment, and retail centers. The

<sup>75</sup> The percentage reduction reflects emission reductions from running emissions. The actual value will be less than this when starting and evaporative emissions are factored into the analysis. ROG emissions have been adjusted to reflect a ratio of 40% evaporative and 60% exhaust emissions based on a statewide EMFAC run of all vehicles.

# Transportation

MP# TR-3.6

RPT-1

Road Pricing Management

range in GHG reductions is attributed to the range of implementation and start date. *Moving Cooler* reports an elasticity range from -0.15 to -0.47 from VTPI. *Moving Cooler* utilizes a stronger elasticity (0.45) to represent greater impact cordon pricing will have on users compared to other pricing strategies.

## Alternative Literature:

- 6.5-14.0% reduction in carbon emissions
- 16-22% reduction in vehicles
- 6-9% increase in transit use

The Center for Clean Air Policy (CCAP) [2] cites two case studies in Europe, one in London and one in Stockholm, which show vehicle reductions of 16% and 22%, respectively. London's fee reduced CO<sub>2</sub> by 6.5%. Stockholm's program reduced injuries by 10%, increased transit use by 6-9%, and reduced carbon emissions by 14% in the central city within months of implementation.

## Alternative Literature References:

[2] Center for Clean Air Policy (CCAP), *Short-term Efficiency Measures*. (p. 1)

<http://www.ccap.org/docs/resources/715/Short-Term%20Travel%20Efficiency%20Measures%20cut%20GHGs%209%2009%20final.pdf>

CCAP cites Transport for London. *Central London Congestion Charging: Impacts Monitoring, Sixth Annual Report*. July 2008 <http://www.tfl.gov.uk/assets/downloads/sixth-annual-impacts-monitoring-report-2008-07.pdf> (p. 6) and Leslie Abboud and Jenny Clevstrom, "Stockholm's Syndrome," August 29, 2006, *Wall Street Journal*. [http://transportation.northwestern.edu/mahmassani/Media/WSJ\\_8.06.pdf](http://transportation.northwestern.edu/mahmassani/Media/WSJ_8.06.pdf) (p. 2)

## Other Literature Reviewed:

None



# Transportation

MP# TR-2.1 & TR-2.2

RPT-2

Road Pricing Management

- Future travel speed (mph) on implemented roads for both a) congested and b) free-flow<sup>77</sup> condition
- Total vehicle miles traveled (VMT) on implemented roadways
- Total project-generated VMT

## Mitigation Method:

$$\% \text{ CO}_2 \text{ Emissions Reduction} = 1 - \frac{\text{Project GHG Emission}_{\text{post strategy}}}{\text{Project GHG emission}_{\text{baseline}}}$$

Where

Project GHG emission<sub>post strategy</sub> = EF<sub>running</sub> after strategy implementation \* project VMT

Project GHG emission<sub>baseline</sub> = EF<sub>running</sub> before strategy implementation \* project VMT

EF<sub>running</sub> = emission factor for running emissions [from table presented under “Detail” below]

Detail:

| mph | Grams of CO <sub>2</sub> / mile |           |
|-----|---------------------------------|-----------|
|     | congested                       | Free-flow |
| 5   | 1,110                           | 823       |
| 10  | 715                             | 512       |
| 15  | 524                             | 368       |
| 20  | 424                             | 297       |
| 25  | 371                             | 262       |
| 30  | 343                             | 247       |
| 35  | 330                             | 244       |
| 40  | 324                             | 249       |
| 45  | 323                             | 259       |
| 50  | 325                             | 273       |
| 55  | 328                             | 289       |
| 60  | 332                             | 306       |
| 65  | 339                             | 325       |
| 70  | 353                             | 347       |
| 75  | 377                             | 375       |
| 80  | 420                             | 416       |
| 85  | 497                             | 478       |

Source: Barth, 2008, Fehr & Peers [1]

<sup>77</sup> A roadway is considered “free flow” if operating at LOS D or better

# Transportation

MP# TR-2.1 & TR-2.2
**RPT-2**
**Road Pricing Management**

By only including the project VMT portion, the reduction is typically on scale with the percentage of cost for traffic improvements and full reduction calculated for project VMT should be used. However, if the project cost is a greater share than their contribution to the VMT on the road, than the project and non-project VMT should be calculated and the percent reduction should be multiplied by the percent cost allocation. The GHG emission reductions associated with non-project VMT (if applicable) would be calculated as follows:

$$\begin{matrix} \text{Metric Tonnes GHG} \\ \text{reduced due to improving} \\ \text{non-Project traffic flow} \end{matrix} = \% \text{ Cost Allocation} * \text{Non-Project VMT} * \frac{(EF_{\text{congested}} - EF_{\text{freeflow}})}{(1,000,000 \text{ gram/MT})}$$

Where:

Non-Project VMT  
that the Project's cost share impacts

= portion of non-project VMT

$EF_{\text{congested}}$   
congested road in g/VMT

= emissions for

$EF_{\text{freeflow}}$   
freeflow road in g/VMT

= emissions for

### Assumptions:

Data based upon the following references:

[1] Barth and Boriboonsomsin, "Real World CO<sub>2</sub> Impacts of Traffic Congestion", *Transportation Research Record, Journal of the Transportation Research Board*, No. 2058, Transportation Research Board, National Academy of Science, 2008.

### Emission Reduction Ranges and Variables:

| Pollutant         | Category Emissions Reductions <sup>78</sup> |
|-------------------|---|
| CO <sub>2</sub> e | 0 - 45% of running                          |
| PM                | 0 - 45% of running                          |
| CO                | 0 - 45% of running                          |

<sup>78</sup> The percentage reduction reflects emission reductions from running emissions. The actual value will be less than this when starting and evaporative emissions are factored into the analysis. ROG emissions have been adjusted to reflect a ratio of 40% evaporative and 60% exhaust emissions based on a statewide EMFAC run of all vehicles.

# Transportation

MP# TR-2.1 & TR-2.2

RPT-2

Road Pricing Management

|                 |                    |
|-----------------|--------------------|
| NOx             | 0 - 45% of running |
| SO <sub>2</sub> | 0 - 45% of running |
| ROG             | 0 - 27% of total   |

## Discussion:

Care must be taken when estimating effectiveness since significantly improving traffic flow essentially lowers the cost and delay involved in travel, which under certain circumstances may induce additional VMT. [See Appendix C for a discussion on induced travel.]

The range of effectiveness presented above is a very rough estimate as emissions reductions will be highly dependent on the level of implementation and degree of congestion on the existing roadways. In addition, the low range of effectiveness was stated at 0% to highlight the potential of induced travel negating benefits achieved from this strategy.

## Example:

Sample calculations are provided below:

- Signal timing coordination implementation:
  - Existing congested speeds of 25 mph
  - Conditions post-implementation: would improve to 25 mph free flow speed
  - Proposed project daily traffic generation is 200,000 VMT
  - Project CO<sub>2</sub> Emissions<sub>baseline</sub> = (371 g CO<sub>2</sub>/mile) \* (200,000 VMT daily) \* (1 MT / 1 x 10<sup>6</sup> g) = 74 MT of CO<sub>2</sub> daily
  - Project CO<sub>2</sub> Emissions<sub>post strategy</sub> = (262 g CO<sub>2</sub>/mile) \* (200,000 VMT daily) \* (1 MT / 1 x 10<sup>6</sup> g) = 52.4 MT of CO<sub>2</sub> daily
  - Percent CO<sub>2</sub>emissions reduction = 1 - (52.4 MT/ 74 MT) = 29%
- Speed management technique:
  - Existing free-flow speeds of 75 mph
  - Conditions post-implementation: reduce to 55 mph free flow speed
  - Proposed project daily traffic generation is 200,000 VMT
  - Project CO<sub>2</sub> Emissions<sub>baseline</sub> = (375 g CO<sub>2</sub>/mile) \* (200,000 VMT daily) \* (1 MT / 1 x 10<sup>6</sup> g) = 75 MT of CO<sub>2</sub> daily
  - Project CO<sub>2</sub> Emissions<sub>post strategy</sub> = (289 g CO<sub>2</sub>/mile) \* (200,000 VMT daily) \* (1 MT / 1 x 10<sup>6</sup> g) = 58 MT of CO<sub>2</sub> daily
  - Percent CO<sub>2</sub>emissions reduction= 1 – (58 tons/ 75 tons) = 23%

## Preferred Literature:

- 7 – 12% reduction in CO<sub>2</sub> emissions

# Transportation

MP# TR-2.1 & TR-2.2

RPT-2

Road Pricing Management

This study [1] examined traffic conditions in Southern California using energy and emissions modeling and calculated the impacts of 1) congestion mitigation strategies to smooth traffic flow, 2) speed management techniques to reduce high free-flow speeds, and 3) suppression techniques to eliminate acceleration/deceleration associated with stop-and-go traffic. Using typical conditions on Southern California freeways, the strategies could reduce emissions by 7 to 12 percent.

The table (in the mitigation method section) was calculated using the CO<sub>2</sub> emissions equation from the report:

$$\ln(y) = b_0 + b_1 * x + b_2 * x^2 + b_3 * x^3 + b_4 * x^4$$

where

y = CO<sub>2</sub> emission in grams / mile

x = average trip speed in miles per hour (mph)

The coefficients for b<sub>i</sub> were based off of Table 1 of the report, which then provides an equation for both congested conditions (real-world) and free-flow (steady-state) conditions.

### Alternative Literature:

- 4 - 13% reduction in fuel consumption

The FHWA study [2] looks at various case studies of traffic flow improvements. In Los Angeles, a new traffic control signal system was estimated to reduce signal delays by 44%, vehicle stops by 41%, and fuel consumption by 13%. In Virginia, a study of retiming signal systems estimated reductions of stops by 25%, travel time by 10%, and fuel consumption by 4%. In California, optimization of 3,172 traffic signals through 1988 (through California's Fuel Efficient Traffic Signal Management program) documented an average reduction in vehicle stops of 16% and in fuel use of 8.6%. The 4-13% reduction in fuel consumption applies only to that vehicular travel directly benefited by the traffic flow improvements, specifically the VMT within the corridor in which the ITS is implemented and only during the times of day that would otherwise be congested without ITS. For example, signal coordination along an arterial normally congested in peak commute hours would produce a 4-13% reduction in fuel consumption only for the VMT occurring along that arterial during weekday commute hours.

*Alternate:*

- Up to 0.02% increase in greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions

*Moving Cooler* [3] estimates that bottleneck relief will result in an increase in GHG emissions during the 40-year period, 2010 to 2050. In the short term, however,

# Transportation

MP# TR-2.1 & TR-2.2

**RPT-2**

**Road Pricing Management**

improved roadway conditions may improve congestion and delay, and thus reduce fuel consumption. VMT and GHG emissions are projected to increase after 2030 as induced demand begins to consume the roadway capacity. The study estimates a maximum increase of 0.02% in GHG emissions.

**Alternative Literature References:**

[2] FHWA, *Strategies to Reduce Greenhouse Gas Emissions from Transportation Sources*. [http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/glob\\_c5.pdf](http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/glob_c5.pdf).

[3] Cambridge Systematics. *Moving Cooler: An Analysis of Transportation Strategies for Reducing Greenhouse Gas Emissions*. Technical Appendices. Prepared for the Urban Land Institute.  
[http://www.movingcooler.info/Library/Documents/Moving%20Cooler\\_Appendix%20B\\_Effectiveness\\_102209.pdf](http://www.movingcooler.info/Library/Documents/Moving%20Cooler_Appendix%20B_Effectiveness_102209.pdf)

**Other Literature Reviewed:**

None

### 3.6.3 Required Project Contributions to Transportation Infrastructure Improvement Projects

**Range of Effectiveness:** Grouped strategy. [See RPT-2 and TST-1 through 7]

**Measure Description:**

The project should contribute to traffic-flow improvements or other multi-modal infrastructure projects that reduce emissions and are not considered as substantially growth inducing. The local transportation agency should be consulted for specific needs.

Larger projects may be required to contribute a proportionate share to the development and/or continuation of a regional transit system. Contributions may consist of dedicated right-of-way, capital improvements, easements, etc. The local transportation agency should be consulted for specific needs.

Refer to Traffic Flow Improvements (RPT-2) or the Transit System Improvements (TST-1 through 7) strategies for a range of effectiveness in these categories. The benefits of Required Contributions may only be quantified when grouped with related improvements.

**Measure Applicability:**

- Urban, suburban, and rural context
- Appropriate for residential, retail, office, mixed use, and industrial projects

**Alternative Literature:**

Although no literature discusses project contributions as a standalone measure, this strategy is a supporting strategy for most operations and infrastructure projects listed in this report.

**Other Literature Reviewed:**

None

# Transportation

MP# TR-1

RPT-4

Road Pricing Management

## 3.6.4 Install Park-and-Ride Lots

**Range of Effectiveness:** Grouped strategy. [See RPT-1, TRT-11, TRT-3, and TST-1 through 6]

### Measure Description:

This project will install park-and-ride lots near transit stops and High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lanes. Park-and-ride lots also facilitate car- and vanpooling. Refer to Implement Area or Cordon Pricing (RPT-1), Employer-Sponsored Vanpool/Shuttle (TRT-11), Ride Share Program (TRT-3), or the Transit System Improvement strategies (TST-1 through 6) for ranges of effectiveness within these categories. The benefits of Park-and-Ride Lots are minimal as a stand-alone strategy and should be grouped with any or all of the above listed strategies to encourage carpooling, vanpooling, ride-sharing, and transit usage.

### Measure Applicability:

- Suburban and rural context
- Appropriate for residential, retail, office, mixed use, and industrial projects

### Alternative Literature:

#### *Alternate:*

- 0.1 – 0.5% vehicle miles traveled (VMT) reduction

A 2005 FHWA [1] study found that regional VMT in metropolitan areas may be reduced between 0.1 to 0.5% (citing Apogee Research, Inc., 1994). The reduction potential of this strategy may be limited because it reduces the trip length but not vehicle trips.

#### *Alternate:*

- 0.50% VMT reduction per day

Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) [2] notes the above number applies to countywide interstates and arterials.

### Alternative Literature References:

[1] FHWA. Transportation and Global Climate Change: A Review and Analysis of the Literature – Chapter 5: Strategies to Reduce Greenhouse Gas Emissions from Transportation Sources.

[http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/glob\\_c5.pdf](http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/glob_c5.pdf)

## Transportation

MP# TR-1

RPT-4

Road Pricing Management

[2] Washington State Department of Transportation. *Cost Effectiveness of Park-and-Ride Lots in the Puget Sound Area.*

<http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/research/reports/fullreports/094.1.pdf>

### Other Literature Reviewed:

None

## 3.7 Vehicles

### 3.7.1 Electrify Loading Docks and/or Require Idling-Reduction Systems

**Range of Effectiveness:** 26-71% reduction in TRU idling GHG emissions

**Measure Description:**

Heavy-duty trucks transporting produce or other refrigerated goods will idle at truck loading docks and during layovers or rest periods so that the truck engine can continue to power the cab cooling elements. Idling requires fuel use and results in GHG emissions.

The Project Applicant should implement an enforcement and education program that will ensure compliance with this measure. This includes posting signs regarding idling restrictions as well as recording engine meter times upon entering and exiting the facility.

**Measure Applicability:**

- Truck refrigeration units (TRU)

**Inputs:**

The following information needs to be provided by the Project Applicant:

- Electricity provider for the Project
- Horsepower of TRU
- Hours of operation

**Baseline Method:**

$$\text{GHG emission} = \frac{\text{CO}_2 \text{ Exhaust}}{\text{Activity} \times \text{AvgHP} \times \text{LF}} \times \text{Hp} \times \text{Hr} \times \text{C} \times \text{LF}$$

Where:

GHG emission = MT CO<sub>2</sub>e

CO<sub>2</sub> Exhaust = Statewide daily CO<sub>2</sub> emission from TRU for the relevant horsepower tier (tons/day). Obtained from OFFROAD2007.

Activity = Statewide daily average TRU operating hours for the relevant horsepower tier (hours/day). Obtained from OFFROAD2007.

AvgHP = Average TRU horsepower for the relevant horsepower tier (HP). Obtained from OFFROAD2007.

Hp = Horsepower of TRU.

Hr = Hours of operation.

C = Unit conversion factor

# Transportation

MP# TR-6

VT-1

Vehicles

LF = Load factor of TRU for the relevant horsepower tier (dimensionless).  
Obtained from OFFROAD 2007.

Note that this method assumes the load factor of the TRU is same as the default in OFFROAD2007.

## Mitigation Method:

### Electrify loading docks

TRUs will be plugged into electric loading dock instead of left idling. The indirect GHG emission from electricity generation is:

$$\text{GHG emission} = \text{Utility} \times \text{Hp} \times \text{LF} \times \text{Hr} \times \text{C}$$

Where:

GHG emissions = MT CO<sub>2</sub>e

Utility = Carbon intensity of Local Utility (CO<sub>2</sub>e/kWh)

Hp = Horsepower of TRU.

LF = Load factor of TRU for the relevant horsepower tier (dimensionless).  
Obtained from OFFROAD2007.

Hr = Hours of operation.

C = Unit conversion factor

$$\text{GHG Reduction \%}^{79} = 1 - \frac{\text{Utility} \times \text{C}}{\text{EF} \times 10^{-6}}$$

### Idling Reduction

Emissions from reduced TRU idling periods are calculated using the same methodology for the baseline scenario, but with the shorter hours of operation.

$$\text{GHG Reduction \%} = 1 - \frac{\text{time}_{\text{mitigated}}}{\text{time}_{\text{baseline}}}$$

### Electrify loading docks

| Power Utility | TRU Horsepower (HP) | Idling Emission Reductions <sup>80</sup> |
|---------------|---------------------|--|
| LADW&P        | < 15                | 26.3%                                    |
|               | < 25                | 26.3%                                    |
|               | < 50                | 35.8%                                    |

<sup>79</sup> This assumes energy from engine losses are the same.

<sup>80</sup> This reduction percentage applies to all GHG and criteria pollutant idling emissions.

# Transportation

MP# TR-6

VT-1

Vehicles

|      |      |       |
|------|------|-------|
| PG&E | < 15 | 72.9% |
|      | < 25 | 72.9% |
|      | < 50 | 76.3% |
| SCE  | < 15 | 61.8% |
|      | < 25 | 61.8% |
|      | < 50 | 66.7% |
| SDGE | < 15 | 53.5% |
|      | < 25 | 53.5% |
|      | < 50 | 59.5% |
| SMUD | < 15 | 67.0% |
|      | < 25 | 67.0% |
|      | < 50 | 71.2% |

## Idling Reduction

Emission reduction from shorter idling period is same as the percentage reduction in idling time.

## **Discussion:**

The output from OFFROAD2007 shows the same emissions within each horsepower tier regardless of the year modeled. Therefore, the emission reduction is dependent on the location of the Project and horsepower of the TRU only.

## **Assumptions:**

Data based upon the following references:

- California Air Resources Board. Off-road Emissions Inventory. OFFROAD2007. Available online at: <http://www.arb.ca.gov/msei/offroad/offroad.htm>
- California Climate Action Registry Reporting Online Tool. 2006 PUP Reports. Available online at: <https://www.climateregistry.org/CARROT/public/reports.aspx>

## **Preferred Literature:**

The electrification of truck loading docks can allow properly equipped trucks to take advantage of external power and completely eliminate the need for idling. Trucks would need to be equipped with internal wiring, inverter, system, and a heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) system. Under this mitigation measure, the direct emissions from fuel combustion are completely displaced by indirect emissions from the CO<sub>2</sub> generated during electricity production. The amount of electricity required depends on the type of truck and refrigeration elements; this data could be determined from manufacturer specifications. The total kilowatt-hours required should be multiplied by the carbon-intensity factor of the local utility provider in order to calculate the amount of indirect CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. To take credit for this mitigation measure, the Project Applicant

# Transportation

MP# TR-6

VT-1

Vehicles

would need to provide detailed evidence supporting a calculation of the emissions reductions.

## Alternative Literature:

None

## Other Literature Reviewed:

1. USEPA. 2002. Green Transport Partnership, A Glance at Clean Freight Strategies: Idle Reduction. Available online at: <http://nepis.epa.gov/Adobe/PDF/P1000S9K.PDF>
2. ATRI. 2009. Research Results: Demonstration of Integrated Mobile Idle Reduction Solutions. Available online at: <http://www.atrionline.org/research/results/ATRI1pagesummaryMIRTDemo.pdf>

None

# Transportation

CEQA# MM T-21

VT-2

Vehicles

## 3.7.2 Utilize Alternative Fueled Vehicles

**Range of Effectiveness:** Reduction in GHG emissions varies depending on vehicle type, year, and associated fuel economy.

### Measure Description:

When construction equipment is powered by alternative fuels such as biodiesel (B20), liquefied natural gas (LNG), or compressed natural gas (CNG) rather than conventional petroleum diesel or gasoline, GHG emissions from fuel combustion may be reduced.

### Measure Applicability:

- Vehicles

### Inputs:

The following information needs to be provided by the Project Applicant:

- Vehicle category
- Traveling speed (mph)
- Number of trips and trip length, or Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)
- Fuel economy (mpg) or Fuel consumption

### Baseline Method:

$$\text{Baseline CO}_2 \text{ Emission} = \text{EF} \times \frac{1}{\text{FE}} \times \text{VMT} \times \text{C}$$

Where:

- Baseline CO<sub>2</sub> Emission = MT of CO<sub>2</sub>
- EF = CO<sub>2</sub> emission factor, from CCAR General Reporting Protocol (g/gallon)
- VMT = Vehicle miles traveled (VMT) = T x L
- FE = Fuel economy (mpg)
- C = Unit conversion factor

$$\text{Baseline N}_2\text{O /CH}_4 \text{ Emission} = \text{EF} \times \text{VMT} \times \text{C}$$

Where:

- Baseline N<sub>2</sub>O/CH<sub>4</sub> Emission = MT of N<sub>2</sub>O or CH<sub>4</sub>
- EF = N<sub>2</sub>O or CH<sub>4</sub> emission factor, from CCAR General Reporting Protocol (g/mile)
- VMT = Vehicle miles traveled (VMT) = T x L
- T = Number of one-way trips
- L = One-way trip length
- FC = Fuel consumption (gallon) = VMT/FE

# Transportation

CEQA# MM T-21

VT-2

Vehicles

FE = Fuel economy (mpg)  
C = Unit conversion factor

The total baseline GHG emission is the sum of the emissions of CO<sub>2</sub>, N<sub>2</sub>O and CH<sub>4</sub>, adjusted by their global warming potentials (GWP):

Baseline GHG Emission

$$= \text{Baseline CO}_2 \text{ Emission} + \text{Baseline N}_2\text{O Emission} \times 310 + \text{Baseline CH}_4 \text{ Emission} \times 21$$

Where:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Baseline GHG Emission} &= \text{MT of CO}_2\text{e} \\ 310 &= \text{GWP of N}_2\text{O} \\ 21 &= \text{GWP of CH}_4 \end{aligned}$$

## Mitigation Method:

Mitigated emissions from using alternative fuel is calculated using the same methodology before, but using emission factors for the alternative fuel, and fuel consumption calculated as follows:

$$\text{GHG Emissions} = \frac{1}{\text{FE}} \times \text{ER} \times \text{VMT} \times \text{EF}_{\text{CO}_2} + \text{VMT} \times \text{EF}_{\text{N}_2\text{O}} + \text{VMT} \times \text{EF}_{\text{CH}_4}$$

Where:

ER = Energy ratio from US Department of Energy (see table below)  
EF = Emission Factor for pollutant  
VMT = Vehicle miles traveled (VMT)  
FE = Fuel economy (mpg)

| Fuel      | Energy Ratio:<br>Amount of fuel needed to provide same energy as |                 |                    |                 |
|-----------|--|-----------------|--------------------|-----------------|
|           | 1 gallon of Gasoline   |                 | 1 gallon of Diesel |                 |
| Gasoline  | 1  | gal             | 1.13               | gal             |
| #2 Diesel | 0.88   | gal             | 1                  | gal             |
| B20       | 0.92   | gal             | 1.01               | gal             |
| CNG       | 126.<br>67   | ft <sup>3</sup> | 143.14             | ft <sup>3</sup> |
| LNG       | 1.56   | gal             | 1.77               | gal             |
| LPC       | 1.37   | gal             | 1.55               | gal             |

# Transportation

CEQA# MM T-21

VT-2

Vehicles

Emission reductions can be calculated as:

$$\text{Reduction} = 1 - \frac{\text{Mitigated Emission}}{\text{Running Emission}}$$

## Emission Reduction Ranges and Variables:

| Pollutant         | Category Emissions Reductions      |
|-------------------|------------------------------------|
| CO <sub>2</sub> e | Range Not Quantified <sup>81</sup> |
| PM                | Range Not Quantified               |
| CO                | Range Not Quantified               |
| NO <sub>x</sub>   | Range Not Quantified               |
| SO <sub>2</sub>   | Range Not Quantified               |
| ROG               | Range Not Quantified               |

## Discussion:

Using the methodology described above, only the running emission is considered. A hypothetical scenario for a gasoline fueled light duty automobile in 2015 is illustrated below. The CO<sub>2</sub> emission factor from motor gasoline in CCAR 2009 is 8.81 kg/gallon. Assuming the automobile makes two trips of 60 mile each per day, and using the current passenger car fuel economy of 27.5 mpg under the CAFE standards, then the annual baseline CO<sub>2</sub> emission from the automobile is:

$$8.81 \times \frac{2 \times 60 \times 365}{27.5} \times 10^{-3} = 14.0 \text{ MT/year}$$

Where 10<sup>-3</sup> is the conversion factor from kilograms to MT.

Using the most recent N<sub>2</sub>O emission factor of 0.0079 g/mile in CCAR 2009 for gasoline passenger cars, the annual baseline N<sub>2</sub>O emission from the automobile is:

$$0.0079 \times 2 \times 365 \times 60 \times 10^{-6} = 0.000346 \text{ MT/year}$$

<sup>81</sup> The emissions reductions varies and depends on vehicle type, year, and the associated fuel economy. The methodology above describes how to calculate the expected GHG emissions reduction assuming the required input parameters are known.

# Transportation

CEQA# MM T-21

VT-2

Vehicles

Similarly, using the same formula with the most recent CH<sub>4</sub> emission factor of 0.0147 g/mile in CCAR 2009 for gasoline passenger cars, the annual baseline CH<sub>4</sub> emission from the automobile is calculated to be 0.000644 MT/year.

Thus, the total baseline GHG emission for the automobile is:

$$14.0 + 0.000346 \times 310 + 0.000644 \times 21 = 14.1 \text{ MT/year}$$

If compressed natural gas (CNG) is used as alternative fuel, the CNG consumption for the same VMT is:

$$\frac{2 \times 60 \times 365}{27.5} \times 126.67 = 201,751 \text{ ft}^3$$

Using the same formula as for the baseline scenario but with emission factors of CNG and the CNG consumption, the mitigated GHG emission can be calculated as shown in the table below

| Pollutant         | Emission (MT/yr) |
|-------------------|------------------|
| CO <sub>2</sub>   | 11.0             |
| N <sub>2</sub> O  | 0.0022           |
| CH <sub>4</sub>   | 0.0323           |
| CO <sub>2</sub> e | 12.4             |

Therefore, the emission reduction is:

$$1 - \frac{12.4}{14.0} = 11.4\%$$

Notice that in the baseline scenario, N<sub>2</sub>O and CH<sub>4</sub> only make up <1% of the total GHG emissions, but actually increase for the mitigated scenario and contribute to >10% of total GHG emissions.

## Assumptions:

Data based upon the following references:

- California Climate Action Registry (CCAR). 2009. General Reporting Protocol. Version 3.1. Available online at: <http://www.climateregistry.org/tools/protocols/general-reporting-protocol.html>

# Transportation

CEQA# MM T-21

VT-2

Vehicles

- US Department of Energy. 2010. Alternative and Advanced Fuels – Fuel Properties. Available online at: <http://www.afdc.energy.gov/afdc/fuels/properties.html>

## Preferred Literature:

The amount of emissions avoided from using alternative fuel vehicles can be calculated using emission factors from the California Climate Action Registry (CCAR) General Reporting Protocol [1]. Multiplying this factor by the fuel consumption or vehicle miles traveled (VMT) gives the direct emissions of CO<sub>2</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O /CH<sub>4</sub>, respectively. Fuel consumption and VMT can be calculated interchangeably with the fuel economy (mpg). The total GHG emission is the sum of the emissions from the three chemicals multiplied by their respective global warming potential (GWP).

Assuming the same VMT, the amount of alternative fuel required to run the same vehicle fleet can be calculated by multiplying gasoline/diesel fuel consumption by the equivalent-energy ratio obtained from the US Department of Energy [2]. Using the alternative fuel consumption and the emission factors for the alternative fuel from CCAR, the mitigated GHG emissions can be calculated. The GHG emissions reduction associated with this mitigation measure is therefore the difference in emissions from these two scenarios.

## Alternative Literature:

None

## Notes:

[1] California Climate Action Registry (CCAR). 2009. General Reporting Protocol. Version 3.1. Available online at:

<http://www.climateregistry.org/tools/protocols/general-reporting-protocol.html>

[2] US Department of Energy. 2010. Alternative and Advanced Fuels – Fuel Properties.

Available online at: <http://www.afdc.energy.gov/afdc/fuels/properties.html>

## Other Literature Reviewed:

None

# Transportation

CEQA# MM T-20

VT-3

Vehicles

## 3.7.3 Utilize Electric or Hybrid Vehicles

**Range of Effectiveness:** 0.4 - 20.3% reduction in GHG emissions

### Measure Description:

When vehicles are powered by grid electricity rather than fossil fuel, direct GHG emissions from fuel combustion are replaced with indirect GHG emissions associated with the electricity used to power the vehicles. When vehicles are powered by hybrid-electric drives, GHG emissions from fuel combustion are reduced.

### Measure Applicability:

- Vehicles

### Inputs:

The following information needs to be provided by the Project Applicant:

- Vehicle category
- Traveling speed (mph)
- Number of trips and trip length, or Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)
- Fuel economy (mpg)

### Baseline Method:

$$\text{Baseline Emission} = \text{EF} \times (1 - \text{R}) \times \text{VMT} \times \text{C}$$

Where:

Baseline Emission = MT of Pollutant

EF = Running emission factor for pollutant at traveling speed, from EMFAC.

VMT = Vehicle miles traveled (VMT)

R = Additional reduction in EF due to regulation (see Table 1)

C = Unit conversion factor

### Mitigation Method:

#### Fully Electric Vehicle

Vehicle will run solely on electricity. The indirect GHG emission from electricity generation is:

$$\text{Mitigated Emission} = \text{Utility} \times \frac{1}{\text{FE}} \times \text{VMT} \times \text{ER} \times \text{C}$$

# Transportation

CEQA# MM T-20

VT-3

Vehicles

Where:

- Mitigated Emission = MT of CO<sub>2</sub>e
- Utility = Carbon intensity of Local Utility (CO<sub>2</sub>e/kWh)
- VMT = Vehicle miles traveled (VMT)
- ER = Energy Ratio = 33.4 kWh/gallon-gasoline or 37.7 kWh/gallon-diesel
- FE = Fuel Economy (mpg)
- C = Unit conversion factor

| Power Utility | Carbon-Intensity<br>(lbs CO <sub>2</sub> e/MWh) |
|---------------|---|
| LADW&P        | 1,238   |
| PG&E          | 456   |
| SCE           | 641   |
| SDGE          | 781   |
| SMUD          | 555   |

Criteria pollutant emissions will be 100% reduced for equipment running solely on electricity.

### Hybrid-Electric Vehicle

The Project Applicant has to determine the fuel consumption reduced from using the hybrid-electric vehicle. The emission reductions for all pollutants are the same as the fuel reduction.

Emission reductions can be calculated as:

$$\text{GHG Reduction\%} = 1 - \frac{\text{Mitigated Emission}}{\text{RunningEmission}}$$

### **Emission Reduction Ranges and Variables:**

See Table VT-3.1 below.

### **Discussion:**

Using the methodology described above, only the running emission is considered. A hypothetical scenario for a gasoline fueled light duty automobile with catalytic converter in 2015 is illustrated below. The running CO<sub>2</sub> emission factor at 30 mph from an EMFAC run of the Sacramento county with temperature of 60F and relative humidity of 45% is 336.1 g/mile. From Table VT-3.1, there will be an additional reduction of 9.1% for the emission factor in 2015 due to Pavley standard. Assuming the automobile makes two trips of 60 mile each per day, then annual baseline emission from the automobile is:

# Transportation

CEQA# MM T-20

VT-3

Vehicles

$$336.1 \times (100\% - 9.1\%) \times 2 \times 365 \times 60 \times 10^{-6} = 13.4 \text{ MT/year}$$

Where  $10^{-6}$  is the conversion factor from grams to MT. Assuming the current passenger car fuel economy of 27.5 mpg under the CAFE standards, and using the carbon-intensity factor for PG&E, the electric provider for the Sacramento region, the mitigated emission from replacing the automobile described above with electric vehicle would be:

$$\left( 456 \times \frac{2 \times 365 \times 60}{27.5} \times 33.4 \times \frac{1}{2,204 \times 10^3} \right) = 11.0 \text{ MT/year}$$

Therefore, the emission reduction is:

$$1 - \frac{11.0}{13.4} = 17.9\%$$

## Assumptions:

Data based upon the following references:

- California Air Resources Board. EMFAC2007. Available online at: [http://www.arb.ca.gov/msei/onroad/latest\\_version.htm](http://www.arb.ca.gov/msei/onroad/latest_version.htm)
- California Climate Action Registry (CCAR). 2009. General Reporting Protocol. Version 3.1. Available online at: <http://www.climateregistry.org/tools/protocols/general-reporting-protocol.html>
- California Climate Action Registry Reporting Online Tool. 2006 PUP Reports. Available online at: <https://www.climateregistry.org/CARROT/public/reports.aspx>
- US Department of Energy. 2010. Alternative and Advanced Fuels – Fuel Properties. Available online at: <http://www.afdc.energy.gov/afdc/fuels/properties.html>

## Preferred Literature:

The amount of emissions avoided from using electric and hybrid vehicles can be calculated using CARB's EMFAC model, which provides state-wide and regional running emission factors for a variety of on-road vehicles in units of grams per mile [1]. Multiplying this factor by the vehicle miles traveled (VMT) gives the direct emissions. For criteria pollutant, emissions can be assumed to be 100% reduced from running on electricity. For GHG, assuming the same VMT, the electricity required to run the same vehicle fleet can be calculated by dividing by the fuel economy (mpg) and multiplying the gasoline-electric energy ratio obtained from the US Department of Energy [2]. Multiplying this value by the carbon-intensity factor of the local utility gives the amount of indirect GHG emissions associated with electric vehicles. The GHG emissions

# Transportation

CEQA# MM T-20

VT-3

Vehicles

reduction associated with this mitigation measure is therefore the difference in emissions from these two scenarios.

**Alternative Literature:**

None

**Notes:**

[1] California Air Resources Board. EMFAC2007. Available online at:

[http://www.arb.ca.gov/msei/onroad/latest\\_version.htm](http://www.arb.ca.gov/msei/onroad/latest_version.htm)

[2] US Department of Energy. 2010. Alternative and Advanced Fuels – Fuel Properties.

Available online at: <http://www.afdc.energy.gov/afdc/fuels/properties.html>

**Other Literature Reviewed:**

None

# Transportation

CEQA# MM T-20

VT-3

Vehicles

**Table VT-3.1**  
**Reduction in EMFAC Running Emission Factor from New Regulations**

| Year | Vehicle Class                            | Reduction | Pollutant       | Regulation                                    |
|------|--|-----------|-----------------|---|
| 2010 | LDA/LDT/MDV                              | 0.4%      | CO <sub>2</sub> | Pavley Standard                               |
| 2011 | LDA/LDT/MDV                              | 1.6%      | CO <sub>2</sub> | Pavley Standard                               |
| 2012 | LDA/LDT/MDV                              | 3.5%      | CO <sub>2</sub> | Pavley Standard                               |
| 2013 | LDA/LDT/MDV                              | 5.3%      | CO <sub>2</sub> | Pavley Standard                               |
| 2014 | LDA/LDT/MDV                              | 7.1%      | CO <sub>2</sub> | Pavley Standard                               |
| 2015 | LDA/LDT/MDV                              | 9.1%      | CO <sub>2</sub> | Pavley Standard                               |
| 2016 | LDA/LDT/MDV                              | 11.0%     | CO <sub>2</sub> | Pavley Standard                               |
| 2017 | LDA/LDT/MDV                              | 13.1%     | CO <sub>2</sub> | Pavley Standard                               |
| 2018 | LDA/LDT/MDV                              | 15.5%     | CO <sub>2</sub> | Pavley Standard                               |
| 2019 | LDA/LDT/MDV                              | 17.9%     | CO <sub>2</sub> | Pavley Standard                               |
| 2020 | LDA/LDT/MDV                              | 20.3%     | CO <sub>2</sub> | Pavley Standard                               |
| 2011 | Other Buses                              | 21.8%     | PM2.5           | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2011 | School Bus                               | 19.8%     | PM2.5           | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2011 | MHDDT Agriculture                        | 17.2%     | PM2.5           | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2011 | MHDDT CA International Registration Plan | 4.6%      | PM2.5           | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2011 | MHDDT Instate                            | 6.1%      | PM2.5           | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2011 | MHDDT Out-of-state                       | 4.6%      | PM2.5           | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2011 | HHDDT Agriculture                        | 23.3%     | PM2.5           | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2011 | HHDDT CA International Registration Plan | 1.7%      | PM2.5           | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2011 | HHDDT Non-neighboring Out-of-state       | 0.5%      | PM2.5           | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2011 | HHDDT Neighboring Out-of-state           | 2.6%      | PM2.5           | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2011 | HHDDT Singleunit                         | 10.3%     | PM2.5           | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2011 | HHDDT Tractor                            | 9.7%      | PM2.5           | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2012 | Other Buses                              | 25.1%     | PM2.5           | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2012 | Power Take Off                           | 28.4%     | PM2.5           | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2012 | School Bus                               | 45.7%     | PM2.5           | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2012 | MHDDT Agriculture                        | 20.9%     | PM2.5           | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2012 | MHDDT CA International Registration Plan | 12.6%     | PM2.5           | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2012 | MHDDT Instate                            | 11.6%     | PM2.5           | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles            |

# Transportation

CEQA# MM T-20

VT-3

Vehicles

| Year | Vehicle Class                            | Reduction | Pollutant | Regulation                                    |
|------|--|-----------|-----------|---|
|      |  |           |           | Regulation                                    |
| 2012 | MHDDT Out-of-state                       | 12.6%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2012 | HHDDT Agriculture                        | 29.2%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2012 | HHDDT CA International Registration Plan | 8.6%      | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2012 | HHDDT Non-neighboring Out-of-state       | 15.9%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2012 | HHDDT Neighboring Out-of-state           | 15.3%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2012 | HHDDT Drayage at Other Facilities        | 9.8%      | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2012 | HHDDT Drayage in Bay Area                | 9.9%      | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2012 | HHDDT Drayage near South Coast           | 7.7%      | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2012 | HHDDT Singleunit                         | 14.7%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2012 | HHDDT Tractor                            | 13.8%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2013 | Other Buses                              | 45.7%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2013 | Power Take Off                           | 57.8%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2013 | School Bus                               | 68.6%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2013 | MHDDT Agriculture                        | 31.1%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2013 | MHDDT CA International Registration Plan | 55.2%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2013 | MHDDT Instate                            | 64.5%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2013 | MHDDT Out-of-state                       | 55.2%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2013 | HHDDT Agriculture                        | 48.2%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2013 | HHDDT CA International Registration Plan | 60.3%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2013 | HHDDT Non-neighboring Out-of-state       | 50.6%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2013 | HHDDT Neighboring Out-of-state           | 63.2%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2013 | HHDDT Drayage at Other Facilities        | 67.3%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2013 | HHDDT Drayage in Bay Area                | 65.7%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2013 | HHDDT Drayage near South Coast           | 51.1%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |

# Transportation

CEQA# MM T-20

VT-3

Vehicles

| Year | Vehicle Class                            | Reduction | Pollutant | Regulation                                    |
|------|--|-----------|-----------|---|
| 2013 | HHDDT Singleunit                         | 66.3%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2013 | HHDDT Tractor                            | 69.6%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2014 | Other Buses                              | 53.9%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2014 | Power Take Off                           | 63.9%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2014 | School Bus                               | 71.4%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2014 | MHDDT Agriculture                        | 33.4%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2014 | MHDDT CA International Registration Plan | 65.7%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2014 | MHDDT Instate                            | 77.1%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2014 | MHDDT Out-of-state                       | 65.7%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2014 | MHDDT Utility                            | 0.8%      | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2014 | HHDDT Agriculture                        | 52.6%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2014 | HHDDT CA International Registration Plan | 63.8%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2014 | HHDDT Non-neighboring Out-of-state       | 46.8%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2014 | HHDDT Neighboring Out-of-state           | 64.1%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2014 | HHDDT Singleunit                         | 79.1%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2014 | HHDDT Tractor                            | 79.4%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2014 | HHDDT Utility                            | 4.7%      | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2015 | Other Buses                              | 49.5%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2015 | Power Take Off                           | 61.7%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2015 | School Bus                               | 71.1%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2015 | MHDDT Agriculture                        | 34.5%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2015 | MHDDT CA International Registration Plan | 60.8%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2015 | MHDDT Instate                            | 74.9%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2015 | MHDDT Out-of-state                       | 60.8%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2015 | MHDDT Utility                            | 0.8%      | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |

# Transportation

CEQA# MM T-20

VT-3

Vehicles

| Year | Vehicle Class                            | Reduction | Pollutant | Regulation                                    |
|------|--|-----------|-----------|---|
| 2015 | HHDDT Agriculture                        | 53.5%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2015 | HHDDT CA International Registration Plan | 55.0%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2015 | HHDDT Non-neighboring Out-of-state       | 37.3%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2015 | HHDDT Neighboring Out-of-state           | 55.2%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2015 | HHDDT Singleunit                         | 77.1%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2015 | HHDDT Tractor                            | 76.6%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2015 | HHDDT Utility                            | 4.4%      | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2016 | Other Buses                              | 43.3%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2016 | Power Take Off                           | 75.2%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2016 | School Bus                               | 70.1%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2016 | MHDDT Agriculture                        | 32.9%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2016 | MHDDT CA International Registration Plan | 56.7%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2016 | MHDDT Instate                            | 73.0%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2016 | MHDDT Out-of-state                       | 56.7%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2016 | MHDDT Utility                            | 0.8%      | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2016 | HHDDT Agriculture                        | 51.3%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2016 | HHDDT CA International Registration Plan | 45.9%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2016 | HHDDT Non-neighboring Out-of-state       | 27.8%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2016 | HHDDT Neighboring Out-of-state           | 46.1%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2016 | HHDDT Singleunit                         | 75.7%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2016 | HHDDT Tractor                            | 73.8%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2016 | HHDDT Utility                            | 4.1%      | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2017 | Other Buses                              | 36.0%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2017 | Power Take Off                           | 71.6%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2017 | School Bus                               | 67.8%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |

# Transportation

CEQA# MM T-20

VT-3

Vehicles

| Year | Vehicle Class                            | Reduction | Pollutant | Regulation                                    |
|------|--|-----------|-----------|---|
| 2017 | MHDDT Agriculture                        | 55.9%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2017 | MHDDT CA International Registration Plan | 52.6%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2017 | MHDDT Instate                            | 70.6%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2017 | MHDDT Out-of-state                       | 52.6%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2017 | MHDDT Utility                            | 0.8%      | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2017 | HHDDT Agriculture                        | 58.8%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2017 | HHDDT CA International Registration Plan | 37.0%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2017 | HHDDT Non-neighboring Out-of-state       | 18.3%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2017 | HHDDT Neighboring Out-of-state           | 37.2%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2017 | HHDDT Singleunit                         | 73.9%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2017 | HHDDT Tractor                            | 70.1%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2017 | HHDDT Utility                            | 3.8%      | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2018 | Other Buses                              | 31.4%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2018 | Power Take Off                           | 67.3%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2018 | School Bus                               | 74.9%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2018 | MHDDT Agriculture                        | 53.8%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2018 | MHDDT CA International Registration Plan | 47.7%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2018 | MHDDT Instate                            | 68.5%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2018 | MHDDT Out-of-state                       | 47.7%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2018 | MHDDT Utility                            | 0.8%      | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2018 | HHDDT Agriculture                        | 55.7%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2018 | HHDDT CA International Registration Plan | 30.3%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2018 | HHDDT Non-neighboring Out-of-state       | 11.0%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2018 | HHDDT Neighboring Out-of-state           | 30.6%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2018 | HHDDT Singleunit                         | 72.3%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |

# Transportation

CEQA# MM T-20

VT-3

Vehicles

| Year | Vehicle Class                            | Reduction | Pollutant | Regulation                                    |
|------|--|-----------|-----------|---|
| 2018 | HHDDT Tractor                            | 67.3%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2018 | HHDDT Utility                            | 3.5%      | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2019 | Other Buses                              | 27.3%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2019 | Power Take Off                           | 76.6%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2019 | School Bus                               | 73.2%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2019 | MHDDT Agriculture                        | 53.0%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2019 | MHDDT CA International Registration Plan | 42.3%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2019 | MHDDT Instate                            | 65.0%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2019 | MHDDT Out-of-state                       | 42.3%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2019 | MHDDT Utility                            | 0.8%      | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2019 | HHDDT Agriculture                        | 54.2%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2019 | HHDDT CA International Registration Plan | 24.5%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2019 | HHDDT Non-neighboring Out-of-state       | 5.1%      | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2019 | HHDDT Neighboring Out-of-state           | 24.9%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2019 | HHDDT Singleunit                         | 69.9%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2019 | HHDDT Tractor                            | 64.2%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2019 | HHDDT Utility                            | 3.1%      | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2020 | Other Buses                              | 23.5%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2020 | Power Take Off                           | 74.3%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2020 | School Bus                               | 71.3%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2020 | MHDDT Agriculture                        | 52.1%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2020 | MHDDT CA International Registration Plan | 37.2%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2020 | MHDDT Instate                            | 60.9%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2020 | MHDDT Out-of-state                       | 37.2%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2020 | MHDDT Utility                            | 0.8%      | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |

# Transportation

CEQA# MM T-20

VT-3

Vehicles

| Year | Vehicle Class                            | Reduction | Pollutant | Regulation                                    |
|------|--|-----------|-----------|---|
| 2020 | HHDDT Agriculture                        | 52.4%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2020 | HHDDT CA International Registration Plan | 19.8%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2020 | HHDDT Non-neighboring Out-of-state       | 3.7%      | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2020 | HHDDT Neighboring Out-of-state           | 20.1%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2020 | HHDDT Singleunit                         | 66.9%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2020 | HHDDT Tractor                            | 61.2%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2020 | HHDDT Utility                            | 2.7%      | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2021 | Other Buses                              | 21.8%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2021 | Power Take Off                           | 79.0%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2021 | School Bus                               | 68.2%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2021 | MHDDT Agriculture                        | 51.2%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2021 | MHDDT CA International Registration Plan | 33.0%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2021 | MHDDT Instate                            | 57.7%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2021 | MHDDT Out-of-state                       | 33.0%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2021 | MHDDT Utility                            | 5.8%      | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2021 | HHDDT Agriculture                        | 50.7%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2021 | HHDDT CA International Registration Plan | 16.7%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2021 | HHDDT Non-neighboring Out-of-state       | 3.0%      | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2021 | HHDDT Neighboring Out-of-state           | 16.9%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2021 | HHDDT Drayage at Other Facilities        | 10.8%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2021 | HHDDT Drayage in Bay Area                | 9.4%      | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2021 | HHDDT Drayage near South Coast           | 9.6%      | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2021 | HHDDT Singleunit                         | 64.6%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2021 | HHDDT Tractor                            | 59.3%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2021 | HHDDT Utility                            | 5.8%      | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |

# Transportation

CEQA# MM T-20

VT-3

Vehicles

| Year | Vehicle Class                            | Reduction | Pollutant | Regulation                                    |
|------|--|-----------|-----------|---|
| 2022 | Other Buses                              | 20.1%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2022 | Power Take Off                           | 79.0%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2022 | School Bus                               | 66.0%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2022 | MHDDT Agriculture                        | 50.6%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2022 | MHDDT CA International Registration Plan | 28.7%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2022 | MHDDT Instate                            | 53.5%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2022 | MHDDT Out-of-state                       | 28.7%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2022 | MHDDT Utility                            | 6.4%      | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2022 | HHDDT Agriculture                        | 49.4%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2022 | HHDDT CA International Registration Plan | 13.9%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2022 | HHDDT Non-neighboring Out-of-state       | 1.5%      | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2022 | HHDDT Neighboring Out-of-state           | 14.2%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2022 | HHDDT Drayage at Other Facilities        | 10.8%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2022 | HHDDT Drayage in Bay Area                | 8.7%      | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2022 | HHDDT Drayage near South Coast           | 8.8%      | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2022 | HHDDT Singleunit                         | 61.0%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2022 | HHDDT Tractor                            | 55.5%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2022 | HHDDT Utility                            | 5.0%      | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2023 | Other Buses                              | 18.5%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2023 | Power Take Off                           | 74.6%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2023 | School Bus                               | 64.1%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2023 | MHDDT Agriculture                        | 79.2%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2023 | MHDDT CA International Registration Plan | 23.7%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2023 | MHDDT Instate                            | 48.4%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2023 | MHDDT Out-of-state                       | 23.7%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |

# Transportation

CEQA# MM T-20

VT-3

Vehicles

| Year | Vehicle Class                            | Reduction | Pollutant | Regulation                                    |
|------|--|-----------|-----------|---|
| 2023 | MHDDT Utility                            | 7.0%      | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2023 | HHDDT Agriculture                        | 68.7%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2023 | HHDDT CA International Registration Plan | 11.6%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2023 | HHDDT Non-neighboring Out-of-state       | 1.0%      | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2023 | HHDDT Neighboring Out-of-state           | 11.9%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2023 | HHDDT Drayage at Other Facilities        | 9.6%      | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2023 | HHDDT Drayage in Bay Area                | 8.2%      | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2023 | HHDDT Drayage near South Coast           | 8.3%      | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2023 | HHDDT Singleunit                         | 56.2%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2023 | HHDDT Tractor                            | 51.1%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2023 | HHDDT Utility                            | 4.1%      | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2024 | Other Buses                              | 15.7%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2024 | Power Take Off                           | 68.7%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2024 | School Bus                               | 61.4%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2024 | MHDDT Agriculture                        | 77.4%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2024 | MHDDT CA International Registration Plan | 20.2%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2024 | MHDDT Instate                            | 43.0%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2024 | MHDDT Out-of-state                       | 20.2%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2024 | MHDDT Utility                            | 5.3%      | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2024 | HHDDT Agriculture                        | 65.6%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2024 | HHDDT CA International Registration Plan | 9.1%      | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2024 | HHDDT Non-neighboring Out-of-state       | 0.7%      | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2024 | HHDDT Neighboring Out-of-state           | 9.3%      | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2024 | HHDDT Drayage at Other Facilities        | 9.7%      | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2024 | HHDDT Drayage in Bay Area                | 7.7%      | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |

# Transportation

CEQA# MM T-20

VT-3

Vehicles

| Year | Vehicle Class                            | Reduction | Pollutant | Regulation                                    |
|------|--|-----------|-----------|---|
| 2024 | HHDDT Drayage near South Coast           | 7.9%      | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2024 | HHDDT Singleunit                         | 50.6%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2024 | HHDDT Tractor                            | 46.7%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2024 | HHDDT Utility                            | 3.4%      | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2025 | Other Buses                              | 13.3%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2025 | Power Take Off                           | 62.0%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2025 | School Bus                               | 58.2%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2025 | MHDDT Agriculture                        | 75.4%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2025 | MHDDT CA International Registration Plan | 15.3%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2025 | MHDDT Instate                            | 37.8%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2025 | MHDDT Out-of-state                       | 15.3%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2025 | MHDDT Utility                            | 3.4%      | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2025 | HHDDT Agriculture                        | 62.7%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2025 | HHDDT CA International Registration Plan | 6.8%      | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2025 | HHDDT Non-neighboring Out-of-state       | 0.6%      | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2025 | HHDDT Neighboring Out-of-state           | 7.0%      | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2025 | HHDDT Drayage at Other Facilities        | 8.6%      | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2025 | HHDDT Drayage in Bay Area                | 7.5%      | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2025 | HHDDT Drayage near South Coast           | 7.6%      | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2025 | HHDDT Singleunit                         | 44.9%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2025 | HHDDT Tractor                            | 42.9%     | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2025 | HHDDT Utility                            | 2.4%      | PM2.5     | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2011 | MHDDT CA International Registration Plan | 1.9%      | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2011 | MHDDT Instate                            | 2.5%      | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2011 | MHDDT Out-of-state                       | 1.9%      | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |

# Transportation

CEQA# MM T-20

VT-3

Vehicles

| Year | Vehicle Class                            | Reduction | Pollutant | Regulation                                    |
|------|--|-----------|-----------|---|
| 2011 | HHDDT CA International Registration Plan | 0.8%      | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2011 | HHDDT Non-neighboring Out-of-state       | 0.1%      | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2011 | HHDDT Neighboring Out-of-state           | 1.2%      | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2011 | HHDDT Singleunit                         | 4.5%      | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2011 | HHDDT Tractor                            | 3.7%      | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2012 | Power Take Off                           | 13.7%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2012 | School Bus                               | 2.2%      | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2012 | MHDDT CA International Registration Plan | 1.5%      | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2012 | MHDDT Instate                            | 2.2%      | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2012 | MHDDT Out-of-state                       | 1.5%      | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2012 | HHDDT CA International Registration Plan | 0.5%      | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2012 | HHDDT Non-neighboring Out-of-state       | 0.1%      | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2012 | HHDDT Neighboring Out-of-state           | 0.9%      | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2012 | HHDDT Singleunit                         | 3.7%      | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2012 | HHDDT Tractor                            | 3.2%      | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2013 | Other Buses                              | 18.9%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2013 | Power Take Off                           | 34.0%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2013 | School Bus                               | 4.4%      | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2013 | MHDDT Agriculture                        | 5.9%      | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2013 | MHDDT CA International Registration Plan | 12.1%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2013 | MHDDT Instate                            | 25.6%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2013 | MHDDT Out-of-state                       | 12.1%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2013 | HHDDT Agriculture                        | 10.6%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2013 | HHDDT CA International Registration Plan | 8.8%      | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2013 | HHDDT Non-neighboring Out-of-state       | 1.3%      | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |

# Transportation

CEQA# MM T-20

VT-3

Vehicles

| Year | Vehicle Class                            | Reduction | Pollutant | Regulation                                    |
|------|--|-----------|-----------|---|
| 2013 | HHDDT Neighboring Out-of-state           | 8.1%      | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2013 | HHDDT Singleunit                         | 33.9%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2013 | HHDDT Tractor                            | 28.8%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2014 | Other Buses                              | 40.5%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2014 | Power Take Off                           | 37.5%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2014 | School Bus                               | 6.4%      | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2014 | MHDDT Agriculture                        | 9.3%      | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2014 | MHDDT CA International Registration Plan | 22.2%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2014 | MHDDT Instate                            | 34.2%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2014 | MHDDT Out-of-state                       | 22.2%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2014 | MHDDT Utility                            | 0.8%      | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2014 | HHDDT Agriculture                        | 17.6%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2014 | HHDDT CA International Registration Plan | 13.3%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2014 | HHDDT Non-neighboring Out-of-state       | 4.7%      | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2014 | HHDDT Neighboring Out-of-state           | 14.7%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2014 | HHDDT Singleunit                         | 45.4%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2014 | HHDDT Tractor                            | 36.9%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2014 | HHDDT Utility                            | 1.6%      | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2015 | Other Buses                              | 52.8%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2015 | Power Take Off                           | 33.0%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2015 | School Bus                               | 6.2%      | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2015 | MHDDT Agriculture                        | 18.4%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2015 | MHDDT CA International Registration Plan | 20.1%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2015 | MHDDT Instate                            | 31.5%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2015 | MHDDT Out-of-state                       | 20.1%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |

# Transportation

CEQA# MM T-20

VT-3

Vehicles

| Year | Vehicle Class                            | Reduction | Pollutant | Regulation                                    |
|------|--|-----------|-----------|---|
| 2015 | MHDDT Utility                            | 0.8%      | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2015 | HHDDT Agriculture                        | 27.8%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2015 | HHDDT CA International Registration Plan | 11.1%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2015 | HHDDT Non-neighboring Out-of-state       | 2.3%      | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2015 | HHDDT Neighboring Out-of-state           | 12.1%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2015 | HHDDT Singleunit                         | 42.8%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2015 | HHDDT Tractor                            | 34.9%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2015 | HHDDT Utility                            | 1.5%      | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2016 | Other Buses                              | 54.4%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2016 | Power Take Off                           | 43.8%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2016 | School Bus                               | 4.5%      | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2016 | MHDDT Agriculture                        | 19.3%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2016 | MHDDT CA International Registration Plan | 22.2%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2016 | MHDDT Instate                            | 32.2%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2016 | MHDDT Out-of-state                       | 22.2%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2016 | MHDDT Utility                            | 0.9%      | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2016 | HHDDT Agriculture                        | 29.9%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2016 | HHDDT CA International Registration Plan | 11.6%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2016 | HHDDT Non-neighboring Out-of-state       | 3.4%      | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2016 | HHDDT Neighboring Out-of-state           | 13.0%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2016 | HHDDT Singleunit                         | 43.2%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2016 | HHDDT Tractor                            | 35.5%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2016 | HHDDT Utility                            | 1.5%      | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2017 | Other Buses                              | 59.5%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2017 | Power Take Off                           | 38.5%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |

# Transportation

CEQA# MM T-20

VT-3

Vehicles

| Year | Vehicle Class                            | Reduction | Pollutant | Regulation                                    |
|------|--|-----------|-----------|---|
| 2017 | MHDDT Agriculture                        | 43.6%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2017 | MHDDT CA International Registration Plan | 27.3%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2017 | MHDDT Instate                            | 35.3%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2017 | MHDDT Out-of-state                       | 27.3%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2017 | MHDDT Utility                            | 1.0%      | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2017 | HHDDT Agriculture                        | 45.0%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2017 | HHDDT CA International Registration Plan | 14.4%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2017 | HHDDT Non-neighboring Out-of-state       | 7.3%      | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2017 | HHDDT Neighboring Out-of-state           | 17.3%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2017 | HHDDT Singleunit                         | 46.2%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2017 | HHDDT Tractor                            | 38.0%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2017 | HHDDT Utility                            | 1.5%      | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2018 | Other Buses                              | 56.1%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2018 | Power Take Off                           | 32.7%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2018 | School Bus                               | 7.7%      | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2018 | MHDDT Agriculture                        | 41.2%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2018 | MHDDT CA International Registration Plan | 26.2%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2018 | MHDDT Instate                            | 41.7%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2018 | MHDDT Out-of-state                       | 26.2%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2018 | MHDDT Utility                            | 1.1%      | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2018 | HHDDT Agriculture                        | 42.1%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2018 | HHDDT CA International Registration Plan | 15.7%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2018 | HHDDT Non-neighboring Out-of-state       | 4.6%      | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2018 | HHDDT Neighboring Out-of-state           | 16.3%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2018 | HHDDT Singleunit                         | 51.8%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |

# Transportation

CEQA# MM T-20

VT-3

Vehicles

| Year | Vehicle Class                            | Reduction | Pollutant | Regulation                                    |
|------|--|-----------|-----------|---|
| 2018 | HHDDT Tractor                            | 43.9%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2018 | HHDDT Utility                            | 1.5%      | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2019 | Other Buses                              | 52.6%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2019 | Power Take Off                           | 38.1%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2019 | School Bus                               | 6.7%      | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2019 | MHDDT Agriculture                        | 40.0%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2019 | MHDDT CA International Registration Plan | 22.3%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2019 | MHDDT Instate                            | 38.2%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2019 | MHDDT Out-of-state                       | 22.3%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2019 | MHDDT Utility                            | 1.3%      | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2019 | HHDDT Agriculture                        | 40.2%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2019 | HHDDT CA International Registration Plan | 12.5%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2019 | HHDDT Non-neighboring Out-of-state       | 2.1%      | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2019 | HHDDT Neighboring Out-of-state           | 13.0%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2019 | HHDDT Singleunit                         | 48.6%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2019 | HHDDT Tractor                            | 41.3%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2019 | HHDDT Utility                            | 1.4%      | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2020 | Other Buses                              | 49.1%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2020 | Power Take Off                           | 41.8%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2020 | School Bus                               | 5.9%      | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2020 | MHDDT Agriculture                        | 38.7%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2020 | MHDDT CA International Registration Plan | 19.3%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2020 | MHDDT Instate                            | 34.5%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2020 | MHDDT Out-of-state                       | 19.3%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2020 | MHDDT Utility                            | 1.4%      | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |

# Transportation

CEQA# MM T-20

VT-3

Vehicles

| Year | Vehicle Class                            | Reduction | Pollutant | Regulation                                    |
|------|--|-----------|-----------|---|
| 2020 | HHDDT Agriculture                        | 38.2%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2020 | HHDDT CA International Registration Plan | 9.9%      | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2020 | HHDDT Non-neighboring Out-of-state       | 1.6%      | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2020 | HHDDT Neighboring Out-of-state           | 10.2%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2020 | HHDDT Singleunit                         | 45.2%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2020 | HHDDT Tractor                            | 39.0%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2020 | HHDDT Utility                            | 1.3%      | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2021 | Other Buses                              | 48.7%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2021 | Power Take Off                           | 51.3%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2021 | School Bus                               | 4.4%      | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2021 | MHDDT Agriculture                        | 38.7%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2021 | MHDDT CA International Registration Plan | 21.2%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2021 | MHDDT Instate                            | 41.5%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2021 | MHDDT Out-of-state                       | 21.2%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2021 | MHDDT Utility                            | 33.5%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2021 | HHDDT Agriculture                        | 37.8%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2021 | HHDDT CA International Registration Plan | 9.7%      | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2021 | HHDDT Non-neighboring Out-of-state       | 1.6%      | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2021 | HHDDT Neighboring Out-of-state           | 9.8%      | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2021 | HHDDT Drayage at Other Facilities        | 40.6%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2021 | HHDDT Drayage in Bay Area                | 41.2%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2021 | HHDDT Drayage near South Coast           | 39.7%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2021 | HHDDT Singleunit                         | 54.2%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2021 | HHDDT Tractor                            | 45.6%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2021 | HHDDT Utility                            | 21.8%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |

# Transportation

CEQA# MM T-20

VT-3

Vehicles

| Year | Vehicle Class                            | Reduction | Pollutant | Regulation                                    |
|------|--|-----------|-----------|---|
| 2022 | Other Buses                              | 48.3%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2022 | Power Take Off                           | 60.0%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2022 | School Bus                               | 3.5%      | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2022 | MHDDT Agriculture                        | 40.5%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2022 | MHDDT CA International Registration Plan | 20.7%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2022 | MHDDT Instate                            | 41.2%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2022 | MHDDT Out-of-state                       | 20.7%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2022 | MHDDT Utility                            | 28.9%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2022 | HHDDT Agriculture                        | 40.7%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2022 | HHDDT CA International Registration Plan | 8.8%      | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2022 | HHDDT Non-neighboring Out-of-state       | 1.4%      | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2022 | HHDDT Neighboring Out-of-state           | 9.0%      | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2022 | HHDDT Drayage at Other Facilities        | 39.6%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2022 | HHDDT Drayage in Bay Area                | 40.5%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2022 | HHDDT Drayage near South Coast           | 39.0%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2022 | HHDDT Singleunit                         | 54.4%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2022 | HHDDT Tractor                            | 45.2%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2022 | HHDDT Utility                            | 18.9%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2023 | Other Buses                              | 47.8%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2023 | Power Take Off                           | 54.7%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2023 | School Bus                               | 2.8%      | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2023 | MHDDT Agriculture                        | 65.9%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2023 | MHDDT CA International Registration Plan | 18.4%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2023 | MHDDT Instate                            | 39.1%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2023 | MHDDT Out-of-state                       | 18.4%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |

# Transportation

CEQA# MM T-20

VT-3

Vehicles

| Year | Vehicle Class                            | Reduction | Pollutant | Regulation                                    |
|------|--|-----------|-----------|---|
| 2023 | MHDDT Utility                            | 25.1%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2023 | HHDDT Agriculture                        | 59.5%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2023 | HHDDT CA International Registration Plan | 7.8%      | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2023 | HHDDT Non-neighboring Out-of-state       | 1.1%      | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2023 | HHDDT Neighboring Out-of-state           | 8.1%      | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2023 | HHDDT Drayage at Other Facilities        | 38.7%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2023 | HHDDT Drayage in Bay Area                | 39.9%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2023 | HHDDT Drayage near South Coast           | 38.4%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2023 | HHDDT Singleunit                         | 52.6%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2023 | HHDDT Tractor                            | 44.0%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2023 | HHDDT Utility                            | 16.2%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2024 | Other Buses                              | 43.4%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2024 | Power Take Off                           | 47.6%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2024 | School Bus                               | 1.8%      | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2024 | MHDDT Agriculture                        | 63.5%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2024 | MHDDT CA International Registration Plan | 15.1%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2024 | MHDDT Instate                            | 33.8%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2024 | MHDDT Out-of-state                       | 15.1%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2024 | MHDDT Utility                            | 19.2%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2024 | HHDDT Agriculture                        | 56.7%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2024 | HHDDT CA International Registration Plan | 6.1%      | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2024 | HHDDT Non-neighboring Out-of-state       | 0.8%      | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2024 | HHDDT Neighboring Out-of-state           | 6.3%      | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2024 | HHDDT Drayage at Other Facilities        | 38.1%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2024 | HHDDT Drayage in Bay Area                | 39.4%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |

# Transportation

CEQA# MM T-20

VT-3

Vehicles

| Year | Vehicle Class                            | Reduction | Pollutant | Regulation                                    |
|------|--|-----------|-----------|---|
| 2024 | HHDDT Drayage near South Coast           | 37.9%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2024 | HHDDT Singleunit                         | 47.2%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2024 | HHDDT Tractor                            | 39.9%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2024 | HHDDT Utility                            | 13.1%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2025 | Other Buses                              | 39.0%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2025 | Power Take Off                           | 39.9%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2025 | School Bus                               | 1.8%      | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2025 | MHDDT Agriculture                        | 61.1%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2025 | MHDDT CA International Registration Plan | 11.6%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2025 | MHDDT Instate                            | 28.9%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2025 | MHDDT Out-of-state                       | 11.6%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2025 | MHDDT Utility                            | 13.9%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2025 | HHDDT Agriculture                        | 53.8%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2025 | HHDDT CA International Registration Plan | 4.6%      | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2025 | HHDDT Non-neighboring Out-of-state       | 0.5%      | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2025 | HHDDT Neighboring Out-of-state           | 4.8%      | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2025 | HHDDT Drayage at Other Facilities        | 37.3%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2025 | HHDDT Drayage in Bay Area                | 38.9%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2025 | HHDDT Drayage near South Coast           | 37.5%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2025 | HHDDT Singleunit                         | 41.5%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2025 | HHDDT Tractor                            | 35.7%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |
| 2025 | HHDDT Utility                            | 10.3%     | NOx       | On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles Regulation |

| Section    | Category   | Page #     | Measure # |
|------------|--|------------|-----------|
| <b>4.0</b> | <b>Water</b>   | <b>332</b> |           |
| 4.1        | Water Supply   | 332        |           |
| 4.1.1      | Use Reclaimed Water                                    | 332        | WSW-1     |
| 4.1.2      | Use Gray Water   | 336        | WSW-2     |
| 4.1.3      | Use Locally Sourced Water Supply                       | 341        | WSW-3     |
| 4.2        | Water Use  | 347        |           |
| 4.2.1      | Install Low-Flow Water Fixtures                        | 347        | WUW-1     |
| 4.2.2      | Adopt a Water Conservation Strategy                    | 362        | WUW-2     |
| 4.2.3      | Design Water-Efficient Landscapes                      | 365        | WUW-3     |
| 4.2.4      | Use Water-Efficient Landscape Irrigation Systems       | 372        | WUW-4     |
| 4.2.5      | Reduce Turf in Landscapes and Lawns                    | 376        | WUW-5     |
| 4.2.6      | Plant Native or Drought-Resistant Trees and Vegetation | 381        | WUW-6     |



# Water

CEQA# MS-G-8  
MP# COS-1.3

## WSW-1

### Water Supply

## 4.0 Water

### 4.1 Water Supply

#### 4.1.1 Use Reclaimed Water

**Range of Effectiveness:** Up to 40% in Northern California and up to 81% in Southern California

#### Measure Description:

California water supplies come from ground water, surface water, and from reservoirs, typically fed from snow melt. Some sources of water are transported over long distances, and sometimes over terrain to reach the point of consumption. Transporting water can require a significant amount of electricity. In addition, treating water to potable standards can also require substantial amounts of energy. Reclaimed water is water reused after wastewater treatment for non-potable uses instead of returning the water to the environment. This is different than gray water, which has not been through wastewater treatment. Reclaimed non-potable water requires significantly less energy to collect, treat, and redistribute water to the point of local areas of non-potable water consumption. Since less energy is required to provide reclaimed water, fewer GHGs will be associated with reclaimed water use compared to the average California water supply use.

This measure describes how to calculate GHG savings from using reclaimed water instead of new potable water supplies for outdoor water uses or other non-potable water uses. The baseline scenario document outlines average Northern and Southern California electricity-use water factors, and assumes that all water is treated to potable standards.

#### Measure Applicability:

- Non-potable water use

#### Inputs:

The following information needs to be provided by the Project Applicant:

- Reclaimed water use (million gallons)
- Total non-potable water use (million gallons)

#### Baseline Method:

$$\text{GHG emissions} = \text{Water}_{\text{non-potable total}} \times \text{Electricity}_{\text{baseline}} \times \text{Utility}$$

Where:

# Water

CEQA# MS-G-8  
MP# COS-1.3

## WSW-1

## Water Supply

- GHG emissions = MT CO<sub>2</sub>e
- Water<sub>non-potable total</sub> = Total volume of non-potable water used (million gallons)  
Provided by Applicant
- Electricity<sub>baseline</sub> = Electricity required to supply, treat, and distribute water (kWh/million gallons)  
Northern California Average: 3,500 kWh/million gallons  
Southern California Average: 11,111 kWh/million gallons
- Utility = Carbon intensity of Local Utility (CO<sub>2</sub>e/kWh)

### Mitigation Method:

A million gallons of reclaimed water would use an average of 2,100 kWh electricity per million gallons of water (range of 1,200 to 3,000 kWh). Therefore the percent reduction in GHG emissions associated with implementing reclaimed water usage is:

$$\text{GHG emission reduction} = \frac{\text{Water}_{\text{reclaimed}}}{\text{Water}_{\text{non-potable total}}} \times \frac{\text{Electricity}_{\text{baseline}} - \text{Electricity}_{\text{reclaimed}}}{\text{Electricity}_{\text{baseline}}}$$

Where:

- GHG emission reduction = Percentage reduction in GHG emissions for non-potable water use.
- Water<sub>reclaimed</sub> = Total volume of reclaimed water used (million gallons)  
Provided by Applicant
- Water<sub>non-potable total</sub> = Total volume of non-potable water used (million gallons)  
Provided by Applicant
- Electricity<sub>reclaimed</sub> = Electricity required to treat and distribute reclaimed water (2,100 kWh/million gallons)
- Electricity<sub>baseline</sub> = Electricity required to supply and distribute water  
Northern California Average: 3,500 kWh/million gallons  
Southern California Average: 11,111 kWh/million gallons

Therefore, for projects in Northern California, the reduction in GHG emissions is:

$$\text{GHG emission reduction} = \frac{\text{Water}_{\text{reclaimed}}}{\text{Water}_{\text{non-potable total}}} \times \frac{(3,500 - 2,100)}{3,500} = \frac{\text{Water}_{\text{reclaimed}}}{\text{Water}_{\text{non-potable total}}} \times 0.40$$

And for projects in Southern California, the reduction in GHG emissions is:

$$\text{GHG emission reduction} = \frac{\text{Water}_{\text{reclaimed}}}{\text{Water}_{\text{non-potable total}}} \times \frac{(11,111 - 2,100)}{11,111} = \frac{\text{Water}_{\text{reclaimed}}}{\text{Water}_{\text{non-potable total}}} \times 0.81$$

# Water

CEQA# MS-G-8  
MP# COS-1.3

## WSW-1

## Water Supply

As shown in these equations, the carbon intensity of the local utility does not play a role in determining the percentage reduction in GHG emissions.

### Emission Reduction Ranges and Variables:

| Pollutant            | Category Emissions Reductions   |
|----------------------|---|
| CO <sub>2</sub> e    | N. California: Up to 40% if assuming 100% reclaimed water                             |
|                      | S. California: Up to 81% if assuming 100% reclaimed water                             |
|                      | Percent reduction would scale down linearly as the percent reclaimed water decreases. |
| All other pollutants | Not quantified <sup>82</sup>  |

### Discussion:

If the Project Applicant uses 100 million gallons of non-potable water for a project in Northern California, they would calculate baseline emissions as described in the baseline methodologies document. If the applicant then selects to mitigate water by committing to using 40 million gallons of reclaimed water in place of the usual water source, the applicant would reduce the amount of GHG emissions associated with outdoor water use by 16%

$$\text{GHG Emission Reduced} = \frac{40}{100} \times 0.40 = 0.16 \text{ or } 16\%$$

### Assumptions:

Data based upon the following reference:

- [1] CEC. 2006. Refining Estimates of Water-Related Energy Use in California. PIER Final Project Report. Prepared by Navigant Consulting, Inc. CEC-500-2006-118. Available online at: <http://www.energy.ca.gov/2006publications/CEC-500-2006-118/CEC-500-2006-118.PDF>

### Preferred Literature:

GHG emissions from the mitigated scenario should be calculated based on the 2006 CEC report, which presents regional baseline electricity-use water factors and a factor of 1,200-3,000 kWh per million gallons for reclaimed water. GHG emissions are calculated by multiplying the amount of water (million gallons) by the electricity-use water factor (kWh per million gallons) by the carbon-intensity of the local utility (CO<sub>2</sub>e per kWh). The GHG emissions reductions associated with this mitigation measure are

<sup>82</sup> Criteria air pollutant emissions may also be reduced due to the reduction in energy use; however, the reduction may not be in the same air basin as the project.

## Water

CEQA# MS-G-8  
MP# COS-1.3

**WSW-1**

**Water Supply**

associated with the difference between the baseline potable water electricity-use water factor and the mitigated scenario.

**Alternative Literature:**

None

**Other Literature Reviewed:**

None

# Water

MP# COS-2.3

**WSW-2**

**Water Supply**

## 4.1.2 Use Gray Water

**Range of Effectiveness:** Up to 100% of outdoor water GHG emissions if outdoor water use is replaced completely with graywater

### Measure Description:

California water supplies come from ground water, surface water, and from reservoirs, typically fed from snow melt. Some sources of water are transported over long distances, and sometimes over terrain to reach the point of consumption. Transporting water can require a significant amount of electricity. In addition, treating water to potable standards can also require substantial amounts of energy. Untreated wastewater generated from bathtubs, showers, bathroom wash basins, and clothes washing machines is known as graywater and is collected and distributed onsite for irrigation of landscape and mulch. Since graywater does not require treatment or energy to redistribute it onsite, there are negligible GHG emissions associated with the use of graywater.

This measure describes how to calculate GHG savings from using graywater instead of new potable water supplies for landscape irrigation and other outdoor uses. The baseline scenario document outlines average Northern and Southern California electricity-use water factors, and assumes that all water is non-potable.

### Measure Applicability:

- Outdoor water use

### Inputs:

The following information needs to be provided by the Project Applicant:

- Graywater use<sup>83</sup> (million gallons), or:
  - Type of graywater system, which must be compliant with the California Plumbing Code, and
  - Number of residents in homes with compliant graywater systems
- Total outdoor water use (million gallons)

### Baseline Method:

$$\text{GHG emissions} = \text{Water}_{\text{outdoor total}} \times \text{Electricity}_{\text{baseline}} \times \text{Utility}$$

<sup>83</sup> Note that this is the amount of graywater used, which may be less than the amount of graywater generated. A project may generate and collect more graywater than is needed for landscape irrigation. The Project Applicant should only take credit for the amount of potable water which is displaced by graywater. The amount of landscape irrigation water demand (graywater demand) is calculated according to the methodology described in WUW-3 and the baseline methodologies document.

# Water

MP# COS-2.3

WSW-2

Water Supply

Where:

GHG emissions = MT CO<sub>2</sub>e

Water<sub>outdoor total</sub> = Total volume of outdoor water used (million gallons)  
Provided by Applicant

Electricity<sub>baseline</sub> = Electricity required to supply, treat, and distribute water (kWh/million gallons)  
Northern California Average: 3,500 kWh/million gallons  
Southern California Average: 11,111 kWh/million gallons

Utility = Carbon intensity of Local Utility (CO<sub>2</sub>e/kWh)

## Mitigation Method:

If the Project Applicant cannot provide the total amount of graywater used, the graywater use can be calculated based on the following equation:

Water<sub>graywater</sub> =

$$\left[ (25 \times \text{Residents}_{\text{graywater-sbw}}) + (15 \times \text{Residents}_{\text{graywater-laundry}}) \right] \frac{\text{gallons}}{\text{day}} \times \frac{365 \text{ days}}{\text{year}} \times \frac{1 \text{ million gallons}}{10^6 \text{ gallons}}$$

Where:

Water<sub>graywater</sub> = Total volume of graywater used (million gallons).

Residents<sub>graywater-sbw</sub> = Total number of residents in homes with graywater systems based on graywater generated from showers, bathtubs, and wash basins  
25 = gallons per day per residential occupant from showers, bathtubs, and washbasins [1]

Residents<sub>graywater-laundry</sub> = Total number of residents in homes with graywater systems based on graywater generated from laundry machines  
15 = gallons per day per residential occupant from laundry machines [1]

The percent reduction in GHG emissions associated with implementing graywater usage is therefore:

$$\text{GHG emission reduction} = \frac{\text{Water}_{\text{graywater}}}{\text{Water}_{\text{outdoor total}}} \times \frac{\text{Electricity}_{\text{baseline}} - \text{Electricity}_{\text{graywater}}}{\text{Electricity}_{\text{baseline}}}$$

Where:

GHG emission reduction = Percentage reduction in GHG emissions for outdoor water use.

Water<sub>graywater</sub> = Total volume of graywater used (million gallons)  
Provided by Applicant or calculated using equation above

Water<sub>outdoor total</sub> = Total volume of outdoor water used (million gallons)  
Provided by Applicant

# Water

MP# COS-2.3

## WSW-2

### Water Supply

Electricity<sub>graywater</sub> = Electricity required to distribute graywater (0 kWh/million gallons)<sup>84</sup>

Electricity<sub>baseline</sub> = Electricity required to supply, treat, and distribute water

Northern California Average: 3,500 kWh/million gallons [2]

Southern California Average: 11,111 kWh/million gallons [2]

Therefore, for projects in Northern California, the reduction in GHG emissions is:

$$\text{GHG emission reduction} = \frac{\text{Water}_{\text{graywater}}}{\text{Water}_{\text{outdoor total}}} \times \frac{(3,500 - 0)}{3,500} = \frac{\text{Water}_{\text{graywater}}}{\text{Water}_{\text{outdoor total}}}$$

And for projects in Southern California, the reduction in GHG emissions is:

$$\text{GHG emission reduction} = \frac{\text{Water}_{\text{graywater}}}{\text{Water}_{\text{outdoor total}}} \times \frac{(11,111 - 0)}{11,111} = \frac{\text{Water}_{\text{graywater}}}{\text{Water}_{\text{outdoor total}}}$$

As shown in these equations, the carbon intensity of the local utility does not play a role in determining the percentage reduction in GHG emissions.

#### Emission Reduction Ranges and Variables:

| Pollutant            | Category Emissions Reductions   |
|----------------------|---|
| CO <sub>2</sub> e    | N. California: Up to 100% if assuming 100% graywater<br>S. California: Up to 100% if assuming 100% graywater<br>Percent reduction would scale down linearly as the percent reclaimed water decreases. |
| All other pollutants | Not Quantified <sup>85</sup>  |

#### Discussion:

If the Project Applicant uses 100 million gallons of water for outdoor uses in a project in Northern California, they would calculate baseline emissions as described above and in the baseline methodologies document. If the Project Applicant then selects to mitigate water by committing to establishing graywater systems based on graywater recovery from laundry machines in 500 homes with an average of 3 people in each home, the amount of graywater used is then:

<sup>84</sup> In some cases the distribution of graywater will require some amount of electricity; for example, graywater generated at residences and pumped to a nearby park. In those cases, Electricity<sub>graywater</sub> will be non-zero.

<sup>85</sup> Criteria air pollutant emissions may also be reduced due to the reduction in energy use; however, the reduction may not be in the same air basin as the project.

# Water

MP# COS-2.3

WSW-2

Water Supply

Water<sub>graywater</sub> =

$$[(25 \times 0) + (15 \times 500 \times 3)] \frac{\text{gallons}}{\text{day}} \times \frac{365 \text{ days}}{\text{year}} \times \frac{1 \text{ million gallons}}{10^6 \text{ gallons}} = 8.2 \text{ million gallons}$$

Then the Project Applicant would reduce the amount of GHG emissions associated with outdoor water use by 8.2%

$$\text{GHG Emission Reduced} = \frac{8.2}{100} = 0.082 \text{ or } 8.2\%$$

## Assumptions:

Data based upon the following references:

- [1] 2007 CPC, Title 24, Part 5, Chapter 16A, Part I – Nonpotable Water Reuse Systems. Available online at:  
[http://www.hcd.ca.gov/codes/sh/2007CPC\\_Graywater\\_Complete\\_2-2-10.pdf](http://www.hcd.ca.gov/codes/sh/2007CPC_Graywater_Complete_2-2-10.pdf)
- [2] CEC. 2006. Refining Estimates of Water-Related Energy Use in California. PIER Final Project Report. Prepared by Navigant Consulting, Inc. CEC-500-2006-118. December. Available online at:  
<http://www.energy.ca.gov/2006publications/CEC-500-2006-118/CEC-500-2006-118.PDF>

## Preferred Literature:

Assuming a compliant graywater system is installed, Part 1606A.0 of the California Plumbing Code (CPC) estimates 25 gallons per day per residential occupant of graywater generation from showers, bathtubs, and wash basins, and 15 gallons per day per residential occupant of graywater discharge from laundry machines. Electricity and CO<sub>2</sub> savings from using graywater are determined by comparing to the emissions that would have been associated with the water use if the graywater demand had instead been supplied by potable water. The baseline emissions should be calculated based on the 2006 CEC methodology. A development may generate and collect more graywater than is needed for landscape irrigation. A Project Applicant should only take credit for emissions reductions associated with the amount of potable water which is displaced by graywater. The amount of landscape irrigation water demand (graywater demand) is calculated according to the methodology described in the baseline methodologies document and WUW-3.

## Alternative Literature:

None

**Other Literature Reviewed:**

- [3] Arizona Department of Environmental Quality. 2009. Using Gray Water at Home Brochure. Available online at:  
<http://www.azdeq.gov/environ/water/permits/download/graybro.pdf>
- [4] Arizona Department of Water Resources. Technologies – Irrigation, Rainwater Harvesting, Gray Water Reuse and Artificial Turf. Available online at:  
<http://www.azwater.gov/AzDWR/StatewidePlanning/Conservation2/Technologies/Tech%20pages%20templates/Landscapelrrigation.htm>. Accessed February 2010.
- [5] AAC, Title 18, Chapter 9, Article 7. Direct Reuse of Reclaimed Water. Available online at: [http://www.azsos.gov/public\\_services/title\\_18/18-09.pdf](http://www.azsos.gov/public_services/title_18/18-09.pdf)
- [6] Oasis Design. Graywater Information Central. Available online at: <http://www.graywater.net/>. Accessed February 2010.

### 4.1.3 Use Locally Sourced Water Supply

**Range of Effectiveness:** 0 – 60% for Northern and Central California, 11 – 75% for Southern California

**Measure Description:**

California water supplies come from ground water, surface water, and from reservoirs, typically fed from snow melt. Some sources of water are transported over long distances, and sometimes over terrain to reach the point of consumption. Transporting water can require a significant amount of electricity. Using locally-sourced water or water from less energy-intensive sources reduces the electricity and indirect CO<sub>2</sub> emissions associated with water supply and transport.

This measure describes how to calculate GHG savings from using local or less energy-intensive water sources instead of water from the typical mix of Northern and Southern California sources. According to the 2006 CEC report [1], water in Northern California (which also includes the Central Coast and San Joaquin Valley for this study) is primarily supplied by deliveries from the State Water Project and groundwater, and to a lesser extent is supplied by the gravity-dominated systems of Hetch Hetchy and the Mokelumne Aqueduct. In contrast, water imported from the State Water Project is Southern California’s dominant water source. The baseline scenario uses average Northern and Southern California electricity intensity factors as reported in 2006 CEC and detailed in the Baseline Method below.

**Measure Applicability:**

- Indoor (potable) and outdoor (non-potable) water use

**Inputs:**

- Total potable and non-potable water use (million gallons)

**Baseline Method:**

$$\text{GHG emissions} = \text{Water}_{\text{baseline}} \times \text{Electricity}_{\text{baseline}} \times \text{Utility}$$

Where:

GHG emissions = MT CO<sub>2</sub>e

Water<sub>baseline</sub> = Total volume of water used (million gallons)  
 Provided by Applicant

Electricity<sub>baseline</sub> = Electricity required to supply, treat, and distribute water (and for indoor uses, the electricity required to treat the resulting wastewater) (kWh/million gallons)

Indoor Uses:

Northern California Average: 5,411 kWh/million gallons [1]

Southern California Average: 13,022 kWh/million gallons [1]

### Outdoor Uses:

Northern California Average: 3,500 kWh/million gallons [1]

Southern California Average: 11,111 kWh/million gallons [1]

Utility = Carbon intensity of Local Utility (CO<sub>2</sub>e/kWh)

### Mitigation Method:

Table WSW-3.1 shows that water from local or nearby groundwater basins, nearby surface water, and gravity-dominated systems have smaller energy-intensity factors than the average Northern and Southern California energy-intensity factors. The Project Applicant should use Table WSW-3.1 to identify the outdoor and indoor electricity intensity factors associated with the Project's water source(s). The GHG emission reduction is then calculated as follows:

$$\text{GHG emission reduction} = \frac{\text{Water}_{\text{mitigated}}}{\text{Water}_{\text{baseline}}} \times \frac{\text{Electricity}_{\text{baseline}} - \text{Electricity}_{\text{mitigated}}}{\text{Electricity}_{\text{baseline}}}$$

### Where:

GHG emission reduction = Percentage reduction in GHG emissions for water use

Water<sub>mitigated</sub> = Volume of water to be supplied from the mitigated (local or less energy-intensive) source  
 Provided by Applicant

Water<sub>baseline</sub> = Total volume of water used (million gallons)  
 Provided by Applicant

Electricity<sub>mitigated</sub> = Electricity required to distribute water for Project from mitigated (local or less-energy intensive) source

Electricity<sub>baseline</sub> = Baseline electricity required to supply, treat, and distribute water (and for indoor uses, the electricity required to treat the resulting wastewater) (kWh/million gallons)

### Indoor Uses:

Northern California Average: 5,411 kWh/million gallons [1]

Southern California Average: 13,022 kWh/million gallons [1]

### Outdoor Uses:

Northern California Average: 3,500 kWh/million gallons [1]

Southern California Average: 11,111 kWh/million gallons [1]

As shown in these equations, the carbon intensity of the local utility does not play a role in determining the percentage reduction in GHG emissions.

### Emission Reduction Ranges and Variables:

| Pollutant            | Category Emissions Reductions  |
|----------------------|--|
| CO <sub>2</sub> e    | Assuming 100% of water is sourced locally:<br>Indoor Uses: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 0-40% reduction for Northern and Central California</li> <li>• 11-64% reduction for Southern California</li> </ul> Outdoor Uses: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 0-60% reduction for Northern and Central California</li> <li>• 12-75% reduction for Southern California</li> </ul> |
| All other pollutants | Not Quantified <sup>86</sup>   |

### Discussion:

Assume a Project is located in Southern California within the Chino Basin and has a total indoor water demand of 100 million gallons. Assume 70 million gallons will be sourced from a water district which obtains its water from the typical Southern California water sources. Therefore, for these 70 million gallons the baseline outdoor water electricity-intensity factor for Southern California is used. Assume that the Project Applicant chooses to mitigate the Project by sourcing the remaining 30 million gallons from the Chino Basin. The expected GHG emission reduction is then:

$$\text{GHG Emission Reduced} = \frac{30}{100} \times \frac{11,111 - 4,298}{11,111} = 0.18 \text{ or } 18\%$$

### Assumptions:

Data based upon the following reference:

- [1] CEC. 2006. Refining Estimates of Water-Related Energy Use in California. PIER Final Project Report. Prepared by Navigant Consulting, Inc. CEC-500-2006-118. December. Available online at: <http://www.energy.ca.gov/2006publications/CEC-500-2006-118/CEC-500-2006-118.PDF>

<sup>86</sup> Criteria air pollutant emissions may also be reduced due to the reduction in energy use; however, the reduction may not be in the same air basin as the project.

- [2]CEC. 2005. California's Water-Energy Relationship. Final Staff Report. CEC 700-2005-011-SF. Available online at: <http://www.energy.ca.gov/2005publications/CEC-700-2005-011/CEC-700-2005-011-SF.PDF>
- [3]NRDC. 2004. Energy Down the Drain: The Hidden Costs of California's Water Supply. Prepared by NRDC and the Pacific Institute. Available online at: <http://www.nrdc.org/water/conservation/edrain/edrain.pdf>

**Preferred Literature:**

Electricity and CO<sub>2</sub> savings from using locally-sourced water or water from sources which require below-average electricity intensities for supply and conveyance (such as gravity-dominated systems or local groundwater basins that are not very deep) are determined by comparing to the emissions that would have occurred if the water had instead been conveyed from typical water sources for the region. According to the 2005 and 2006 CEC reports [1,2], the typical mix of water sources in Northern and Central California is the State Water Project, groundwater, and gravity-dominated systems such as Hetch Hetchy and the Mokelumne Aqueduct. The majority of water in Southern California is supplied by imports from the State Water Project and the Colorado River Aqueduct. Examples of mitigated electricity-intensity factors are shown in Table WSW-3.1 and are based on data provided in 2006 CEC [1], 2005 CEC [2], and 2004 NRDC [3]. GHG emissions are calculated by multiplying the amount of water (million gallons) by the electricity-use water factor (kWh per million gallons) by the carbon-intensity of the local utility (CO<sub>2</sub>e per kWh). The GHG emissions reductions associated with this mitigation measure are associated with the difference between the baseline water electricity-intensity factor and the mitigated electricity-intensity factor.

**Alternative Literature:**

None

**Other Literature Reviewed:**

None

# Water

## WSW-3

## Water Supply

**Table WSW-3.1**  
**Energy Intensity of Water Use (kWh/MG) by Region**

| REGION              | WATER USE SEGMENT   |                        |                           |  |                                   |                                     |               |
|---------------------|---|------------------------|---------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------|
|                     | Supply & Conveyance <sup>1</sup>                                  | Treatment <sup>1</sup> | Distribution <sup>1</sup> | OUTDOOR TOTAL (NON-POTABLE) <sup>2</sup> | Wastewater Treatment <sup>1</sup> | INDOOR TOTAL (POTABLE) <sup>3</sup> |               |
| Northern California | SWP to Bay Area surface water                                     | 3,150                  | 111                       | 1,272                                    | <b>4,533</b>                      | 1,911                               | <b>6,444</b>  |
|                     | Hetch Hetchy to Bay Area gravity dominated                        | 0                      | 111                       | 1,272                                    | <b>1,383</b>                      | 1,911                               | <b>3,294</b>  |
|                     | Mokelumne Aqueduct to Bay Area gravity dominated                  | 160                    | 111                       | 1,272                                    | <b>1,543</b>                      | 1,911                               | <b>3,454</b>  |
| Central California  | SWP to Central Coast surface water                                | 3,150                  | 111                       | 1,272                                    | <b>4,533</b>                      | 1,911                               | <b>6,444</b>  |
|                     | SWP to San Joaquin Valley surface water                           | 1,510                  | 111                       | 1,272                                    | <b>2,893</b>                      | 1,911                               | <b>4,804</b>  |
|                     | San Joaquin River Basin & Central Coast <sup>4</sup> groundwater  | 896                    | 111                       | 1,272                                    | <b>2,279</b>                      | 1,911                               | <b>4,190</b>  |
|                     | Tulare Lake Basin <sup>4</sup> groundwater                        | 537                    | 111                       | 1,272                                    | <b>1,920</b>                      | 1,911                               | <b>3,831</b>  |
|                     | Fresno and Kings Counties (Westlands WD) <sup>4</sup> groundwater | 2,271                  | 111                       | 1,272                                    | <b>3,654</b>                      | 1,911                               | <b>5,565</b>  |
| Southern California | SWP to L.A. Basin surface water                                   | 8,325                  | 111                       | 1,272                                    | <b>9,708</b>                      | 1,911                               | <b>11,619</b> |
|                     | Colorado River Aqueduct to L.A. Basin surface water               | 6,140                  | 111                       | 1,272                                    | <b>7,523</b>                      | 1,911                               | <b>9,434</b>  |
|                     | Chino Basin <sup>5</sup> groundwater                              | 2,915                  | 111                       | 1,272                                    | <b>4,298</b>                      | 1,911                               | <b>6,209</b>  |
|                     | Los Angeles <sup>4</sup> groundwater                              | 1,780                  | 111                       | 1,272                                    | <b>3,163</b>                      | 1,911                               | <b>5,074</b>  |
|                     | San Diego County (Sweetwater WD) <sup>4</sup> groundwater         | 1,433                  | 111                       | 1,272                                    | <b>2,816</b>                      | 1,911                               | <b>4,727</b>  |
|                     | San Diego County (Yuima WD) <sup>4</sup>                          | 2,029                  | 111                       | 1,272                                    | <b>3,412</b>                      | 1,911                               | <b>5,323</b>  |

# Water

## WSW-3

## Water Supply

| REGION     | WATER USE SEGMENT                |                                    |                           |  |                                   |                                     |               |
|------------|----------------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------|
|            | Supply & Conveyance <sup>1</sup> | Treatment <sup>1</sup>             | Distribution <sup>1</sup> | OUTDOOR TOTAL (NON-POTABLE) <sup>2</sup> | Wastewater Treatment <sup>1</sup> | INDOOR TOTAL (POTABLE) <sup>3</sup> |               |
|            | <i>groundwater</i>               |                                    |                           |  |                                   |                                     |               |
| State-wide | Local / Intrabasin               | 120                                | 111                       | 1,272                                    | <b>1,503</b>                      | 1,911                               | <b>3,414</b>  |
|            | Groundwater                      | 4.45 kWh / MG / foot of well depth | 111                       | 1,272                                    | <b>TBC</b>                        | 1,911                               | <b>TBC</b>    |
|            | Ocean Desalination               | 13,800                             | 111                       | 1,272                                    | <b>15,183</b>                     | 1,911                               | <b>17,094</b> |
|            | Brackish Water Desalination      | 3,230                              | 111                       | 1,272                                    | <b>4,613</b>                      | 1,911                               | <b>6,524</b>  |

### Abbreviations:

CEC - California Energy Commission  
 kWh - kilowatt hour  
 MG - million gallons  
 NRDC - Natural Resources Defense Council  
 SWP - State Water Project  
 TBC - to be calculated based on well depth  
 WD - Water District

### Notes:

1. Treatment, Distribution, and Wastewater Treatment electricity-intensity factors from 2006 CEC. Supply & Conveyance electricity-intensity factors from 2006 CEC unless otherwise noted.
2. Outdoor (Non-Potable) electricity-intensity factor is the sum of the Supply & Conveyance, Treatment, and Distribution electricity-intensity factors.
3. Indoor (Potable) electricity-intensity factor is the sum of the Supply & Conveyance, Treatment, Distribution, and Wastewater Treatment electricity-intensity factors.
4. Supply & Conveyance electricity-intensity factor from 2004 NRDC.
5. Supply & Conveyance electricity-intensity factor from 2005 CEC.

### Sources:

CEC. 2006. Refining Estimates of Water-Related Energy Use in California. PIER Final Project Report. Prepared by Navigant Consulting, Inc. CEC-500-2006-118. December. Available at: <http://www.energy.ca.gov/2006publications/CEC-500-2006-118/CEC-500-2006-118.PDF>

CEC. 2005. California's Water-Energy Relationship. Final Staff Report. CEC 700-2005-011-SF. Available online at: <http://www.energy.ca.gov/2005publications/CEC-700-2005-011/CEC-700-2005-011-SF.PDF>

NRDC. 2004. Energy Down the Drain: The Hidden Costs of California's Water Supply. Prepared by NRDC and the Pacific Institute. Available online at: <http://www.nrdc.org/water/conservation/edrain/edrain.pdf>

# Water

CEQA# MM-E23  
MP# EE-2.1.6; COS 2.2

## WUW-1

### Water Use

## 4.2 Water Use

### 4.2.1 Install Low-Flow Water Fixtures

**Range of Effectiveness:** 20% of GHG emissions associated with indoor Residential water use; 17-31% of GHG emissions associated with Non-Residential indoor water use.

#### Measure Description:

Water use contributes to GHG emissions indirectly, via the production of the electricity that is used to pump, treat, and distribute the water. Installing low-flow or high-efficiency water fixtures in buildings reduces water demand, energy demand, and associated indirect GHG emissions.

This measure describes how to calculate GHG savings from installing low-flow water toilets, urinals, showerheads, or faucets, or high-efficiency clothes washers and dishwashers in residential and commercial buildings. To take credit for this mitigation measure, the Project Applicant must know the total expected indoor water demand before and after installation of low-flow or high-efficiency water fixtures. If expected water demand after implementation of the mitigation measure is not known, it can be calculated based on the information provided below. Water flow rates presented here in Tables WUW-1.1 and WUW-1.3 are based on technical specifications in the California Code of Regulations Title 20 (Appliance Efficiency Regulations) [2], Title 24 (California Green Building Standards Code) [1] and ENERGY STAR [5-8]. Indoor water end-uses for residential and commercial buildings presented here in Tables WUW-1.1 and WUW-1.2 are based on data provided in a 2003 report by the Pacific Institute for Studies in Development, Environment, and Security [3]. This report incorporates data from the most comprehensive end-use survey available to date, the 1999 Residential End Uses of Water survey published by the American Water Works Association [4], as well as California-specific population, water, and appliance data. California-specific data includes local utility water use and market penetration rates of low-flow and high-efficiency water fixtures.

The baseline scenario document describes the method to calculate baseline GHG emissions. It provides average Northern and Southern California electricity-use water factors and assumes that all water is treated to potable standards.

The percent reduction in GHG emissions is calculated based on the baseline scenario water use and the percent reduction in indoor water use achieved from a Project Applicant's commitment to installing low-flow and high-efficiency water fixtures. Table WUW-1.4 lists the estimated percent reductions in GHG emissions by water fixture and land use. The sum of all percent reductions applicable to the Project gives the overall percent reduction in GHG emissions expected from this mitigation measure. The details of these calculations are described below.

# Water

CEQA# MM-E23  
MP# EE-2.1.6; COS 2.2

## WUW-1

## Water Use

**Measure Applicability:**

- Indoor water use
- To meet CEQA enforcement requirements, the Project Applicant should only take credit for this mitigation measure if the clothes washers and dishwashers are supplied by the Project Applicant/builder.

**Inputs:**

The following information needs to be provided by the Project Applicant:

- Total expected indoor water demand, without installation of low-flow or high-efficiency fixtures (million gallons), AND
- Total expected indoor water demand, after installation of low-flow or high-efficiency fixtures (million gallons), OR
- Commitment to low-flow or high-efficiency water fixtures (toilets, showerheads, sink faucets, dishwashers, clothes washers, or all of the above)

**Baseline Method:**

$$\text{GHG emissions} = \text{Water}_{\text{baseline}} \times \text{Electricity} \times \text{Utility}$$

Where:

- GHG emissions = MT CO<sub>2</sub>e
- Water<sub>baseline</sub> = Total expected indoor water demand, without installation of low-flow and high-efficiency fixtures (million gallons)  
Provided by Applicant
- Electricity = Electricity required to supply, treat, and distribute water and the resulting wastewater (kWh/million gallons)  
Northern California Average: 5,411 kWh/million gallons  
Southern California Average: 13,022 kWh/million gallons
- Utility = Carbon intensity of Local Utility (CO<sub>2</sub>e/kWh)

**Mitigation Method:**

Since this mitigation method does not change the electricity intensity factor (kWh/million gallons) associated with the supply, treatment, and distribution of the water, the percent reduction in GHG emissions is dependent only on the change in water consumption.

The Project Applicant can choose to compute the percent reduction in GHG emissions in one of three ways:

Method A

The Project Applicant can use Table WUW-1.4 to calculate the overall percent reduction in GHG emissions from committing to installing certain low-flow or high-efficiency water fixtures. The Project Applicant may commit to installing fixtures based on three

# Water

CEQA# MM-E23  
MP# EE-2.1.6; COS 2.2

## WUW-1

### Water Use

standards: the California Green Building Standards Code (CGBSC) mandatory requirements, the CGBSC voluntary standards, or the ENERGY STAR standards. Table WUW-1.4 presents the percent reductions in GHG emissions for each of these three standards based on water fixture type (toilet, showerhead, clothes washer, etc) and land use type (residential, office, restaurant, etc). Note that in Table WUW-1.4, it is assumed that a Project Applicant commits to installing low-flow or high-efficiency fixtures for 100% of an end-use category (i.e. either 0% or 100% of toilets will be low-flow, either 0% or 100% of clothes washers will be high-efficiency, etc). The total percent reduction in GHG emissions expected from this mitigation measure is then simply the sum of all of the individual percent reductions:

$$\text{GHG emission reduction} = \sum \text{PercentReduction}_{\text{Fixture}}$$

Where:

- GHG emission reduction = Percentage reduction in GHG emissions for indoor water use.
- PercentReduction<sub>Fixture</sub> = Percent reduction in GHG emissions from each individual water fixture (i.e. toilet, bathroom faucet, dishwasher, etc.)  
Provided in Table WUW-1.4

### Method B

If the Project Applicant can provide detailed and substantial evidence to support a calculation of Water<sub>mitigated</sub>, then that value can be used to calculate the percent GHG emission reduction using the following equation:

$$\text{GHG emission reduction} = \frac{\text{Water}_{\text{baseline}} - \text{Water}_{\text{mitigated}}}{\text{Water}_{\text{baseline}}}$$

Where:

- GHG emission reduction = Percentage reduction in GHG emissions for indoor water use.
- Water<sub>baseline</sub> = Total expected indoor water demand, without installation of low-flow and high-efficiency fixtures (million gallons)  
Provided by Applicant
- Water<sub>mitigated</sub> = Total calculated indoor water demand, after installation of low-flow and high-efficiency fixtures (million gallons)  
Provided by Applicant or calculated using equations below

As shown in this equation, the carbon intensity of the local utility does not play a role in determining the percentage reduction in GHG emissions.

### Method C

The Project Applicant may choose to install fixtures which exceed the requirements of the California Green Building Standards Code but have different flow rates than those

# Water

CEQA# MM-E23  
MP# EE-2.1.6; COS 2.2

## WUW-1

## Water Use

specified in the Tables WUW-1.1 and WUW-1.3. To take credit for this mitigation measure, the Project Applicant would need to calculate the percent reduction in GHG emissions using the equations below. In these equations, it is assumed that a Project Applicant commits to installing low-flow or high-efficiency fixtures for 100% of an end-use category (i.e. either 0% or 100% of toilets will be low-flow, either 0% or 100% of clothes washers will be high-efficiency, etc). More complicated equations are necessary to account for less than 100% commitment in one or more end-use categories.

$$\text{Water}_{\text{mitigated}} = \sum \text{EndUseWater}_{\text{mitigated}}$$

End-Uses are toilets, urinals, showerheads, bathroom faucets, kitchen faucets, dishwashers, clothes washers, and leaks and other.

Where,

$$\text{EndUseWater}_{\text{mitigated}} = \text{EndUse}_{\text{PercentIndoor}} \times \text{Water}_{\text{baseline}} \times \frac{\text{EndUseFlowRate}_{\text{mitigated}}}{\text{EndUseFlowRate}_{\text{unmitigated}}}$$

$\text{EndUse}_{\text{PercentIndoor}}$  = % of Indoor Water Use for that end-use  
 Provided in Table WUW-1.1 for Residential Buildings  
 Provided in Table WUW-1.1 for Non-Residential Buildings

$\text{Water}_{\text{baseline}}$  = Total expected indoor water demand, without installation of low-flow and high-efficiency fixtures (million gallons)  
 Provided by Applicant

$\text{EndUseFlowRate}_{\text{baseline}}$  = Baseline current California standard water flow rate for that end-use  
 Provided in Table WUW-1.1 for Residential Buildings  
 Provided in Table WUW-1.3 for Non-Residential Buildings

$\text{EndUseFlowRate}_{\text{mitigated}}$  = Mitigated water flow rate for that end use  
 Provided by Applicant, supported by manufacturer specification or technical sheets

For the Leak, Other end use and all end-uses where the Project Applicant makes no commitment to installing low-flow or high-efficiency water fixtures,  
 $\text{EndUseFlowRate}_{\text{mitigated}} = \text{EndUseFlowRate}_{\text{unmitigated}}$ , so then  $\text{EndUseWater}_{\text{mitigated}} = \text{EndUse}_{\text{PercentIndoor}} \times \text{Water}_{\text{baseline}}$ .

Then the percent reduction in GHG emissions is calculated as follows:

$$\text{GHG emission reduction} = \frac{\text{Water}_{\text{baseline}} - \text{Water}_{\text{mitigated}}}{\text{Water}_{\text{baseline}}}$$

Where:

GHG emission reduction = Percentage reduction in GHG emissions for indoor water use.



## Water

CEQA# MM-E23

MP# EE-2.1.6; COS 2.2

### WUW-1

### Water Use

From Table WUW-1.4, the percent reduction in GHG emissions associated with indoor water use is then:

For residences:

$$6.6\% + 4.4\% + 5.7\% + 3.3\% + 0.2\% = 20.2\%$$

For hotel:

$$13.8\% + 5.4\% + 1.2\% + 0.8\% + 1.9\% + 6.4\% + 1.5\% = 31.0\%$$

### Assumptions:

Data based upon the following references:

- [1] CCR Title 24, Part 11. 2010. Draft California Green Building Standards Code. Available online at: <http://www.documents.dgs.ca.gov/bsc/documents/2010/Draft-2010-CALGreenCode.pdf>
- [2] CCR Title 20, Division 2, Chapter 4, Article 4, Section 1605. Appliance Efficiency Regulations.
- [3] Gleick, P.H.; Haasz, D.; Henges-Jeck, C.; Srinivasan, V.; Cushing, K.K.; Mann, A. 2003. Waste Not, Want Not: The Potential for Urban Water Conservation in California. Published by the Pacific Institute for Studies in Development, Environment, and Security. Full report available online at: [http://www.pacinst.org/reports/urban\\_usage/waste\\_not\\_want\\_not\\_full\\_report.pdf](http://www.pacinst.org/reports/urban_usage/waste_not_want_not_full_report.pdf). Appendices available online at: [http://www.pacinst.org/reports/urban\\_usage/appendices.htm](http://www.pacinst.org/reports/urban_usage/appendices.htm)
- [4] Mayer, P.W.; DeOreo, W.B.; Opitz, E.M.; Kiefer, J.C.; Davis, W.Y.; Dziegielewski, B.; Nelson, J.O. 1999. Residential End Uses of Water. Published by the American Water Works Association Research Foundation.
- [5] USEPA. ENERGY STAR: Clothes Washers Key Product Criteria. Available online at: [http://www.energystar.gov/index.cfm?c=clotheswash.pr\\_crit\\_clothes\\_washers](http://www.energystar.gov/index.cfm?c=clotheswash.pr_crit_clothes_washers)
- [6] USEPA. ENERGY STAR: Commercial Clothes Washers for Consumers. Available online at: [http://www.energystar.gov/index.cfm?fuseaction=find\\_a\\_product.showProductGroup&pgw\\_code=CCW](http://www.energystar.gov/index.cfm?fuseaction=find_a_product.showProductGroup&pgw_code=CCW)
- [7] USEPA. ENERGY STAR: Dishwashers Key Product Criteria. Available online at: [http://www.energystar.gov/index.cfm?c=dishwash.pr\\_crit\\_dishwashers](http://www.energystar.gov/index.cfm?c=dishwash.pr_crit_dishwashers)
- [8] USEPA. ENERGY STAR Commercial Dishwashers Savings Calculator. Available online at: [http://www.energystar.gov/index.cfm?fuseaction=find\\_a\\_product.showProductGroup&pgw\\_code=COH](http://www.energystar.gov/index.cfm?fuseaction=find_a_product.showProductGroup&pgw_code=COH)

### Preferred Literature:

## Water

CEQA# MM-E23

MP# EE-2.1.6; COS 2.2

### WUW-1

### Water Use

For the baseline scenario, the California Green Building Standards Code [1] specifies baseline water flow rates for toilets, showerheads, urinals, bathroom faucets, and kitchen faucets. The California Appliance Efficiency Regulation (Title 20) [2] specifies baseline water flow rates for residential and commercial dishwashers and clothes washers. For the mitigated scenario, the 2010 CGBSC also specifies water flow rates for toilets, showerheads, urinals, bathroom faucets, and kitchen faucets which become mandatory in 2011, additional voluntary flow rates for these same fixtures, and voluntary flow rates for commercial dishwashers and clothes washers. In addition, ENERGY STAR-certified residential and commercial dishwashers and clothes washers have mitigated water flow rates [5-8].

#### Alternative Literature:

None

#### Other Literature Reviewed:

- [9] USEPA. Water Sense: Product Factsheets and Final Specifications. Available online at: <http://www.epa.gov/watersense/products/index.html>. Accessed February 2010.

USEPA WaterSense labeled products include toilets, bathroom sink faucets, and flushing urinals, and are certified to meet USEPA's standards for improved water efficiency. While WaterSense models do perform with greater water efficiency than federal standard models, they are not more efficient than the models required in California starting in 2011 due to the 2010 CGBSC. Furthermore, WaterSense models are compared to federal standard models and calculations would need to be adjusted to account for differences in California standards. USEPA reports that toilets, bathroom faucets, and showers account for 30%, 15%, and 17% of indoor household water use, respectively. USEPA reports that WaterSense toilets use 20% less water than the federal standard model, while WaterSense bathroom faucets use 30% less water. Federal standard showerheads use 2.5 gallons of water per minute while the WaterSense models use 2.0 gallons of water per minute, which is equivalent to the 2010 CGBSC Mandatory Requirement. Further, federal standard flushing urinal models use 1.0 gallons per flush, while WaterSense models uses 0.5 gallons per flush, which is equivalent to the 2010 CGBSC Mandatory Requirement.

# Water

CEQA# MM-E23  
MP# EE-2.1.6; COS 2.

## WUW-1

## Water Use

**Table WUW-1.1**  
**Reduction in Water use from Low-flow or High-efficiency Residential Water Fixtures**

| Fixture                      | % of Indoor Water Use <sup>1</sup> | Water Flow Rate                                   |  |  |                                    | Unit                      |
|------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|--|--|------------------------------------|---------------------------|
|                              |                                    | Baseline Current California Standard <sup>2</sup> | Mitigated 2010 California Green Building Standards Code (Mandatory in 2011) <sup>3</sup> | Mitigated 2010 California Green Building Standards Code (Voluntary) <sup>4</sup> | Mitigated ENERGY STAR <sup>5</sup> |                           |
| Toilet                       | 33%                                | 1.6   | 1.28   | --   | --                                 | gallons/flush             |
| Showerhead                   | 22%                                | 2.5   | 2.0  | --   | --                                 | gallons/minute @ 60 psi   |
| Bathroom Faucet              | 18%                                | 2.2   | 1.5  | --   | --                                 | gallons/minute @ 60 psi   |
| Kitchen Faucet               |                                    | 2.2   | 1.8  | --   | --                                 | gallons/minute @ 60 psi   |
| Standard Dishwasher          | 1%                                 | 6.5   | --   | 5.8  | 5.0                                | gallons/cycle             |
| Compact Dishwasher           |                                    | 4.5   | --   | --   | 3.5                                | gallons/cycle             |
| Top-loading Clothes Washer   | 14%                                | 6.0   | --   | --   | 6.0                                | gallons/cycle/ cubic foot |
| Front-loading Clothes Washer |                                    | 6.0   | --   | --   | 6.0                                | gallons/cycle/ cubic foot |
| Leaks, Other                 | 12%                                | --  | --   | --   | --                                 | --                        |

**Notes:**

1. Indoor household end use of water 2000 estimates from Figure 2-4c of the Pacific Institute report.
2. Baseline water flow rates for toilets, showerheads, bathroom faucets, and kitchen faucets are from the 2010 California Green Building Standards Code. Baseline water flow rates for dishwashers and clothes washers are from CCR Title 20, Division 2, Chapter 4, Article 4, Section 1605.2 (Appliance Efficiency Regulations for appliances sold in California).
3. Mitigated water flow rates for toilets, showerheads, bathroom faucets, and kitchen faucets are voluntary in 2010 and mandatory starting January 1, 2011.
4. Mitigated water flow rates for dishwashers and clothes washers are voluntary.
5. In some cases, the 2011 ENERGY STAR dishwasher and clothes washer models have lower flow rates than the 2010 California Green Building Standards Code. Using these ENERGY STAR models results in an additional mitigation beyond what is recommended by the 2010 California Green Building Standards Code.

# Water

CEQA# MM-E23  
MP# EE-2.1.6; COS 2.

## WUW-1

## Water Use

**Table WUW-1.2**  
**Percent Indoor Water Use by End-Use in Non-Residential Buildings**

| End-Use                      | OFFICE             |                     | HOTEL              |                     | RESTAURANT         |                     | GROCERY STORE      |                     | NON-GROCERY RETAIL STORES |                     | K-12 SCHOOL        |                     | OTHER SCHOOL       |                     |
|------------------------------|--------------------|---------------------|--------------------|---------------------|--------------------|---------------------|--------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|---------------------|--------------------|---------------------|--------------------|---------------------|
|                              | Total <sup>1</sup> | Indoor <sup>2</sup> | Total <sup>1</sup>        | Indoor <sup>2</sup> | Total <sup>1</sup> | Indoor <sup>2</sup> | Total <sup>1</sup> | Indoor <sup>2</sup> |
| <b>Restroom</b>              | 26%                | --                  | 51%                | --                  | 34%                | --                  | 17%                | --                  | 26%                       | --                  | 20%                | --                  | 20%                | --                  |
| Toilets (72% of Restroom)    | --                 | 48%                 | --                 | 46%                 | --                 | 27%                 | --                 | 26%                 | --                        | 46%                 | --                 | 51%                 | --                 | 37%                 |
| Urinals (17% of Restroom)    | --                 | 11%                 | --                 | 11%                 | --                 | 6%                  | --                 | 6%                  | --                        | 11%                 | --                 | 12%                 | --                 | 9%                  |
| Faucets (4% of Restroom)     | --                 | 3%                  | --                 | 3%                  | --                 | 1%                  | --                 | 1%                  | --                        | 3%                  | --                 | 3%                  | --                 | 2%                  |
| Showers (7% of Restroom)     | --                 | 5%                  | --                 | 4%                  | --                 | 3%                  | --                 | 2%                  | --                        | 4%                  | --                 | 5%                  | --                 | 4%                  |
| <b>Kitchen</b>               | 3%                 | --                  | 10%                | --                  | 46%                | --                  | 9%                 | --                  | 4%                        | --                  | 2%                 | --                  | 1%                 | --                  |
| Faucets (57% of Kitchen)     | --                 | 4%                  | --                 | 7%                  | --                 | 29%                 | --                 | 11%                 | --                        | 6%                  | --                 | 4%                  | --                 | 1%                  |
| Dishwashers (24% of Kitchen) | --                 | 2%                  | --                 | 3%                  | --                 | 12%                 | --                 | 5%                  | --                        | 2%                  | --                 | 2%                  | --                 | 1%                  |
| Ice Making (19% of Kitchen)  | --                 | 1%                  | --                 | 2%                  | --                 | 10%                 | --                 | 4%                  | --                        | 2%                  | --                 | 1%                  | --                 | 0%                  |
| <b>Laundry</b>               | 0%                 | 0%                  | 14%                | 18%                 | 0%                 | 0%                  | 0%                 | 0%                  | 0%                        | 0%                  | 0%                 | 0%                  | 1%                 | 3%                  |
| <b>Other</b>                 | 10%                | 26%                 | 5%                 | 6%                  | 12%                | 13%                 | 22%                | 46%                 | 11%                       | 27%                 | 6%                 | 21%                 | 17%                | 44%                 |
| <b>Landscaping</b>           | 38%                | --                  | 10%                | --                  | 6%                 | --                  | 3%                 | --                  | 38%                       | --                  | 72%                | --                  | 61%                | --                  |
| <b>Cooling</b>               | 23%                | --                  | 10%                | --                  | 2%                 | --                  | 49%                | --                  | 21%                       | --                  | unknown            | --                  | unknown            | --                  |
| <b>TOTAL</b>                 | 100%               | 100%                | 100%               | 100%                | 100%               | 100%                | 100%               | 100%                | 100%                      | 100%                | 100%               | 100%                | 100%               | 100%                |

**Notes:**

1. Water end-use data from Figures E-1, E-2, E-5, E-6, E-7, E-8, and E-9 of Appendix E of the Pacific Institute report.
2. Indoor end-use data calculated based on the total water use data for the relevant building category and Figure 4-3 and Figure 4-4 of the Pacific Institute report. Figure 4-3 shows the breakdown of restroom water use by end-use in the commercial & industry sector. Figure 4-4 shows the breakdown of kitchen water use by end-use in the commercial & industry sector; it was assumed that all end-uses except dishwashing and ice making are associated with faucet water use.

# Water

CEQA# MM-E23  
MP# EE-2.1.6; COS 2.

## WUW-1

## Water Use

**Table WUW-1.3**  
**Reduction in Water use from Low-flow or High-efficiency Non-Residential Water Fixtures**

| Fixture                                     | Water Flow Rate                                   |  |  |                                    | Unit                      |
|---|---|--|--|------------------------------------|---------------------------|
|   | Baseline Current California Standard <sup>1</sup> | Mitigated 2010 California Green Building Standards Code (Mandatory in 2011) <sup>2</sup> | Mitigated 2010 California Green Building Standards Code (Voluntary) <sup>3</sup> | Mitigated ENERGY STAR <sup>4</sup> |                           |
| Toilet                                      | 1.6   | 1.28   | 1.12   | --                                 | gallons/flush             |
| Urinal                                      | 1.0   | 0.5  | 0.5  | --                                 | gallons/flush             |
| Showerhead                                  | 2.5   | 2.0  | 1.8  | --                                 | gallons/minute @ 60 psi   |
| Bathroom Faucet                             | 0.5   | 0.4  | 0.35   | --                                 | gallons/minute @ 60 psi   |
| Kitchen Faucet                              | 2.2   | 1.8  | 1.6  | --                                 | gallons/minute @ 60 psi   |
| Dishwasher: High Temp, Under Counter        | 1.98  | --   | 0.90   | 1.00                               | gallons/rack              |
| Dishwasher: High Temp, Door                 | 1.44  | --   | 0.95   | 0.95                               | gallons/rack              |
| Dishwasher: High Temp, Single Tank Conveyor | 1.13  | --   | 0.70   | 0.70                               | gallons/rack              |
| Dishwasher: High Temp, Multi Tank Conveyor  | 1.10  | --   | 0.70   | 0.54                               | gallons/rack              |
| Dishwasher: Low Temp, Under Counter         | 1.95  | --   | 0.98   | 1.70                               | gallons/rack              |
| Dishwasher: Low Temp, Door                  | 1.85  | --   | 1.16   | 1.18                               | gallons/rack              |
| Dishwasher: Low Temp, Single Tank Conveyor  | 1.23  | --   | 0.62   | 0.79                               | gallons/rack              |
| Dishwasher: Low Temp, Multi Tank Conveyor   | 0.99  | --   | 0.62   | 0.54                               | gallons/rack              |
| Top-loading Clothes Washer                  | 9.5   | --   | 8.6  | 6.0                                | gallons/cycle/ cubic foot |
| Front-loading Clothes Washer                | 9.5   | --   | 8.6  | 6.0                                | gallons/cycle/ cubic foot |

# Water

CEQA# MM-E23  
 MP# EE-2.1.6; COS 2.

## WUW-1

### Water Use

**Notes:**

1. Baseline water flow rates for toilets, showerheads, bathroom faucets, and kitchen faucets are from the 2010 California Green Building Standards Code. Baseline water flow rates for dishwashers are from the ENERGY STAR Commercial Dishwasher Calculator. Baseline water flow rates for clothes washers are from CCR Title 20, Division 2, Chapter 4, Article 4, Section 1605.2 (Appliance Efficiency Regulations for appliances sold in California).
2. These mitigated water flow rates for toilets, showerheads, bathroom faucets, and kitchen faucets are voluntary in 2010 and mandatory starting January 1, 2011.
3. These mitigated water flow rates for toilets, showerheads, bathroom faucets, and kitchen faucets are voluntary and represent the maximum recommended flow rate in order to achieve an overall 30% reduction in water use. Mitigated water flow rates for dishwashers and clothes washers are also voluntary. The range of values shown here represents different types of commercial dishwashers (high-temperature or chemical; conveyor, door, or undercounter models). See Appendix A5 of the 2010 California Green Building Standards Code for details.
4. In some cases, the ENERGY STAR dishwasher and clothes washer models have lower flow rates than the 2010 California Green Building Standards Code. Using these ENERGY STAR models results in an additional mitigation beyond what is recommended by the 2010 California Green Building Standards Code. See the following ENERGY STAR website for details: [http://www.energystar.gov/index.cfm?c=comm\\_dishwashers.pr\\_crit\\_comm\\_dishwashers](http://www.energystar.gov/index.cfm?c=comm_dishwashers.pr_crit_comm_dishwashers)

# Water

CEQA# MM-E23  
MP# EE-2.1.6; COS 2.

## WUW-1

## Water Use

Table WUW-1.4

Percent Reductions in GHG emissions from Installing Low-Flow or High-Efficiency Water Fixtures

| FIXTURE   | LAND USE    |        |       |            |               |                          |             |              |
|---|-------------|--------|-------|------------|---------------|--------------------------|-------------|--------------|
|   | RESIDENTIAL | OFFICE | HOTEL | RESTAURANT | GROCERY STORE | NON-GROCERY RETAIL STORE | K-12 SCHOOL | OTHER SCHOOL |
| <b>2010 California Green Building Standards Code (Mandatory Requirements starting in 2011):</b> |             |        |       |            |               |                          |             |              |
| Toilet  | 6.6%        | 9.6%   | 9.2%  | 5.3%       | 5.1%          | 9.1%                     | 10.3%       | 7.4%         |
| Urinal  | N/A         | 5.7%   | 5.4%  | 3.1%       | 3.0%          | 5.4%                     | 6.1%        | 4.4%         |
| Showerhead  | 4.4%        | 0.9%   | 0.9%  | 0.5%       | 0.5%          | 0.9%                     | 1.0%        | 0.7%         |
| Bathroom Faucet   | 5.7%        | 0.5%   | 0.5%  | 0.3%       | 0.3%          | 0.5%                     | 0.6%        | 0.4%         |
| Kitchen Faucet  | 3.3%        | 0.8%   | 1.3%  | 5.2%       | 1.9%          | 1.0%                     | 0.7%        | 0.3%         |
| <b>2010 California Green Building Standards Code (Voluntary Standards):</b>                     |             |        |       |            |               |                          |             |              |
| Toilet  | N/A         | 14.4%  | 13.8% | 8.0%       | 7.7%          | 13.7%                    | 15.4%       | 11.1%        |
| Urinal  | N/A         | 5.7%   | 5.4%  | 3.1%       | 3.0%          | 5.4%                     | 6.1%        | 4.4%         |
| Showerhead  | N/A         | 1.3%   | 1.2%  | 0.7%       | 0.7%          | 1.2%                     | 1.4%        | 1.0%         |
| Bathroom Faucet   | N/A         | 0.8%   | 0.8%  | 0.4%       | 0.4%          | 0.8%                     | 0.9%        | 0.6%         |
| Kitchen Faucet  | N/A         | 1.2%   | 1.9%  | 7.8%       | 2.9%          | 1.5%                     | 1.1%        | 0.4%         |
| Top-Loading Clothes Washer  | N/A         | N/A    | 1.8%  | N/A        | N/A           | N/A                      | N/A         | 0.3%         |

# Water

CEQA# MM-E23  
MP# EE-2.1.6; COS 2.

## WUW-1

### Water Use

| FIXTURE  | LAND USE    |        |       |            |               |                          |             |              |
|--|-------------|--------|-------|------------|---------------|--------------------------|-------------|--------------|
|  | RESIDENTIAL | OFFICE | HOTEL | RESTAURANT | GROCERY STORE | NON-GROCERY RETAIL STORE | K-12 SCHOOL | OTHER SCHOOL |
| Front-Loading Clothes Washer                           | N/A         | N/A    | 1.8%  | N/A        | N/A           | N/A                      | N/A         | 0.3%         |
| Residential Standard Dishwasher                        | 0.1%        | N/A    | N/A   | N/A        | N/A           | N/A                      | N/A         | N/A          |
| Residential Compact Dishwasher                         | N/A         | N/A    | N/A   | N/A        | N/A           | N/A                      | N/A         | N/A          |
| Commercial Dishwasher: High Temp, Under Counter        | N/A         | 1.0%   | 1.6%  | 6.5%       | 2.5%          | 1.3%                     | 0.9%        | 0.3%         |
| Commercial Dishwasher: High Temp, Door                 | N/A         | 0.6%   | 1.0%  | 4.1%       | 1.5%          | 0.8%                     | 0.6%        | 0.2%         |
| Commercial Dishwasher: High Temp, Single Tank Conveyor | N/A         | 0.7%   | 1.1%  | 4.6%       | 1.7%          | 0.9%                     | 0.7%        | 0.2%         |
| Commercial Dishwasher: High Temp, Multi Tank Conveyor  | N/A         | 0.7%   | 1.1%  | 4.4%       | 1.6%          | 0.9%                     | 0.6%        | 0.2%         |
| Commercial Dishwasher: Low Temp, Under Counter         | N/A         | 0.9%   | 1.5%  | 6.0%       | 2.2%          | 1.2%                     | 0.9%        | 0.3%         |
| Commercial Dishwasher: Low Temp, Door                  | N/A         | 0.7%   | 1.1%  | 4.5%       | 1.7%          | 0.9%                     | 0.6%        | 0.2%         |
| Commercial Dishwasher: Low Temp, Single Tank Conveyor  | N/A         | 0.9%   | 1.5%  | 6.0%       | 2.2%          | 1.2%                     | 0.9%        | 0.3%         |

# Water

CEQA# MM-E23  
MP# EE-2.1.6; COS 2.

## WUW-1

### Water Use

| FIXTURE  | LAND USE    |        |       |            |               |                          |             |              |
|--|-------------|--------|-------|------------|---------------|--------------------------|-------------|--------------|
|  | RESIDENTIAL | OFFICE | HOTEL | RESTAURANT | GROCERY STORE | NON-GROCERY RETAIL STORE | K-12 SCHOOL | OTHER SCHOOL |
| Commercial Dishwasher:<br>Low Temp,<br>Multi Tank Conveyor   | N/A         | 0.7%   | 1.1%  | 4.5%       | 1.7%          | 0.9%                     | 0.6%        | 0.2%         |
| <b>ENERGY STAR Standards:</b>                                |             |        |       |            |               |                          |             |              |
| Top-Loading<br>Clothes Washer                                | N/A         | N/A    | 6.4%  | N/A        | N/A           | N/A                      | N/A         | 0.9%         |
| Front-Loading<br>Clothes Washer                              | N/A         | N/A    | 6.4%  | N/A        | N/A           | N/A                      | N/A         | 0.9%         |
| Residential Standard<br>Dishwasher                           | 0.2%        | N/A    | N/A   | N/A        | N/A           | N/A                      | N/A         | N/A          |
| Residential Compact<br>Dishwasher                            | 0.2%        | N/A    | N/A   | N/A        | N/A           | N/A                      | N/A         | N/A          |
| Commercial Dishwasher:<br>High Temp,<br>Under Counter        | N/A         | 0.9%   | 1.5%  | 5.9%       | 2.2%          | 1.2%                     | 0.8%        | 0.3%         |
| Commercial Dishwasher:<br>High Temp,<br>Door                 | N/A         | 0.6%   | 1.0%  | 4.1%       | 1.5%          | 0.8%                     | 0.6%        | 0.2%         |
| Commercial Dishwasher:<br>High Temp,<br>Single Tank Conveyor | N/A         | 0.7%   | 1.1%  | 4.6%       | 1.7%          | 0.9%                     | 0.7%        | 0.2%         |
| Commercial Dishwasher:<br>High Temp,<br>Multi Tank Conveyor  | N/A         | 0.9%   | 1.5%  | 6.1%       | 2.3%          | 1.2%                     | 0.9%        | 0.3%         |
| Commercial Dishwasher:<br>Low Temp,<br>Under Counter         | N/A         | 0.2%   | 0.4%  | 1.5%       | 0.6%          | 0.3%                     | 0.2%        | 0.1%         |

# Water

CEQA# MM-E23  
MP# EE-2.1.6; COS 2.

## WUW-1

### Water Use

| FIXTURE   | LAND USE    |        |       |            |               |                          |             |              |
|---|-------------|--------|-------|------------|---------------|--------------------------|-------------|--------------|
|   | RESIDENTIAL | OFFICE | HOTEL | RESTAURANT | GROCERY STORE | NON-GROCERY RETAIL STORE | K-12 SCHOOL | OTHER SCHOOL |
| Commercial Dishwasher:<br>Low Temp,<br>Door                 | N/A         | 0.7%   | 1.1%  | 4.3%       | 1.6%          | 0.8%                     | 0.6%        | 0.2%         |
| Commercial Dishwasher:<br>Low Temp,<br>Single Tank Conveyor | N/A         | 0.7%   | 1.1%  | 4.3%       | 1.6%          | 0.8%                     | 0.6%        | 0.2%         |
| Commercial Dishwasher:<br>Low Temp,<br>Multi Tank Conveyor  | N/A         | 0.8%   | 1.4%  | 5.5%       | 2.0%          | 1.1%                     | 0.8%        | 0.3%         |

**Notes:**

N/A indicates that either (a) an improved standard does not exist, or (b) the percent of indoor water use for that fixture and land use is typically zero. For example, (a) the ENERGY STAR standard for residential clothes washers is the same as the baseline current California standard, and (b) no water is expected to be used for laundry (clothes washers) in the Office land use.

#### 4.2.2 Adopt a Water Conservation Strategy

**Range of Effectiveness:** Varies depending on Project Applicant and strategies selected. It is equal to the Percent Reduction in water commitment.

**Measure Description:**

Water use contributes to GHG emissions indirectly, via the production of the electricity that is used to pump, treat, and distribute the water. Reducing water use reduces energy demand and associated indirect GHG emissions.

This mitigation measure describes how to calculate GHG emissions reductions from a Water Conservation Strategy which achieves X% reduction in water use (where X% is the specific percentage reduction in water use committed to by the Project Applicant). The steps taken to achieve this X% reduction in water use can vary in nature and may incorporate technologies which have not yet been established at the time this document was written. In order to take credit for this mitigation measure, the Project Applicant would need to provide detailed and substantial evidence supporting the percent reduction in water use.

The expected percent reduction is applied to the baseline water use, calculated according to the baseline methodology document. The energy-intensity factor associated with water conveyance, treatment, and distribution is provided in the 2006 CEC report [1].

This measure may incorporate other mitigation measures (WUW-1 through 6) of this document. As such, if this measure is used, the other measures cannot be used. These measures can be consulted to assist in determining methods of quantification and typical ranges of effectiveness.

**Measure Applicability:**

- Indoor and/or Outdoor water use

**Inputs:**

The following information needs to be provided by the Project Applicant:

- Total expected water demand, without implementation of Water Conservation Strategy (million gallons)
- Percent reduction in water use after implementation of Water Conservation Strategy (%)

**Baseline Method:**

$$\text{GHG emissions} = \text{Water}_{\text{baseline}} \times \text{Electricity} \times \text{Utility}$$

# Water

CEQA# MS-G-8  
MP# COS-1.

## WUW-2

## Water Use

Where:

GHG emissions = MT CO<sub>2</sub>e

Water<sub>baseline</sub> = Total expected water demand, without implementation of Water Conservation Strategy (million gallons)  
Provided by Applicant

Electricity = Electricity required to supply, treat, and distribute water (and for indoor uses, the electricity required to treat the wastewater) (kWh/million gallons)

Northern California Avg (outdoor uses): 3,500 kWh/million gallons [1]

Northern California Avg (indoor uses): 5,411 kWh/million gallons [1]

Southern California Avg (outdoor uses): 11,111 kWh/million gallons [1]

Southern California Avg (indoor uses): 13,022 kWh/million gallons [1]

Utility = Carbon intensity of Local Utility (CO<sub>2</sub>e/kWh)

If there are percent reductions associated with both indoor and outdoor water use, the GHG emissions from indoor and outdoor water use should be calculated separately and then summed. Thus,

$$\text{Total GHG emissions} = \text{GHG emissions}_{\text{indoor}} + \text{GHG emissions}_{\text{outdoor}}$$

### Mitigation Method:

Since this mitigation method does not change the electricity intensity factor (kWh/million gallons) associated with the supply and distribution of the water, the percent reduction in GHG emissions is dependent only on the change in water consumption:

$$\text{GHG emission reduction} = \text{PercentReduction}$$

Where:

GHG emission reduction = Percentage reduction in GHG emissions for water use.

PercentReduction = Expected percent reduction in water use after implementation of Water Conservation Strategy (%)  
Provided by Applicant

As shown in these equations, the carbon intensity of the local utility does not play a role in determining the percentage reduction in GHG emissions.

### Emission Reduction Ranges and Variables:

| Pollutant         | Category Emissions Reductions |
|-------------------|-------------------------------|
| CO <sub>2</sub> e | To be determined by Applicant |

# Water

CEQA# MS-G-8  
MP# COS-1.

## WUW-2

## Water Use

All other  
pollutants

---

Not Quantified<sup>88</sup>

### Discussion:

The percent reduction in GHG emissions is equivalent to the percent reduction in indoor and outdoor water usage. Therefore, if a Project Applicant implements a Water Conservation Strategy which achieves a 10% reduction in water use, the GHG emissions associated with water use are reduced by 10%.

### Assumptions:

Data based upon the following reference:

- [1] CEC. 2006. Refining Estimates of Water-Related Energy Use in California. PIER Final Project Report. Prepared by Navigant Consulting, Inc. CEC-500-2006-118. Available online at: <http://www.energy.ca.gov/2006publications/CEC-500-2006-118/CEC-500-2006-118.PDF>

### Preferred Literature:

2006 CEC report

### Alternative Literature:

None

### Other Literature Reviewed:

None

---

<sup>88</sup> Criteria air pollutant emissions may also be reduced due to the reduction in energy use; however, the reduction may not be in the same air basin as the project.

#### 4.2.3 Design Water-Efficient Landscapes

**Range of Effectiveness:** 0 – 70% reduction in GHG emissions from outdoor water use

**Measure Description:**

Water use contributes to GHG emissions indirectly, via the production of the electricity that is used to pump, treat, and distribute the water. Designing water-efficient landscapes for a project site reduces water consumption and the associated indirect GHG emissions. Examples of measures which a Project Applicant should consider when designing landscapes are reducing lawn sizes, planting vegetation with minimal water needs such as California native species, choosing vegetation appropriate for the climate of the project site, and choosing complimentary plants with similar water needs or which can provide each other with shade and/or water.

This measure describes how to calculate GHG savings from residential and commercial landscape plantings which have decreased watering demands compared to standard California landscape plantings. The methodology for calculating water demand presented here is based on the California Department of Water Resources (CDWR) 2009 Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance [1] and the CDWR 2000 report: “A Guide to Estimating Irrigation Water Needs of Landscape Plantings in California: The Landscape Coefficient Method and WUCOLS III” (“WUCOLS”) [2].

By January 1, 2010, all local water agencies were required to adopt the CDWR Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance or develop their own local ordinance which is at least as effective at conserving water as the Model Ordinance. Some local agencies have published or are in the process of developing local ordinances.<sup>89</sup> A Project Applicant may choose to use the methodology presented in a local ordinance to demonstrate a percent reduction in water use and GHG emissions; however, the calculations will be similar to the methodology presented in the CDWR Model Ordinance and re-described here.

**Measure Applicability:**

- Outdoor water use

**Inputs:**

The following information needs to be provided by the Project Applicant:

---

<sup>89</sup> List of local water agencies and a description of their plans to either adopt the CDWR Model Ordinance or develop their own ordinance: <ftp://ftp.water.ca.gov/Model-Water-Efficient-Landscape-Ordinance/Local-Ordinances/>

# Water

MP# COS-2.1

## WUW-3

### Water Use

- $Water_{baseline}$ , to be calculated by the Project Applicant using the methodology described below
- $Water_{mitigated}$ , to be calculated by the Project Applicant using the methodology described below

#### Baseline Method:

The Project's baseline water use is the Maximum Applied Water Allowance (MAWA) described in the Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance:

$$MAWA = ET_0 \times 0.62 \times [(0.7 \times LA) + (0.3 \times SLA)]$$

Where:

- MAWA = Maximum Applied Water Allowance (gallons per year)
- $ET_0$  = Annual Reference Evapotranspiration<sup>90</sup> from Appendix A of the Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance (inches per year)
- 0.7 = ET Adjustment Factor (ETAF)
- LA = Landscape Area<sup>91</sup> includes Special Landscape Area<sup>92</sup> (square feet)
- 0.62 = Conversion factor (to gallons per square foot)
- SLA = Portion of the landscape area identified as Special Landscape Area (square feet)
- 0.3 = the additional ET Adjustment Factor for Special Landscape Area

Then the baseline GHG emissions are calculated as follows:

$$GHG \text{ emissions} = MAWA \times Electricity \times Utility$$

Where:

- GHG emissions = MT CO<sub>2</sub>e
- Electricity = Electricity required to supply, treat, and distribute water (kWh/million gallons)
  - Northern California Average (outdoor uses): 3,500 kWh/million gallons
  - Southern California Average (outdoor uses): 11,111 kWh/million gallons

<sup>90</sup> Evapotranspiration is water lost to the atmosphere due to evaporation from soil and transpiration from plant leaves. For a more detailed definition, see this California Irrigation Management Information System (CIMIS) website:

<http://www.cimis.water.ca.gov/cimis/info/EtoOverview.jsp;jsessionid=91682943559928B8A9A243D2A2665E19>

<sup>91</sup> § 491 Definitions in Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance: "Landscape Area (LA) means all the planting areas, turf areas, and water features in a landscape design plan subject to the Maximum Applied Water Allowance calculation. The landscape area does not include footprints of buildings or structures, sidewalks, driveways, parking lots, decks, patios, gravel or stone walks, other pervious or non-pervious hardscapes, and other non-irrigated areas designed for non-development (e.g., open spaces and existing native vegetation)."

<sup>92</sup> § 491 Definitions in Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance: "Special Landscape Area (SLA) means an area of the landscape dedicated solely to edible plants, areas irrigated with recycled water, water features using recycled water and areas dedicated to active play such as parks, sports fields, golf courses, and where turf provides a playing surface."

# Water

MP# COS-2.1

## WUW-3

### Water Use

Utility = Carbon intensity of Local Utility (CO<sub>2</sub>e/kWh)

#### Mitigation Method:

Since this mitigation method does not change the electricity intensity factor (kWh/million gallons) associated with the supply, treatment, and distribution of the water, the percent reduction in GHG emissions is dependent only on the change in water consumption.

The Project's mitigated water use is the Estimated Total Water Use (ETWU) described in the Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance:

$$ETWU = ET_0 \times 0.62 \times \left( \frac{PF \times HA}{IE} + SLA \right)$$

Where:

- ETWU = Estimated total water use (gallons per year)
- ET<sub>0</sub> = Annual Reference Evapotranspiration from Appendix A of the Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance (inches per year)
- PF = Plant Factor from WUCOLS<sup>93</sup>  
see Table WUW-3.1 for examples and WUCOLS for a complete list of values
- HA = Hydrozone Area<sup>94</sup> (square feet)
- SLA = Special Landscape Area (square feet)
- 0.62 = Conversion factor (to gallons per square foot)
- IE = Irrigation Efficiency<sup>95</sup> (minimum 0.71)

Then the percent reduction in GHG emissions is calculated as follows:

$$\text{GHG emission reduction} = \frac{\text{MAWA} - \text{ETWU}}{\text{MAWA}}$$

<sup>93</sup> § 491 Definitions in Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance: "Plant Factor (PF)" is a factor, when multiplied by ET<sub>0</sub>, estimates the amount of water needed by plants." The Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance indicates that PF is 0-0.3 for low water use plants, 0.4-0.6 for moderate water use plants, and 0.7-1.0 for high water use plants. PF is equivalent to the "species factor" (k<sub>s</sub>) in WUCOLS. See Table A above for examples of low, moderate, and high water use plants from WUCOLS. For a complete list of PF (k<sub>s</sub>) values, see the species evaluation list in WUCOLS.

<sup>94</sup> § 491 Definitions in Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance: "Hydrozone means a portion of the landscaped area having plants with similar water needs. A hydrozone may be irrigated or non-irrigated."

<sup>95</sup> § 491 Definitions in Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance: "Irrigation Efficiency (IE) means the measurement of the amount of water beneficially used divided by the amount of water applied. Irrigation efficiency is derived from measurements and estimates of irrigation system characteristics and management practices. The minimum average irrigation efficiency for purposes of the ordinance is 0.71. Greater irrigation efficiency can be expected from well designed and maintained systems."

## Water

MP# COS-2.1

### WUW-3

Water Use

As shown in this equation, the regional electricity intensity factor and utility carbon intensity factor do not play a role in determining the percentage reduction in GHG emissions. Furthermore, since  $ET_0$  is a multiplier in both MAWA and ETWU, it cancels out and therefore  $ET_0$  does not play a role in determining the percentage reduction in GHG emissions either.

**Table WUW-3.1: Example Plant Factor (PF) Values from WUCOLS**

| Water Needs             | PF Range                                  | Plant Type                                 | Species Examples                              |
|-------------------------|---|--|---|
| Low                     | 0 - 0.3                                   | tree                                       | Quercus agrifolia (coast live oak)            |
|                         |   |  | Yucca   |
|                         |   |  | Pinus halepensis (Aleppo pine)                |
|                         |   | shrub                                      | Quercus berberidifolia (California scrub oak) |
|                         |   |  | Lonicera subspicata (chaparral honeysuckle)   |
|                         |   |  | Salvia apiana (white sage)                    |
|                         |   | vine                                       | Macfadyena unguis-cati (cat's claw)           |
| groundcover             | Arctostaphylos spp. (manzanita)           |  |   |
| perennial               | Monardella villosa (coyote mint)          |  |   |
| Moderate                | 0.4 - 0.6                                 | tree                                       | Acer negundo (California box elder)           |
|                         |   |  | Acer paxii (evergreen maple)                  |
|                         |   | shrub                                      | Buxus microphylla japonica (Japanese boxwood) |
|                         |   | vine                                       | Wisteria                                      |
|                         |   |  | Aristolochia durior (Dutchman's pipe)         |
|                         | groundcover                               | Cerastigma plumbaginoides (dwarf plumbago) |   |
|                         | perennial                                 | Monarda didyma (bee balm)                  |   |
|                         | 0.6                                       | turf grasses<br>(warm season)              | Bermudagrass                                  |
|                         |   |  | kikuyugrass                                   |
|                         |   |  | seashore paspalum                             |
| St. Augustinegrass      |   |  |   |
| zoysiagrass             |   |  |   |
| High                    | 0.7 - 1.0                                 | tree                                       | Betula pendula (European white birch)         |
|                         |   |  | Betula nigra (river/red birch)                |
|                         |   | shrub                                      | Cyathea cooperii (Australian tree fern)       |
|                         |   |  | Cornus stolonifera (red osier dogwood)        |
|                         |   | groundcover                                | Soleirolia soleirolii (baby's tears)          |
|                         |   | perennial                                  | Mimulus spp., herbaceous (monkey flower)      |
|                         | Woodwardia radicans (European chain fern) |  |   |
|                         | 0.8                                       | turf grasses<br>(cool season)              | annual bluegrass                              |
|                         |   |  | annual ryegrass                               |
|                         |   |  | colonial bentgrass                            |
| creeping bentgrass      |   |  |   |
| hard fescue             |   |  |   |
| highland bentgrass      |   |  |   |
| Kentucky bluegrass      |   |  |   |
| meadow fescue           |   |  |   |
| perennial ryegrass      |   |  |   |
| red fescue              |   |  |   |
| rough-stalked bluegrass |   |  |   |
| tall fescue             |   |  |   |

# Water

MP# COS-2.1

## WUW-3

Water Use

### Emission Reduction Ranges and Variables:

| Pollutant            | Category Emissions Reductions   |
|----------------------|---|
| CO <sub>2</sub> e    | Assuming an irrigation efficiency of 71% as specified in the Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance and no Special Landscape Area: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 0% reduction if 100% of vegetation is Moderate PF</li> <li>• 13% reduction if 40% of vegetation is Low PF, 40% is Moderate PF, and 20% is High PF</li> <li>• 35% reduction if 50% of vegetation is Low PF and 50% is Moderate PF</li> <li>• 70% reduction if 100% of vegetation is Low PF</li> </ul> |
| All other pollutants | Not Quantified <sup>96</sup>  |

### Discussion:

Example calculations of MAWA and ETWU are provided in the Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance. In this example, assume that the Project Applicant has used the equations to calculate MAWA = 100 million gallons and ETWU = 80 million gallons. Then the GHG emissions reduction is 20%:

$$\text{GHG Emission Reduced} = \frac{100 - 80}{100} = 0.2 \text{ or } 20\%$$

### Assumptions:

Data based upon the following references:

- [1] California Department of Water Resources. 2009. Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance. Available online at: <http://www.water.ca.gov/wateruseefficiency/docs/MWEL09-10-09.pdf>
- [2] (“WUCOLS”): California Department of Water Resources. 2000. A Guide to Estimating Irrigation Water Needs of Landscape Plantings in California: The Landscape Coefficient Method and WUCOLS III. Available online at: [http://www.water.ca.gov/pubs/conservation/a\\_guide\\_to\\_estimating\\_irrigation\\_water\\_needs\\_of\\_landscape\\_plantings\\_in\\_california\\_wucols/wucols00.pdf](http://www.water.ca.gov/pubs/conservation/a_guide_to_estimating_irrigation_water_needs_of_landscape_plantings_in_california_wucols/wucols00.pdf)
- [3] CEC. 2006. Refining Estimates of Water-Related Energy Use in California. PIER Final Project Report. Prepared by Navigant Consulting, Inc. CEC-500-2006-118. December. Available online at: <http://www.energy.ca.gov/2006publications/CEC-500-2006-118/CEC-500-2006-118.PDF>

### Preferred Literature:

The California Department of Water Resources Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance requires that the Estimated Total Water Use (ETWU) of certain landscape

<sup>96</sup> Criteria air pollutant emissions may also be reduced due to the reduction in energy use; however, the reduction may not be in the same air basin as the project.

## Water

MP# COS-2.1

### WUW-3

Water Use

projects shall not exceed the Maximum Applied Water Allowance (MAWA) for that landscape area. The MAWA is calculated based on average irrigation efficiencies and plant factors, two major influences on the water demand of a landscape. The ETWU is calculated based on project-specific plant factors and irrigation efficiency.

#### Alternative Literature:

- [4] (“WUCOLS”): California Department of Water Resources. 2000. A Guide to Estimating Irrigation Water Needs of Landscape Plantings in California: The Landscape Coefficient Method and WUCOLS III. Available online at: [http://www.water.ca.gov/pubs/conservation/a\\_guide\\_to\\_estimating\\_irrigation\\_water\\_needs\\_of\\_landscape\\_plantings\\_in\\_california\\_wucols/wucols00.pdf](http://www.water.ca.gov/pubs/conservation/a_guide_to_estimating_irrigation_water_needs_of_landscape_plantings_in_california_wucols/wucols00.pdf)
- [5] The Las Pilitas Nursery website has a user-friendly and searchable database of native California plants: <http://www.laspilitas.com/shop/plant-products>. As shown in WUCOLS, many California native plants have minimal or very low water needs.

The equation on page 9 of WUCOLS [4] shows that water demand for irrigation landscape plantings (ETL, landscape evapotranspiration) is calculated by multiplying two parameters: the landscape coefficient (KL) and the reference evapotranspiration (ET<sub>o</sub>). KL values are based on a species factor, density factor, and microclimate factor. The guidance provides detailed instructions on how to assign project-specific values for these three factors. KL can then be divided by the irrigation efficiency to obtain the Total Water Applied, as shown on page 31 of the guidance [4]. Total Water Applied is analogous to ETWU in the methodology shown above. Thus, the detailed WUCOLS methodology could be used to perform a more rigorous calculation of ETWU which incorporates microclimate effects (e.g. windy areas, areas shaded by buildings, etc) and vegetation density effects.

#### Other Literature Reviewed:

None

## Water

CEQA# MS-G-8  
MP# COS-3.1

### WUW-4

### Water Use

#### 4.2.4 Use Water-Efficient Landscape Irrigation Systems

**Range of Effectiveness:** 6.1% reduction in GHG emissions from outdoor water

**Measure Description:**

Water use contributes to GHG emissions indirectly, via the production of the electricity that is used to pump, treat, and distribute the water. Using water-efficient landscape irrigation techniques such as “smart” irrigation technology reduces outdoor water demand, energy demand, and the associated GHG emissions.<sup>97</sup>

“Smart” irrigation control systems use weather, climate, and/or soil moisture data to automatically adjust watering schedules in response to environmental and climate changes, such as changes in temperature or precipitation levels. Thus, the appropriate amount of moisture for a certain vegetation type is maintained, and excessive watering is avoided. Many companies which design and install smart irrigation systems, such as Calsense, ET Water, and EPA-certified WaterSense Irrigation Partners, may be able to provide a site-specific estimate of the percent reduction in outdoor water use that can be expected from installing a smart irrigation system. Expected reductions are in the range of 1 – 30%, with the high end of the range associated with historically high water users. To take credit for the high end of the GHG emissions reductions based on these company quotes, the Project Applicant would need to provide detailed and substantial evidence supporting the proposed percent reduction in water use. Alternatively, the Project Applicant could apply the average percent reduction reported in a 2009 study conducted by Aquacraft, Inc. in cooperation with the California Department of Water Resources, the California Urban Water Conservation Council, and a consortium of California water utilities. This comprehensive study showed that smart irrigation systems of various brands achieve an average of 6.1% reduction in outdoor water use in California. This percent reduction is based on a two year study (one year pre and post installation of smart controllers) of over two thousand sites in seventeen different water utilities throughout northern and southern California. While the study also presents utility-specific percent reductions, variations in implementation and sample size between utilities renders these percent reductions insufficient for characterization in a mitigation measure at this time. The study also notes that for a sample of smart controllers where data was collected for three years after installation, the percent reduction in water use increased with time, with the greatest percent reduction achieved in year three.

---

<sup>97</sup> The installation of smart irrigation controllers will be required starting in 2011 as indicated in the 2010 Draft California Green Building Standards Code. As technology advances and newer generation smart irrigation controllers become available, the Project Applicant may choose to use this mitigation measure to quantify water use and associated GHG reductions beyond what would be achieved with the standards required by the California Green Building Standards Code.

# Water

CEQA# MS-G-8  
MP# COS-3.1

## WUW-4

## Water Use

The expected percent reduction is applied to the baseline water use, calculated according to the baseline methodology document. The energy-intensity factor associated with water conveyance and distribution is provided in the 2006 CEC report [2].

### Measure Applicability:

- Outdoor water use

### Inputs:

The following information needs to be provided by the Project Applicant:

- Total expected outdoor water demand, without installation of smart landscape irrigation controller (million gallons).
- (Optional) Project-specific percent reduction in outdoor water demand, after installation of smart landscape irrigation controller. Percent reduction must be verifiable. Otherwise, use the default value of 6.1%.

### Baseline Method:

$$\text{GHG emissions} = \text{Water}_{\text{baseline}} \times \text{Electricity} \times \text{Utility}$$

Where:

$$\text{GHG emissions} = \text{MT CO}_2\text{e}$$

$$\text{Water}_{\text{baseline}} = \text{Total expected outdoor water demand, without installation of smart landscape irrigation controllers (million gallons)} \\ \text{Provided by Applicant}$$

$$\text{Electricity} = \text{Electricity required to supply, treat, and distribute water (kWh/million gallons)} \\ \text{Northern California Average: 3,500 kWh/million gallons} \\ \text{Southern California Average: 11,111 kWh/million gallons}$$

$$\text{Utility} = \text{Carbon intensity of Local Utility (CO}_2\text{e/kWh)}$$

### Mitigation Method:

Since this mitigation method does not change the electricity intensity factor (kWh/million gallons) associated with the supply and distribution of the water, the percent reduction in GHG emissions is dependent only on the change in water consumption:

$$\text{GHG emission reduction} = \text{PercentReduction} \times \text{Water}_{\text{baseline}}$$

Where:

$$\text{GHG emission reduction} = \text{Percentage reduction in GHG emissions for outdoor water use.}$$

$$\text{Water}_{\text{baseline}} = \text{Total expected outdoor water demand, without installation of smart landscape irrigation controllers (million gallons)}$$

# Water

CEQA# MS-G-8  
MP# COS-3.1

## WUW-4

## Water Use

Provided by Applicant

PercentReduction = Expected percent reduction in water use after installation of smart landscape irrigation controllers (%)

Provided by Applicant or use default 6.1%

As shown in these equations, the carbon intensity of the local utility does not play a role in determining the percentage reduction in GHG emissions.

### Emission Reduction Ranges and Variables:

| Pollutant            | Category Emissions Reductions                 |
|----------------------|---|
| CO <sub>2</sub> e    | 6.1% unless project-specific data is provided |
| All other pollutants | Not Quantified <sup>98</sup>                  |

### Discussion:

The percent reduction in GHG emissions is equivalent to the percent reduction in outdoor water usage. Therefore, if a Project Applicant uses the default percent reduction in water usage associated with installing smart landscape irrigation control systems (6.1%), the resulting reduction in GHG emissions is also 6.1%.

### Assumptions:

Data based upon the following references:

- [1] "Evaluation of California Weather-Based "Smart" Irrigation Controller Programs." July 2009. Presented to the California Department of Water Resources by The Metropolitan Water District of Southern California and The East Bay Municipal Utility District. Facilitated by the California Urban Water Conservation Council. Prepared by Aquacraft Inc., National Research Center Inc., and Dr. Peter J. Bickel. Available online at: [http://www.aquacraft.com/Download\\_Reports/Evaluation\\_of\\_California\\_Smart\\_Controller\\_Programs\\_-\\_Final\\_Report.pdf](http://www.aquacraft.com/Download_Reports/Evaluation_of_California_Smart_Controller_Programs_-_Final_Report.pdf)
- [2] CEC. 2006. Refining Estimates of Water-Related Energy Use in California. PIER Final Project Report. Prepared by Navigant Consulting, Inc. CEC-500-2006-118. Available online at: <http://www.energy.ca.gov/2006publications/CEC-500-2006-118/CEC-500-2006-118.PDF>

### Preferred Literature:

As described above, the 2009 study [1] conducted by Aquacraft, Inc. in cooperation with the California Department of Water Resources, the California Urban Water Conservation Council, and a consortium of California water utilities showed that smart

<sup>98</sup> Criteria air pollutant emissions may also be reduced due to the reduction in energy use; however, the reduction may not be in the same air basin as the project.

irrigation systems of various brands achieve an average of 6.1% reduction in outdoor water use in California.

### Alternative Literature:

When common watering systems such as in-ground sprinklers are used, much of the water applied to lawns and landscapes is not absorbed by the vegetation. Instead, it is lost through runoff or evaporation. The USEPA reports that a study by the American Water Works Association found that households with in-ground sprinkler systems used 35% more water outdoors than households without these systems, while households with drip irrigation systems used 16% more water [3]. The USEPA reports that hand-held hoses or sprinklers are often more water efficient than automatic irrigation systems.

However, “smart” automatic landscape irrigation systems do exist. Examples include systems which automatically adjust watering schedules in response to environmental and climate changes, such as changes in temperature or precipitation levels. A few references have quantified reductions from this type of irrigation strategy. The Southern Nevada Water Authority reports that smart irrigation systems can reduce outdoor water use by an average of 15 to 30 percent, depending on the system, landscape type, and location [4]. One study conducted in 40 households with historically high water use in Irvine, California showed an average reduction in outdoor water use of 16% [5,6]. Another study conducted in Santa Barbara, California households with historically high water use showed an average water savings of 26% [5,7]. A Project Applicant could also hire an EPA-certified WaterSense Irrigation Partner to design and install a new irrigation system or audit an existing system in an effort to minimize the amount of water consumed [6].

- [3] USEPA. 2002. Water-Efficient Landscaping: Preventing Pollution & Using Resources Wisely. Available online at:  
<http://www.epa.gov/npdes/pubs/waterefficiency.pdf>
- [4] Southern Nevada Water Authority. Smart Irrigation Controllers. Available online at:  
[http://www.snwa.com/html/land\\_irrig\\_smartclocks.html](http://www.snwa.com/html/land_irrig_smartclocks.html). Accessed March 2010.
- [5] Irrigation Association. Smart Controller Efficiency Testing. Available online at:  
<http://www.irrigation.org/SWAT/Industry/case-studies.asp>. Accessed March 2010.
- [6] Irvine Ranch Water District, et al. 2001. Residential Weather-Based Irrigation Scheduling: Evidence from the Irvine “ET Controller” Study. Available online at:  
<http://www.irrigation.org/swat/images/irvine.pdf>
- [7] Santa Barbara County Water Agency, et al. 2003. Santa Barbara County ET Controller Distribution and Installation Program Final Report. Available online at:  
[http://www.irrigation.org/swat/images/santa\\_barbara.pdf](http://www.irrigation.org/swat/images/santa_barbara.pdf)
- [8] USEPA. WaterSense: Landscape Irrigation. Available online at:  
[http://www.epa.gov/WaterSense/services/landscape\\_irrigation.html](http://www.epa.gov/WaterSense/services/landscape_irrigation.html)

### 4.2.5 Reduce Turf in Landscapes and Lawns

**Range of Effectiveness:** Varies and is equal to the percent commitment to turf reduction, assuming no other outdoor water uses

#### Measure Description:

Water use contributes to GHG emissions indirectly, via the production of the electricity that is used to pump, treat, and distribute the water. Turf grass (i.e. lawn grass) has relatively high water needs compared to most other types of vegetation. For example, trees planted in turf generally do not need additional watering besides what is required for the turf. Water agencies in Southern California have instituted turf removal programs which provide rebates for resident who reduce the turf area in their lawns. Reducing the turf size of landscapes and lawns reduces water consumption and the associated indirect GHG emissions.<sup>99</sup>

This measure describes how to calculate GHG savings from reducing the turf area of an existing lawn by X square feet, or designing a lawn to have X square feet less than the turf area of a standard lawn at the project location.<sup>100</sup>

Additional GHG emissions reductions may occur due to a reduction in fertilizer usage. Since this will vary based on individual occupant behavior, this reduction in GHG emissions from decreased fertilizer usage is not quantified.

#### Measure Applicability:

- Outdoor water use

#### Inputs:

The following information needs to be provided by the Project Applicant:

- Turf area of existing lawn or standard lawn at the project location (square feet)
- Turf area reduction commitment (square feet reduced or percent of baseline reduced)

#### Baseline Method:

<sup>99</sup> See the SoCal WaterSmart Residential Turf Program description at [http://socialwatersmart.com/index.php?option=com\\_content&view=article&id=77&Itemid=10](http://socialwatersmart.com/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=77&Itemid=10). Accessed March 2010.

<sup>100</sup> The Project Applicant would need to provide a value for and evidence supporting this “standard-sized lawn.” This value is likely to vary greatly depending on the type of building (single-family, condo, apartment complex, commercial space) as well as location (region in California, urban or suburban).

# Water

## WUW-5 Water Use

The methodology for calculating water demand presented here is based on the California Department of Water Resources (CDWR) 2009 Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance [1] and the CDWR 2000 report: “A Guide to Estimating Irrigation Water Needs of Landscape Plantings in California: The Landscape Coefficient Method and WUCOLS III” [2].

The Project Applicant should first calculate the amount of water required to support the existing turf or standard-sized turf ( $Water_{baseline}$ ).<sup>101</sup> In the equations below, “crop” also represents “turf grass,” or lawn grasses.

$$ET_C = K_C \times ET_0$$

Where:

- $ET_C$  = Crop Evapotranspiration, the total amount of water the baseline turf loses during a specific time period due to evapotranspiration<sup>102</sup> (inches water/day)
- $K_C$  = Crop Coefficient, factor determined from field research, which compares the amount of water lost by the crop (e.g. turf) to the amount of water lost by a reference crop (unitless)

Species-specific; provided in Table WUW-5.1 below
- $ET_0$  = Reference Evapotranspiration, the amount of water lost by a reference crop (inches water/day)

Region-specific; provided in Appendix A of the CDWR Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance [1]

---

<sup>101</sup> Page 10 of the CDWR report explains that the objective of landscape management is to maintain the “health, appearance, and reasonable growth” of plants, and not necessarily to replenish all of the water lost at maximum evapotranspiration rates. Thus, the CDWR methodology presented here calculates only the amount of water required to sustain the health, appearance, and growth of the plants.

<sup>102</sup> Evapotranspiration is water lost to the atmosphere due to evaporation from soil and transpiration from plant leaves. For a more detailed definition, see this California Irrigation Management Information System (CIMIS) website:  
<http://www.cimis.water.ca.gov/cimis/infoEtoOverview.jsp;jsessionid=91682943559928B8A9A243D2A2665E19>

# Water

## WUW-5 Water Use

**Table WUW-5.1:  
Crop Coefficient for Turf Grasses**

| Category               | Kc  | Species   |
|------------------------|-----|---|
| cool season<br>grasses | 0.8 | annual bluegrass<br>annual ryegrass<br>colonial bentgrass<br>creeping bentgrass<br>hard fescue<br>highland bentgrass<br>Kentucky bluegrass<br>meadow fescue<br>perennial ryegrass<br>red fescue<br>rough-stalked bluegrass<br>tall fescue |
| warm season<br>grasses | 0.6 | Bermudagrass<br>kikuyugrass<br>seashore paspalum<br>St. Augustinegrass<br>zoysiagrass   |

Reference: p. 6 and p. 137 of CDWS report

Then:  $Water_{baseline} = ETC \times Area_{baseline} \times 0.62 \times 365$

Where:

- $Water_{baseline}$  = Volume of water required to support the baseline turf (gallons/year)
- $Area_{baseline}$  = Area of existing or standard turf (square feet)  
Provided by the Applicant
- 0.62 = conversion factor (gallons/squarefoot inches water)
- 365 = conversion factor (days/year)
- ETC = Crop evapotranspiration  
Calculated using the equation on page 280

Then the baseline GHG emissions are calculated as follows:

$$GHG \text{ emissions} = Water_{baseline} \times Electricity \times Utility$$

Where:

- GHG emissions = MT CO<sub>2</sub>e
- Electricity = Electricity required to supply, treat, and distribute water (kWh/million gallons)

# Water

## WUW-5

## Water Use

Northern California Average (outdoor uses): 3,500 kWh/million gallons

Southern California Average (outdoor uses): 11,111 kWh/million gallons

Utility = Carbon intensity of Local Utility (CO<sub>2</sub>e/kWh)

### Mitigation Method:

The equations above show that the GHG emissions are directly proportional to the water demand, which is in turn directly proportional to the area of the turf. Therefore, only the area of the existing or standard turf and the commitment to turf area reduction (square feet reduced or percent of baseline reduced) are needed to calculate the percent reduction in GHG emissions:

$$\text{GHG emission reduction} = \frac{\text{Area}_{\text{reduction}}}{\text{Area}_{\text{baseline}}} = \text{AreaPercentReduction}$$

Where:

Area<sub>reduction</sub> = Area of turf to be reduced (square feet)

Provided by the Applicant

Area<sub>baseline</sub> = Area of existing or standard turf (square feet)

Provided by the Applicant

AreaPercentReduction = Percent reduction in turf area (%)

Provided by the Applicant

As shown in this equation, the regional electricity intensity factor for water and the utility carbon intensity factor do not play a role in determining the percentage reduction in GHG emissions.

### Emission Reduction Ranges and Variables:

| Pollutant            | Category Emissions Reductions   |
|----------------------|---|
| CO <sub>2</sub> e    | Up to 100%, assuming 100% reduction in turf grass area. This would be the case for rock-lawns, for example. |
| All other pollutants | Not Quantified <sup>103</sup>   |

### Discussion:

In this example, assume that the Project Applicant has provided detailed evidence to show that the turf area of a standard lawn at the project location is 8,000 square feet. If the Project Applicant then commits to reducing the turf area of lawns by 3,000 square feet, then the GHG emissions reduction is 37.5%.

<sup>103</sup> Criteria air pollutant emissions may also be reduced due to the reduction in energy use; however, the reduction may not be in the same air basin as the project.

# Water

## WUW-5 Water Use

$$\text{GHG Emission Reduced} = \frac{3,000}{8,000} = 0.375 \text{ or } 37.5\%$$

**Assumptions:**

Data based upon the following references:

- [1] California Department of Water Resources. 2009. Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance. Available online at:  
<http://www.water.ca.gov/wateruseefficiency/docs/MWEL09-10-09.pdf>
- [2] California Department of Water Resources. 2000. A Guide to Estimating Irrigation Water Needs of Landscape Plantings in California: The Landscape Coefficient Method and WUCOLS III. Available online at:  
[http://www.water.ca.gov/pubs/conservation/a\\_guide\\_to\\_estimating\\_irrigation\\_water\\_needs\\_of\\_landscape\\_plantings\\_in\\_california\\_wucols/wucols00.pdf](http://www.water.ca.gov/pubs/conservation/a_guide_to_estimating_irrigation_water_needs_of_landscape_plantings_in_california_wucols/wucols00.pdf)
- [3] CEC. 2006. Refining Estimates of Water-Related Energy Use in California. PIER Final Project Report. Prepared by Navigant Consulting, Inc. CEC-500-2006-118. December. Available online at:  
<http://www.energy.ca.gov/2006publications/CEC-500-2006-118/CEC-500-2006-118.PDF>

**Preferred Literature:**

See above

**Alternative Literature:**

None

**Other Literature Reviewed:**

None

# Water

CEQA# MM D-16  
MP# COS-3.1

## WUW-6

### Water Use

#### 4.2.6 Plant Native or Drought-Resistant Trees and Vegetation

**Range of Effectiveness:** Best Management Practice; may be quantified if substantial evidence is available.

#### Measure Description:

California native plants within their natural climate zone and ecotype need minimal watering beyond normal rainfall, so less water is needed for irrigating native plants than non-native species. Drought-resistant vegetation needs even less watering. Water use contributes to GHG emissions indirectly, via the production of the electricity that is used to pump, treat, and distribute the water. Thus, planting native and drought-resistant vegetation reduces water use and the associated GHGs. Designing landscapes with native plants can provide many other benefits, including reducing the need for fertilization and pesticide use, and providing a more natural habitat for native wildlife. Although there is much anecdotal evidence for the benefits of planting native vegetation, few scientific studies have quantified the actual water savings. Therefore, this mitigation measure would most likely be employed as a Best Management Practice. Future studies may quantify the water-saving benefits of planting native or drought-resistant vegetation. In order to take quantitative credit for this mitigation measure, the Project Applicant would need to provide detailed and substantial evidence supporting a percent reduction in water use. The percent reduction would be applied to the baseline water use, calculated according to the baseline methodology described in WUW-3 (Design water efficient landscapes) and the baseline methodology document.

#### Measure Applicability:

- Outdoor water use

#### Inputs:

The following information needs to be provided by the Project Applicant:

- Percent reduction in water use, calculated using detailed and substantial evidence
- $Water_{baseline}$ , to be calculated by the Project Applicant using the baseline methodology described in WUW-3 (Design water efficient landscapes) and the baseline methodology document

#### Baseline Method

See WUW-3 (Design water efficient landscapes)

# Water

CEQA# MM D-16  
MP# COS-3.1

## WUW-6

## Water Use

### Mitigation Method

Since this mitigation method does not change the electricity intensity factor (kWh/million gallons) associated with the supply, treatment, and distribution of the water, the percent reduction in GHG emissions is dependent only on the change in water consumption:

$$\text{GHG emission reduction} = \text{PercentReduction} \times \text{Water}_{\text{baseline}}$$

Where:

GHG emission reduction = Percentage reduction in GHG emissions for outdoor water use.

$\text{Water}_{\text{baseline}}$  = Baseline water demand, without planting native or drought-resistant vegetation

Provided by Applicant, calculated using baseline methodology of Mitigation Measure WUW-3

PercentReduction = Expected percent reduction in water use resulting from planting native or drought-resistant vegetation

Provided by Applicant

As shown in these equations, the carbon intensity of the local utility does not play a role in determining the percentage reduction in GHG emissions.

### Emission Reduction Ranges and Variables:

| Pollutant            | Category Emissions Reductions |
|----------------------|-------------------------------|
| CO <sub>2</sub> e    | To be determined by Applicant |
| All other pollutants | Not Quantified <sup>104</sup> |

### Discussion:

Currently there is not sufficient substantial evidence supporting a generalized reduction in emissions due to planting native or drought tolerant species. However, if the project applicant is able to provide sufficient substantial evidence supporting a reduction in water usage associated with native or drought tolerant species, the percent reduction in GHG emissions is equivalent to the percent reduction in outdoor water usage. Therefore, if a Project Applicant can support a 10% reduction in water use by native and drought tolerant species, the GHG emissions associated with water use are reduced by 10%.

### Assumptions:

None

---

<sup>104</sup> Criteria air pollutant emissions may also be reduced due to the reduction in energy use; however, the reduction may not be in the same air basin as the project.

# Water

CEQA# MM D-16

MP# COS-3.1

**WUW-6**

**Water Use**

## Alternative Literature:

The EPA reports that while there is anecdotal evidence for the water-saving benefits of planting native and drought-resistant vegetation, there are very few scientific studies available which quantify the benefits. There are several good resources available which describe the qualitative benefits. The California Native Plant Society provides many resources for designing a native plant garden, including how to identify native plants and where to buy them. The Las Pilitas Nursery provides similar resources and also lists species of drought-resistant plants that are best for specific California regions. The EPA also provides tips for designing landscapes with native plants.

USEPA. "Exploring the Environmental, Social and Economic Benefits Conference," December 6-7, 2004. USEPA. Greenacres: Landscaping with Native Plants Research Needs. Available online at:

[http://www.epa.gov/greenacres/conf12\\_04/conf\\_A.html](http://www.epa.gov/greenacres/conf12_04/conf_A.html). Accessed March 2010.

California Native Plant Society. Homepage. Available online at: <http://www.cnps.org/>. Accessed March 2010.

Las Pilitas Nursery. Drought Tolerant or Resistant Native Plants. Available online at: [http://www.laspilitas.com/garden/Drought\\_resistant\\_plants\\_for\\_a\\_California\\_garden.html](http://www.laspilitas.com/garden/Drought_resistant_plants_for_a_California_garden.html). Accessed March 2010.

USEPA. Greenacres: Native Plants Brochure. Available online at: <http://www.epa.gov/greenacres/navland.html#Introduction>. Accessed March 2010.

## Alternative Literature:

None.

## Other Literature Reviewed:

None

| Section | Category                                 | Page # | Measure # |
|---------|--|--------|-----------|
| 5.0     | <b>Area Landscaping</b>                  | 384    |           |
| 5.1     | Landscaping Equipment                    | 384    |           |
| 5.1.1   | Prohibit Gas Powered Landscape Equipment | 384    | A-1       |
| 5.1.2   | Implement Lawnmower Exchange Program     | 389    | A-2       |
| 5.1.3   | Electric Yard Equipment Compatibility    | 391    | A-3       |



# Area Landscaping

## A-1

## Landscaping Equipment

### 5.0 Landscaping Equipment

#### 5.1 Landscaping Equipment

##### 5.1.1 Prohibit Gas Powered Landscape Equipment.

###### Measure Description:

Electric lawn equipment including lawn mowers, leaf blowers and vacuums, shredders, trimmers, and chain saws are available. When electric landscape equipment is used in place of a conventional gas-powered equipment, direct GHG emissions from natural gas combustion are replaced with indirect GHG emissions associated with the electricity used to power the equipment.

###### Measure Applicability:

[1] Landscaping equipment

###### Inputs:

The following information needs to be provided by the Project Applicant:

- Electricity provider for the Project
- Horsepower of landscaping equipment
- Hours of operation

###### Baseline Method:

Look up landscape equipment emission factor based on type of fuel used:

| Landscaping Equipment Horsepower | CO <sub>2</sub> Emission Factor from Gasoline (g/hp-hr) |
|----------------------------------|---|
| < 25                             | 429.44  |
| 25 – 50                          | 783.30  |
| 50 – 120                         | 774.50  |
| 120 –175                         | 753.25  |
| > 175                            | 732.00  |

$$\text{GHG emission} = \text{EF} \times \text{Hp} \times \text{LF} \times \text{Hr} \times 10^{-6}$$

Where:

GHG emission = MT CO<sub>2</sub>e per year

EF = CO<sub>2</sub> emission factor for the relevant horsepower tier show in table above (g/hp-hr). Obtained from OFFROAD2007.

# Area Landscaping

## A-1

## Landscaping Equipment

- Hp = Horsepower of landscaping equipment
- LF = Load factor of equipment for the relevant horsepower tier (dimensionless).  
Obtained from OFFROAD2007.
- Hr = Hours of operation per year
- $10^{-6}$  = Unit conversion from grams to MT

### Mitigation Method:

Landscaping equipment will run on electricity instead of gasoline. The indirect GHG emission from electricity generation is:

$$\text{GHG emission} = \text{Utility} \times \text{Hp} \times \text{LF} \times \text{Hr} \times \text{C}$$

Where:

- GHG emissions = MT CO<sub>2</sub>e
- Utility = Carbon intensity of Local Utility (CO<sub>2</sub>e/kWh). See table below.
- Hp = Horsepower of landscaping equipment.
- LF = Load factor of equipment for the relevant horsepower tier (dimensionless).  
Obtained from OFFROAD2007.
- Hr = Hours of operation.
- C = Unit conversion factor

| Power Utility | Carbon-Intensity (lb CO <sub>2</sub> e/kWh) |
|---------------|---|
| LADWP         | 1,238                                       |
| PG&E          | 456   |
| SCE           | 641   |
| SDGE          | 781   |
| SMUD          | 555   |

$$\text{GHG Reduction \%}^{105} = 1 - \frac{\text{Utility} \times \text{C}}{\text{EF} \times 10^{-6}}$$

- EF = Emission Factor for the relevant fuel horsepower tier (g/hp-hr)  
Obtained from OFFROAD2007. See accompanying tables.

### Emission Reduction Ranges and Variables:

| Power Utility | Equipment Horsepower | Project GHG Emission Reductions |
|---------------|----------------------|---------------------------------|
| LADWP         | < 25                 | 2.5%                            |
|               | 25 – 50              | 46.5%                           |

<sup>105</sup> This assumes energy from engine losses are the same.

# Area Landscaping

## A-1

## Landscaping Equipment

| Power Utility | Equipment Horsepower | Project GHG Emission Reductions |
|---------------|----------------------|---------------------------------|
|               | 50 – 120             | 45.9%                           |
|               | 120 –175             | 44.4%                           |
|               | > 175                | 42.8%                           |
| PG&E          | < 25                 | 64.1%                           |
|               | 25 – 50              | 80.3%                           |
|               | 50 – 120             | 80.1%                           |
|               | 120 –175             | 79.5%                           |
|               | > 175                | 78.9%                           |
| SCE           | < 25                 | 49.5%                           |
|               | 25 – 50              | 72.3%                           |
|               | 50 – 120             | 72.0%                           |
|               | 120 –175             | 71.2%                           |
|               | > 175                | 70.4%                           |
| SDGE          | < 25                 | 38.5%                           |
|               | 25 – 50              | 66.3%                           |
|               | 50 – 120             | 65.9%                           |
|               | 120 –175             | 64.9%                           |
|               | > 175                | 63.9%                           |
| SMUD          | < 25                 | 56.3%                           |
|               | 25 – 50              | 76.0%                           |
|               | 50 – 120             | 75.8%                           |
|               | 120 –175             | 75.1%                           |
|               | > 175                | 74.3%                           |

Criteria pollutants will be reduced by reduction in combustion. They will also increase through the increase in energy use. However, the increase may not be in the same air basin.

### Discussion:

The output from OFFROAD2007 shows the same emissions within each horsepower tier regardless of the year modeled. Therefore, the emission reduction is dependent on the location of the Project and horsepower of the landscaping equipment only.

### Assumptions:

Data based upon the following references:

California Air Resources Board. Off-road Emissions Inventory. OFFROAD2007.  
 Available online at: <http://www.arb.ca.gov/msei/offroad/offroad.htm>

## Area Landscaping

A-1

Landscaping Equipment

California Climate Action Registry Reporting Online Tool. 2006 PUP Reports. Available online at: <https://www.climateregistry.org/CARROT/public/reports.aspx>

### Preferred Literature:

The amount of direct GHG emissions avoided can be calculated using CARB's OFFROAD model, which provides state-wide and regional emission factors for different types of landscaping equipment that can be converted to grams per horsepower-hour [1]. Multiplying this factor by the typical horsepower and load factor of the equipment and number of hours of operation gives the direct GHG emissions. Assuming the same number of operating hours and power output as the gas-powered equipment, the same amount of energy consumption multiplied by the carbon-intensity factor of the local utility gives the amount of indirect GHG emissions associated with using the electric landscape equipment. The GHG emissions reduction associated with this mitigation measure is therefore the difference in emissions from these two scenarios.

### Companion Strategy:

In order to take credit for Mitigation Measure 80, a Project Applicant must also commit to providing electrical outlets on the exterior of all buildings (Mitigation Measure 60) so that electrical lawn equipment is compatible with built facilities.

### Alternative Literature:

None

### Notes:

1. CARB. OFFROAD 2007 Model. Available online at: <http://www.arb.ca.gov/msei/offroad/offroad.htm>. Accessed February 2010.

### Other Literature Reviewed:

- A. USEPA. Lawn Mower Exchange Program Calculator. Available online at: [http://www.epa.gov/air/community/mowerexchange\\_calculator.html](http://www.epa.gov/air/community/mowerexchange_calculator.html). Accessed February 2010.
- B. USEPA. Improving Air Quality in Your Community: Outdoor Air – Transportation: Lawn Equipment. Available online at: <http://www.epa.gov/air/community/details/yardequip.html>. Accessed February 2010.
- C. CARB. AB118 Lawn and Garden Equipment Replacement Project. Available online at: <http://www.arb.ca.gov/msprog/aqip/lger.htm>. Accessed February 2010.
- D. SCAQMD. Mow Down Air Pollution Electric Lawn Mower Exchange. Available online at: <http://www.aqmd.gov/tao/lawnmower2009.html>. Accessed February 2010.
- E. VCAPD. Lawn Mower Trade-In Program for Ventura County Residents. Available online at: [http://www.vcapcd.org/LawnMower\\_EN.htm](http://www.vcapcd.org/LawnMower_EN.htm). Accessed February 2010.

## Area Landscaping

**A-1**

**Landscaping Equipment**

- F. SMAQMD. Mow Down Air Pollution. Available online at:  
<http://www.airquality.org/mobile/mowdown/index.shtml>. Accessed February 2010.

## Area

CEQA# MM D-13

MP# EE-4.2

A-2

Landscaping Equipment

### 5.1.2 Implement Lawnmower Exchange Program

**Range of Effectiveness:** Best Management Practice, influences Area GHG emissions from landscape equipment

#### Measure Description:

When electric and rechargeable battery-powered lawnmowers are used in place of conventional gas-powered lawnmowers, direct GHG emissions from fuel combustion are displaced by indirect GHG emissions associated with the electricity used to power the equipment. The indirect GHG emissions from electricity generation are expected to be significantly less than the direct GHG emissions from gasoline or diesel fuel combustion. Since the magnitude of the GHG emissions reduction depends on the equipment model (including electric power efficiency and battery recharge time), hours of operation, fuel displaced, and number of lawnmowers replaced, the exact GHG emissions reduction is not quantifiable at this time. Therefore, this mitigation measure should be incorporated as a Best Management Practice to allow for educated residents and commercial tenants to reduce their contribution to GHG emissions from landscaping. Many California Air Districts, including eight air districts supported by the CARB Lawn and Garden Equipment Replacement (LGER) Project, already have lawnmower exchange programs in place. This Best Management Practice could involve participating in these established lawnmower exchange programs, supplementing the established programs, or implementing a new program for the Project. The Project Applicant should check with the local air district regarding participating in established programs. The Project Applicant could take quantitative credit for this mitigation measure if detailed and substantial evidence were provided.

#### Measure Applicability:

- GHG emissions from landscaping

#### Assumptions:

Data based upon the following references:

- CARB. AB118 Lawn and Garden Equipment Replacement Project. Available online at: <http://www.arb.ca.gov/msprog/agip/lger.htm>. Accessed February 2010.
- SCAQMD. Mow Down Air Pollution Electric Lawn Mower Exchange. Available online at: <http://www.aqmd.gov/tao/lawnmower2009.html>. Accessed February 2010.
- VCAPD. Lawn Mower Trade-In Program for Ventura County Residents. Available online at: [http://www.vcapcd.org/LawnMower\\_EN.htm](http://www.vcapcd.org/LawnMower_EN.htm). Accessed February 2010.
- SMAQMD. Mow Down Air Pollution. Available online at: <http://www.airquality.org/mobile/mowdown/index.shtml>. Accessed February 2010.

## Area

CEQA# MM D-13

MP# EE-4.2

A-2

Landscaping Equipment

### Emission Reduction Ranges and Variables:

This is a Best Management Practice and therefore there is no quantifiable reduction at this time. Check with local agencies for guidance on any allowed reductions associated with implementation of best management practices.

### Preferred Literature:

CARB's Lawn and Garden Equipment Replacement (LGER) Project was established to encourage the use of cordless zero-emission lawn and garden equipment and to help bring more electric equipment to the market. The LGER Project provides vouchers for electric cordless residential lawn mowers valued up to \$250 for each gas-powered lawnmower turned in. The LGER Project provides grants to eight air districts with existing lawnmower exchange programs, including AVAQMD, MDAQMD, SCAQMD, SDAPCD, SJVAPCD, SMAQMD, VCAPCD, and YSAQMD. Individual air districts may offer vouchers of different values.

### Alternative Literature:

None

### Other Literature Reviewed:

- USEPA. Lawn Mower Exchange Program Calculator. Available online at: [http://www.epa.gov/air/community/mowerexchange\\_calculator.html](http://www.epa.gov/air/community/mowerexchange_calculator.html). Accessed February 2010.
- USEPA. Improving Air Quality in Your Community: Outdoor Air – Transportation: Lawn Equipment. Available online at: <http://www.epa.gov/air/community/details/yardequip.html>. Accessed February 2010.

## Area

CEQA# MM D-14

MP# MO-2.4

## A-3

## Landscaping Equipment

### 5.1.3 Electric Yard Equipment Compatibility

**Range of Effectiveness:** Best Management Practice, influences Area GHG emissions from landscape equipment. Not applicable on its own. This measure enhances effectiveness of A-1 and A-2.

#### Measure Description:

This measure is required to be grouped with measures A-1 “Prohibit Gas Powered Landscape Equipment” and A-2 “Implement a Lawnmower Exchange Program.” In order for measures A-1 and A-2 to be feasible, electrical outlets on the exterior of buildings must be accessible so that the electric landscaping equipment can be charged. In this mitigation measure, the Project Applicant commits to providing electrical outlets on the exterior of Project buildings as necessary for sufficient powering of electric lawnmowers and other landscaping equipment.

#### Measure Applicability:

- This measure is part of a grouped measure
- This measure contributes to reductions in GHG emissions from landscaping

#### Emission Reduction Ranges and Variables:

This measure is a Best Management Practice grouped with other measures and therefore there is no quantifiable reduction at this time. Check with local agencies for guidance on any allowed reductions associated with implementation of Best Management Practices.

#### Preferred Literature:

None

| Section    | Category  | Page #     | Measure # |
|------------|---|------------|-----------|
| <b>6.0</b> | <b>Solid Waste</b>                                    | <b>392</b> |           |
| 6.1        | Solid Waste   | 392        |           |
| 6.1.1      | Institute or Extend Recycling and Composting Services | 401        | SW-1      |
| 6.1.2      | Recycle Demolished Construction Material              | 402        | SW-2      |



# Solid Waste

CEQA# MM D-14  
MP# WRD-2

SW-1

Solid Waste

## 6.0 Solid Waste

### 6.1 Solid Waste

#### 6.1.1 Institute or Extend Recycling and Composting Services

**Range of Effectiveness:** Varies depending on Project Applicant and strategies selected. Best Management Practice.

**Measure Description:**

The transport and decomposition of landfill waste and the flaring of landfill gas all produce GHG emissions. Decomposition of waste produces methane, a GHG which has a global warming potential over 20 times that of CO<sub>2</sub>. The transport of waste from the site of generation to the landfill produces GHG emissions from the combustion of the fuel used to power the vehicle. Choosing waste management practices which reduce the amount of waste sent to landfills will reduce GHG emissions. Strategies to reduce landfill waste include increasing recycling, reuse, and composting, and encouraging lifestyle choices and office practices which reduce waste generation.

Current protocols for quantifying emissions reductions from diverted landfill waste developed by the USEPA and the California Center for Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB) are based on life-cycle approaches, which reflect emissions and reductions in both the upstream and downstream processes around waste management. The Project Applicant should seek local agency guidance on comparing and/or combining operational emissions inventories and life cycle emissions inventories.

Furthermore, while tools are available to quantify the avoided landfill GHG emissions from a specified amount of diverted or recycled waste, taking credit for this mitigation measure also requires the determination of the effects of instituting or extending recycling and composting services. Since both government and privately-sponsored recycling and composting programs vary dramatically in scope, waste materials accepted, and outreach efforts, no literature references exist which provide default values for percent of waste diverted. To take credit for this measure, the Project Applicant would need to provide detailed and substantial evidence supporting the amount of waste reduced or diverted to recycling and composting due to the institution of extended recycling and composting services.

**Measure Applicability:**

[2] Solid waste disposed to landfill

# Solid Waste

CEQA# MM D-14  
MP# WRD-2

SW-1

Solid Waste

## Inputs:

The following information needs to be provided by the Project Applicant:

- For residential buildings: number of residents
- For shopping malls and office buildings: building square footage
- For public venues: annual number of visitors
- For all other commercial buildings: number of employees
- Waste disposal method
- Amount of waste reduced or diverted to recycling and composting due to the institution of extended recycling and composting services.

## Baseline Method:

The Project Applicant must first calculate the total amount of waste generated at the project.

For residential buildings and all commercial buildings except shopping malls and offices:

$$\text{Waste}_{\text{baseline total}} = \text{People} \times \text{DisposalRate}$$

For shopping malls and office buildings:

$$\text{Waste}_{\text{baseline total}} = \text{SF} \times \text{DisposalRate}$$

Where:

People = Number of residents, employees, or visitors (for public venues)  
Provided by Applicant

SF = Square feet of building  
Provided by Applicant

DisposalRate = Annual disposal rate of waste (tons/resident/year,  
tons/employee/year, or tons/visitor/year)  
From Tables SW-1.1 and SW-1.2

The total waste stream is then portioned into material-specific streams (paper, glass, metal, plastic, etc.) using the percentages listed in Table SW-1.3.

USEPA's Waste Reduction Model (WARM) is used to quantify baseline emissions and emissions reductions from diverting landfill waste to composting or recycling. This web-based tool is available online at

[http://www.epa.gov/climatechange/wycd/waste/calculators/Warm\\_Form.html](http://www.epa.gov/climatechange/wycd/waste/calculators/Warm_Form.html). The required inputs are the tons of waste associated with one of three waste management practices: landfill (baseline scenario), recycled (mitigated scenario), combusted (not applicable in California), and composted (mitigated scenario). The amount of each type of waste in tons is entered into the "Tons Landfilled" column in the Baseline Scenario of

## Solid Waste

CEQA# MM D-14  
MP# WRD-2

SW-1

Solid Waste

WARM to calculate the baseline GHG emissions in metric MT carbon equivalent (MTCE). Other input variables include landfill type (presence of landfill gas control system or not) and distance of waste transport; however, default values can be used.

### Mitigation Method:

In WARM, the project applicant specifies the amount of waste associated with each of the three alternative scenarios: waste reduced (e.g. reduced waste generation), waste recycled, and waste composted. WARM then calculates the GHG savings associated with the alternative scenarios as compared with the baseline scenario.

### Assumptions:

Data based upon the following reference:

- USEPA. 2009. Waste Reduction Model. Available online at: [http://www.epa.gov/climatechange/wycd/waste/calculators/Warm\\_home.html](http://www.epa.gov/climatechange/wycd/waste/calculators/Warm_home.html)
- CIWMB. 1999. Statewide Waste Characterization Study: Final Results and Report. Available online at: <http://www.calrecycle.ca.gov/publications/LocalAsst/34000009.pdf>
- CIWMB. 2006. Targeted Statewide Waste Characterization Study: Waste Disposal and Diversion Findings for Selected Industry Groups. Available online at: <http://www.ciwmb.ca.gov/WasteChar/WasteStudies.htm#2006Industry>

### Preferred Literature:

USEPA's WARM was developed to track GHG emission reductions from various waste management options. This tool calculates the GHG emissions associated with a baseline waste management strategy, as well as those associated with an alternative strategy that may include source reduction, recycling, composting, combusting, or landfilling. WARM then calculates the GHG savings associated with the alternative strategy as compared with the baseline strategy. WARM requires input of the estimated tons of waste per material type per disposal strategy. There are 34 different material types (e.g., aluminum cans, mixed paper, yard trimmings, carpet). Other input variables include landfill type (presence of landfill gas control system or not) and distance of waste transport; however, default values can be used. Note that WARM was developed based on a life-cycle approach, which reflects emissions and reductions in both the upstream and downstream processes around waste management. USEPA notes that emission factors developed based on this life cycle approach are not appropriate for use in GHG inventories.

### Alternative Literature:

None

## Solid Waste

CEQA# MM D-14  
MP# WRD-2

SW-1

Solid Waste

### Other Literature Reviewed:

- HF&H Consultants. 2008. 5-Year Audit Program Assessment and Final Report. Prepared for StopWaste.Org. Available online at: [http://www.stopwaste.org/docs/revised\\_assessment\\_report-final\\_1-08.pdf](http://www.stopwaste.org/docs/revised_assessment_report-final_1-08.pdf)
- StopWaste.Org. 2008. Multifamily Dwelling Recycling Evaluation Report. Available online at: [http://www.stopwaste.org/docs/mfd\\_evaluation\\_rpt.pdf](http://www.stopwaste.org/docs/mfd_evaluation_rpt.pdf)

# Solid Waste

CEQA# MM D-14  
MP# WRD-2

## SW-1

## Solid Waste

**Table SW-1.1  
Residential Waste Disposal Rates**

| <b>Multi-family Homes</b>  |                |   |
|----------------------------|----------------|---|
| All Counties               | All Regions    | Annual Disposal Rate (tons/resident/year) |
|                            |                | 0.46                                      |
| <b>Single-family Homes</b> |                |   |
| County                     | Region         | Annual Disposal Rate (tons/resident/year) |
| Alameda                    | Bay Area       | 0.42                                      |
| Alpine                     | Mountain       | 0.25                                      |
| Amador                     | Mountain       | 0.25                                      |
| Butte                      | Central Valley | 0.36                                      |
| Calaveras                  | Mountain       | 0.25                                      |
| Colusa                     | Central Valley | 0.36                                      |
| Contra Costa               | Bay Area       | 0.42                                      |
| Del Norte                  | Coastal        | 0.44                                      |
| El Dorado                  | Mountain       | 0.25                                      |
| Fresno                     | Central Valley | 0.36                                      |
| Glenn                      | Central Valley | 0.36                                      |
| Humboldt                   | Coastal        | 0.44                                      |
| Imperial                   | Southern       | 0.41                                      |
| Inyo                       | Mountain       | 0.25                                      |
| Kern                       | Southern       | 0.41                                      |
| Kings                      | Central Valley | 0.36                                      |
| Lake                       | Central Valley | 0.36                                      |
| Lassen                     | Mountain       | 0.25                                      |
| Los Angeles                | Southern       | 0.41                                      |
| Madera                     | Central Valley | 0.36                                      |
| Marin                      | Bay Area       | 0.42                                      |
| Mariposa                   | Mountain       | 0.25                                      |
| Mendocino                  | Coastal        | 0.44                                      |
| Merced                     | Central Valley | 0.36                                      |
| Modoc                      | Mountain       | 0.25                                      |
| Mono                       | Mountain       | 0.25                                      |

# Solid Waste

CEQA# MM D-14  
MP# WRD-2

## SW-1

## Solid Waste

| Single-family Homes |                |   |
|---------------------|----------------|---|
| County              | Region         | Annual Disposal Rate (tons/resident/year) |
| Monterey            | Coastal        | 0.44                                      |
| Napa                | Bay Area       | 0.42                                      |
| Nevada              | Mountain       | 0.25                                      |
| Orange              | Southern       | 0.41                                      |
| Placer              | Central Valley | 0.36                                      |
| Plumas              | Mountain       | 0.25                                      |
| Riverside           | Southern       | 0.41                                      |
| Sacramento          | Central Valley | 0.36                                      |
| San Benito          | Coastal        | 0.44                                      |
| San Bernardino      | Southern       | 0.41                                      |
| San Diego           | Southern       | 0.41                                      |
| San Francisco       | Bay Area       | 0.42                                      |
| San Joaquin         | Central Valley | 0.36                                      |
| San Luis Obispo     | Southern       | 0.41                                      |
| San Mateo           | Bay Area       | 0.42                                      |
| Santa Barbara       | Southern       | 0.41                                      |
| Santa Clara         | Bay Area       | 0.42                                      |
| Santa Cruz          | Coastal        | 0.44                                      |
| Shasta              | Mountain       | 0.25                                      |
| Sierra              | Mountain       | 0.25                                      |
| Siskiyou            | Mountain       | 0.25                                      |
| Solano              | Bay Area       | 0.42                                      |
| Sonoma              | Coastal        | 0.44                                      |
| Stanislaus          | Central Valley | 0.36                                      |
| Sutter              | Central Valley | 0.36                                      |
| Tehama              | Central Valley | 0.36                                      |
| Trinity             | Mountain       | 0.25                                      |
| Tulare              | Central Valley | 0.36                                      |
| Tuolumne            | Mountain       | 0.25                                      |
| Ventura             | Southern       | 0.41                                      |
| Yolo                | Central Valley | 0.36                                      |
| Yuba                | Central Valley | 0.36                                      |

Source:

# Solid Waste

CEQA# MM D-14  
MP# WRD-2

**SW-1**

**Solid Waste**

| Single-family Homes |        |   |
|---------------------|--------|---|
| County              | Region | Annual Disposal Rate (tons/resident/year) |
|                     |        |   |

CalRecycle. Solid Waste Characterization Database: Residential Waste Disposal Rates. Available online at: <http://www.calrecycle.ca.gov/wastechar/Resdisp.htm>

CIWMB. 1999. Statewide Waste Characterization Study: Final Results and Report. Available online at: <http://www.calrecycle.ca.gov/publications/LocalAsst/34000009.pdf>.

# Solid Waste

CEQA# MM D-14  
MP# WRD-2

SW-1

Solid Waste

**Table SW-1.2  
Commercial Waste Disposal Rates**

| <b>Commercial Industry</b>                    | <b>Annual Disposal Rate</b> |                        |
|---|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Fast-Food Restaurants                         | 2.1                         | tons/employee/year     |
| Full-Service Restaurants                      | 2.2                         | tons/employee/year     |
| Food Stores                                   | 2.4                         | tons/employee/year     |
| Durable Wholesale Distributors                | 1.2                         | tons/employee/year     |
| Non-Durable Wholesale Distributors            | 1.4                         | tons/employee/year     |
| Large Hotels                                  | 2.0                         | tons/employee/year     |
| Building Material & Gardening, Big-Box Stores | 3.2                         | tons/employee/year     |
| Building Material & Gardening, Other Stores   | 1.7                         | tons/employee/year     |
| Retail, Big-Box Stores                        | 1.4                         | tons/employee/year     |
| Retail, Other Stores                          | 0.9                         | tons/employee/year     |
| Shopping Malls, Anchor Stores                 | 1.1                         | tons/1,000 sqft/year   |
| Shopping Malls, Other                         | 1.0                         | tons/1,000 sqft/year   |
| Public Venues and Events                      | 0.1                         | tons/100 visitors/year |
| Large Office Buildings                        | 0.9                         | tons/1,000 sqft/year   |

**Abbreviations:**

lb - pound

sqft - square feet

**Source:**

CIWMB. 2006. Targeted Statewide Waste Characterization Study: Waste Disposal and Diversion Findings for Selected Industry Groups. Table 2. Available online at: <http://www.ciwmb.ca.gov/WasteChar/WasteStudies.htm#2006Industry>

# Solid Waste

CEQA# MM D-14  
MP# WRD-2

## SW-1

## Solid Waste

**Table SW-1.3**  
**Waste Streams and Percent of Disposed Waste**

| Building Category                             | Disposed Waste Streams                |               |                      |                          |                                  |                           |   |   |
|---|---------------------------------------|---------------|----------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------|---|---|
|   | Paper [Mixed Paper, Broad Definition] | Glass [Glass] | Metal [Mixed Metals] | Plastic [Mixed Plastics] | Electronics [Personal Computers] | Organics [Mixed Organics] | Construction & Demolition [Clay Bricks, Concrete] | Household Hazardous, Special, and Mixed Residue [Mixed MSW] |
| Residential                                   | 27.4%                                 | 4.0%          | 4.6%                 | 8.8%                     | n/a                              | 45.0%                     | 4.5%  | 5.5%  |
| Fast-Food Restaurants                         | 33.0%                                 | 0.6%          | 1.6%                 | 11.6%                    | 0.0%                             | 52.5%                     | 0.6%  | 0.0%  |
| Full-Service Restaurants                      | 17.3%                                 | 2.7%          | 2.8%                 | 7.3%                     | 0.1%                             | 66.5%                     | 1.8%  | 1.5%  |
| Food Stores                                   | 18.5%                                 | 0.5%          | 1.4%                 | 9.5%                     | 0.0%                             | 65.0%                     | 5.0%  | 0.0%  |
| Durable Wholesale Distributors                | 26.3%                                 | 0.7%          | 11.4%                | 9.9%                     | 0.5%                             | 5.4%                      | 43.5%   | 2.4%  |
| Non-Durable Wholesale Distributors            | 26.5%                                 | 0.5%          | 3.3%                 | 16.0%                    | 2.6%                             | 32.7%                     | 18.4%   | 0.1%  |
| Large Hotels                                  | 32.3%                                 | 4.7%          | 3.8%                 | 9.7%                     | 0.4%                             | 44.2%                     | 4.8%  | 0.1%  |
| Building Material & Gardening, Big-Box Stores | 12.2%                                 | 1.9%          | 8.3%                 | 7.1%                     | 1.2%                             | 8.0%                      | 60.1%   | 1.2%  |
| Building Material & Gardening, Other Stores   | 13.4%                                 | 5.3%          | 3.9%                 | 7.1%                     | 1.9%                             | 18.6%                     | 47.4%   | 2.3%  |
| Retail, Big-Box Stores                        | 21.7%                                 | 1.1%          | 5.3%                 | 16.0%                    | 0.8%                             | 23.6%                     | 27.1%   | 4.4%  |
| Retail, Other Stores                          | 31.8%                                 | 6.2%          | 8.7%                 | 14.4%                    | 0.7%                             | 17.5%                     | 15.0%   | 5.7%  |
| Shopping Malls, Anchor Stores                 | 37.9%                                 | 5.0%          | 3.0%                 | 28.8%                    | 0.1%                             | 15.5%                     | 9.1%  | 0.5%  |
| Shopping Malls, Other                         | 32.7%                                 | 1.8%          | 2.3%                 | 19.6%                    | 0.2%                             | 35.9%                     | 5.3%  | 2.0%  |
| Public Venues and Events                      | 42.0%                                 | 5.5%          | 1.8%                 | 14.8%                    | 0.0%                             | 34.0%                     | 0.7%  | 1.2%  |
| Large Office Buildings                        | 50.3%                                 | 1.8%          | 1.6%                 | 12.5%                    | 0.1%                             | 24.4%                     | 8.3%  | 1.1%  |

**Abbreviations:**

MSW - municipal solid waste

**Notes:**

The USEPA report identifies waste streams with slightly different names than the CIWMB report. The CIWMB and USEPA waste stream categories were paired; USEPA categories are shown in brackets [ ] above.

**Sources:**

CIWMB. 1999. Statewide Waste Characterization Study: Final Results and Report. Available online at: <http://www.calrecycle.ca.gov/publications/LocalAsst/34000009.pdf>

CIWMB. 2006. Targeted Statewide Waste Characterization Study: Waste Disposal and Diversion Findings for Selected Industry Groups. Available online at: <http://www.ciwmb.ca.gov/WasteChar/WasteStudies.htm#2006Industry>

USEPA. 2006. Solid Waste Management and Greenhouse Gases: A Life-Cycle Assessment of Emissions and Sinks. Available online at: <http://www.epa.gov/climatechange/wycd/waste/SWMGHGreport.html>

## Solid Waste

CEQA# MM C-4  
MP# WRD-2.3

SW-2

Solid Waste

### 6.1.2 Recycle Demolished Construction Material

**Range of Effectiveness:** Varies depending on Project Applicant and strategies selected. Best Management Practice.

**Measure Description:**

Recycling demolished construction material can contribute to GHG reductions in multiple ways. First, it displaces new construction materials, thereby reducing the need for new raw material acquisition and manufacturing of those new construction materials. Harvesting of raw materials and manufacturing new materials requires energy in the form of fuel combustion and electricity, both of which are associated with GHG emissions. If the process of recycling construction materials is less carbon-intensive than the processes required to harvest and produce new construction materials, recycling these construction materials results in a net reduction in GHG emissions. Second, using local recycled construction material reduces the emissions associated with the transportation of new construction materials, which are typically manufactured farther away from a project site. Third, recycling construction material avoids sending this material to landfills. Wood-based materials decompose in landfills and contribute to methane emissions.

Unlike measures which reduce GHG emissions during the operational lifetime of a project, such as reducing building electricity and water usage, this mitigation effort is realized prior to the actual operational lifetime of a project. Therefore, these GHG emissions reductions are best quantified in terms of a life-cycle analysis. Life cycle analyses examine all stages of the life of a product, including raw material acquisition, manufacture, transportation, installation, use, and disposal or recycling. The Project Applicant should seek local agency guidance on comparing and/or combining operational emissions inventories and life cycle emissions inventories.

**Measure Applicability:**

- Life cycle emissions from construction materials

**Preferred Literature:**

The California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB) cites decreases in greenhouse gas emissions as a benefit of construction waste management and recycling in its document “Construction Waste Management” which is used as part of California Sustainable Design Training. The document is available online at: [www.calrecycle.ca.gov/greenbuilding/training/statemanual/waste.doc](http://www.calrecycle.ca.gov/greenbuilding/training/statemanual/waste.doc)

**Alternative Literature:**

None

**Other Literature Reviewed:**

None

| Section | Category                        | Page # | Measure # |
|---------|---------------------------------|--------|-----------|
| 7.0     | <b>Vegetation</b>               | 402    |           |
| 7.1     | Vegetation                      | 402    |           |
| 7.1.1   | Urban Tree Planting             | 402    | V-1       |
| 7.1.2   | Create New Vegetated Open Space | 406    | V-2       |



# Vegetation

CEQA# MM T-14  
MP# COS-3.3, COS 3.2

V-1

Vegetation

## 7.0 Vegetation

### 7.1 Vegetation

#### 7.1.1 Urban Tree Planting

**Range of Effectiveness:** CO<sub>2</sub> reduction varies by the number of trees. VOC emissions may increase.

**Measure Description:**

Planting trees sequesters CO<sub>2</sub> while the trees are actively growing. The amount of CO<sub>2</sub> sequestered depends on the type of tree. IPCC indicates that in most cases, the active growing period of a tree is 20 years and after this time the amount of carbon in biomass slows and will be completely offset by losses from clipping, pruning, and occasional death [1]. Therefore, the emissions only occur for a 20 year period and are summed over all years to give a net one-time GHG benefit.

If large areas of trees will be planted, the lead agency may want to ensure enforceability by requiring submission of annual inventory consistent with the Urban Forest Protocol [2]. This is a comprehensive protocol that requires maintenance and replacement of trees. If the Project Applicant desires to use this approach, calculation methodologies and assumptions presented in the protocol should be used. The information required to implement this protocol is often not available at the time of the CEQA process.

The type of tree species planted will result in varying degrees of carbon sequestration. In addition, trees emit volatile organic compounds (VOCs), which are criteria pollutant precursors. Therefore the Project Applicant may want to consider these issues when selecting the type of tree to plant. See [3] for details on low-VOC trees.

**Measure Applicability:**

- New trees

**Inputs:**

The following information needs to be provided by the Project Applicant:

- Species classes of trees planted, if known
- Number of net new trees in each species class, if known
- Total number of net new trees

**Baseline Method:**

In the baseline case, there are no net new trees planted.

# Vegetation

CEQA# MM T-14  
MP# COS-3.3, COS 3.2

**V-1**

**Vegetation**

**Mitigation Method:**

Look up default annual CO<sub>2</sub> sequestration rates on a per tree basis:

| Broad species class        | Default annual CO <sub>2</sub> accumulation per tree <sup>1</sup><br>(MT CO <sub>2</sub> / year) |
|----------------------------|--|
| Aspen                      | 0.0352   |
| Soft maple                 | 0.0433   |
| Mixed hardwood             | 0.0367   |
| Hardwood maple             | 0.0521   |
| Juniper                    | 0.0121   |
| Cedar/larch                | 0.0264   |
| Douglas fir                | 0.0447   |
| True fir/Hemlock           | 0.0381   |
| Pine                       | 0.0319   |
| Spruce                     | 0.0337   |
| Miscellaneous <sup>2</sup> | 0.0354   |

1. IPCC's carbon (C) values converted to carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) using ratio of molecular weights (44/12).
2. Average of all other broad species classes. To be assumed if tree type is not known.

Therefore, the reduction in GHG emissions associated with planting new trees is:

$$\text{GHG emission reduction} = (\text{Growing Period} \times \sum_{i=1}^n [\text{Sequestration } i \times \text{Trees } i]) \div \text{Total GHG emissions}$$

Where:

GHG emission reduction = Percentage reduction in GHG emissions as compared to total GHG emissions.

Growing Period = Growing period for all trees, expressed in years (20).

*n* = Number of broad species classes. Provided by Applicant.

Sequestration *i* = Default annual CO<sub>2</sub> accumulation per tree for broad species class *i*.  
Lookup in table above.

Trees *i* = Number of net new trees of broad species class *i*.

Total GHG emissions = Total GHG emissions. Provided by Applicant.

**Emission Reduction Ranges and Variables:**

| Pollutant            | Category Emissions Reductions   |
|----------------------|---------------------------------|
| CO <sub>2</sub> e    | Varies based on number of trees |
| VOC                  | May increase                    |
| All other pollutants | Not Quantified                  |

# Vegetation

CEQA# MM T-14 V-1 Vegetation  
 MP# COS-3.3, COS 3.2

**Discussion:**

If the applicant has baseline total project emissions of 5,000 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e per year, and if the applicant elects to mitigate GHG emissions by committing to planting 500 net new “miscellaneous” trees, the applicant would reduce the amount of GHG emissions associated with the project by 7%.

$$\text{GHG Emission Reduced} = \frac{20 \times 0.0354 \times 500}{5,000} = 0.07 \text{ or } 7\%$$

**Assumptions:**

Data based upon the following reference:

- [1] IPCC. 2006. 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories, Volume 4, Table 8.2. Available online at: [http://www.ipcc-nggip.iges.or.jp/public/2006gl/pdf/4\\_Volume4/V4\\_08\\_Ch8\\_Settlements.pdf](http://www.ipcc-nggip.iges.or.jp/public/2006gl/pdf/4_Volume4/V4_08_Ch8_Settlements.pdf)

**Preferred Literature:**

The IPCC Guidelines [1] provide a method for estimating the amount of carbon sequestered by trees. IPCC default annual CO<sub>2</sub> sequestration rates on a per tree basis are used. Table 8.2 of the IPCC Guidelines provides species class-specific sequestration values. For species that do not appear or if the species is unknown, the average value from Table 8.2 (0.035 MT CO<sub>2</sub> per year per tree) can be assumed to be representative of trees planted. Urban trees are only net carbon sinks when they are actively growing. The IPCC assumes an active growing period of 20 years (see p. 8.9). Thereafter, the accumulation of carbon in biomass slows with age, and will be completely offset by losses from clipping, pruning, and occasional death. Actual active growing periods are subject to, among other things, species, climate regime, and planting density. Additional credit may be taken for planting native trees. See WUW-3 for details on the design of water-efficient landscaping.

**Alternative Literature:**

The Center for Urban Forest Research Tree Carbon Calculator is based on a small set of data and extrapolates annual tree girth increases for various tree species [1]. Furthermore, it extrapolates the amount of carbon associated with a given girth for each tree species. This method is based on extrapolation of a limited dataset. In addition it requires considerably more input requirements that may not be available for CEQA projects. These inputs include knowledge of specific tree species that will be planted and assumptions regarding anticipated growth rates. Considering the order of magnitude of mitigation from this option, the additional complexity of this method would not generally be warranted for most CEQA projects.

The CAR Urban Forest Sector Protocol [2] provides guidelines for estimating the amount of CO<sub>2</sub> sequestered by common California tree species. This methodology

## Vegetation

CEQA# MM T-14  
MP# COS-3.3, COS 3.2

V-1

Vegetation

would require Project Applicants to know the tree species to be planted at the time the CEQA analysis is prepared. Furthermore, this methodology would require Project Applicants to estimate the expected diameter of trees, which is dependent on climate and tree sub-species, among other things.

### Alternative Literature References:

[2] CAR. 2010. Urban Forest Project Protocol Version 1.1. Available online at: <http://www.climateactionreserve.org/how/protocols/adopted/urban-forest/current-urban-forest-project-protocol/>

[3] The Center for Urban Forest Research Tree Carbon Calculator. Available online at: <http://www.fs.fed.us/ccrc/topics/urban-forests/>

### Other Literature Reviewed:

None

# Vegetation

MP# COS-4.1

V-2

Vegetation

## 7.1.2 Create New Vegetated Open Space

**Range of Effectiveness:** varies based on amount and type of land vegetated

### Measure Description:

A development which re-vegetates or creates vegetated land from previously settled land sequesters CO<sub>2</sub> from the atmosphere which would not have been captured had there been no land-type change. There is no reduction in GHG emissions associated with preservation of a land.

### Measure Applicability:

- Open space

### Inputs:

The following information needs to be provided by the Project Applicant:

- Types of land uses created
- Acres of each land use created

### Baseline Method:

In the baseline case, there is no preserved or created open space.

### Mitigation Method:

Lookup carbon dioxide sequestered per acre for each land use that will be preserved or created:

| Land Use    | Sub-Category | Default annual CO <sub>2</sub> accumulation per acre <sup>1</sup> (MT CO <sub>2</sub> / acre) |
|-------------|--------------|---|
| Forest Land | Scrub        | 14.3  |
|             | Trees        | 111   |
| Cropland    | --           | 6.9   |
| Grassland   | --           | 4.31  |
| Wetlands    | --           | 0   |

1. Calculated by multiplying total biomass (MT dry matter/acre) from IPCC data by the carbon fraction in plant material (0.47), then using the ratio of molecular weights (44/12) to convert from MT of carbon (C) to MT of carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>).

Land uses are defined by IPCC as follows:

#### (i) Forest Land

# Vegetation

MP# COS-4.1

V-2

Vegetation

This category includes all land with woody vegetation consistent with thresholds used to define Forest Land in the national greenhouse gas inventory. It also includes systems with a vegetation structure that currently fall below, but *in situ* could potentially reach the threshold values used by a country to define the Forest Land category.

**(ii) Cropland**

This category includes cropped land, including rice fields, and agro-forestry systems where the vegetation structure falls below the thresholds used for the Forest Land category.

**(iii) Grassland**

This category includes rangelands and pasture land that are not considered Cropland. It also includes systems with woody vegetation and other non-grass vegetation such as herbs and brushes that fall below the threshold values used in the Forest Land category. The category also includes all grassland from wild lands to recreational areas as well as agricultural and silvi-pastoral systems, consistent with national definitions.

**(iv) Wetlands**

This category includes areas of peat extraction and land that is covered or saturated by water for all or part of the year (e.g., peatlands) and that does not fall into the Forest Land, Cropland, Grassland or Settlements categories. It includes reservoirs as a managed sub-division and natural rivers and lakes as unmanaged sub-divisions.

$$\text{GHG emission reduction} = \left( \sum_{i=1}^n [\text{Sequestration } i \times \text{Acres } i] \right) \div \text{Total GHG emissions}$$

Where:

GHG emission reduction = Percentage reduction in GHG emissions as compared to total GHG emissions.

$n$  = Number of land uses. Provided by Applicant.

Sequestration  $i$  = Default annual CO<sub>2</sub> accumulation per acre for land use  $i$ . Look up in table above.

Acres  $i$  = Number of acres of land use  $i$ .

Total GHG emissions = Total one-time GHG emissions. Provided by Applicant.

**Emission Reduction Ranges and Variables:**

| Pollutant            | Category Emissions Reductions |
|----------------------|-------------------------------|
| CO <sub>2</sub> e    | Varies                        |
| All other pollutants | Not Quantified                |

**Discussion:**

If the applicant has baseline one-time emissions of 5,000 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e per year, and if the applicant elects to mitigate GHG emissions by committing to creating 50 acres of forest

# Vegetation

MP# COS-4.1

V-2

Vegetation

land (scrub) and 20 acres of grassland, the applicant would reduce the amount of one-time GHG emissions by 16%.

$$\text{GHG Emission Reduced} = \frac{14.3 \times 50 + 4.31 \times 20}{5,000} = 0.16 \text{ or } 16\%$$

## Assumptions:

Data based upon the following references:

[1] IPCC. 2006. 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories, Volume 4. Available online at: <http://www.ipcc-nggip.iges.or.jp/public/2006gl/vol4.html>

## Preferred Literature:

The IPCC Guidelines provide a method for calculating changes in CO<sub>2</sub> sequestration due to land-type conversions. While other methods exist, notably the CCAR Forest Protocol [2], the IPCC Guidelines [1] have more general default values available that will be applicable to all areas of California without requiring detailed site-specific information. A general knowledge of the proposed change in land type is sufficient to quantify reductions in greenhouse gas emissions. IPCC designates four general vegetation types: forest land, cropland, grassland, and wetland. The amount of sequestered CO<sub>2</sub> is calculated based on the amount of carbon stock in each type of biomass (MT carbon / hectare vegetation). IPCC defaults for the carbon stock in each vegetation type are summarized in Table 8.4. (Note that this table represents the amount of carbon removed due to land conversion to settlements; it can also be used to calculate the amount of carbon sequestered due to conversion from settlement to vegetated land. Note also that a conversion to wetlands is not relevant for California). In addition to general default values, the IPCC Guidelines have climate and species-specific data available which can be used if details of the proposed development are known. To calculate the final mass of CO<sub>2</sub>, the mass of carbon is then multiplied by 3.67, which is the ratio of molecular mass of CO<sub>2</sub> to the molecular mass of carbon. This method assumes that all of the carbon is converted into CO<sub>2</sub>, which is appropriate for most CEQA projects.

## Alternative Literature:

The CAR Forest Sector Protocol provides guidelines for estimating the amount of CO<sub>2</sub> sequestered by vegetated land [1]. The Protocol is specific to forest land only, and is not appropriate for estimating land-type conversions to or from cropland or grassland. Additionally, the methodology is limited to conversions from vegetated land to settlement or settlement to vegetated land, but is not appropriate for changes from one vegetated land type to another vegetated land type. The Protocol recommends accounting for changes in the organic carbon content of soil, which requires soil sampling and testing. While testing of existing soil is feasible, the protocol does not

## Vegetation

MP# COS-4.1

V-2

Vegetation

provide adequate methods for predicting the future soil organic carbon content after a land-type conversion has taken places. Furthermore, soil testing may be a burdensome task for a Project Applicant. Methodologies which provide default values, such as the IPCC Guidelines, are preferable.

### Alternative Literature References:

[2] CAR. 2010. Urban Forest Project Protocol Version 1.1. Available online at:  
<http://www.climateactionreserve.org/how/protocols/adopted/urban-forest/current-urban-forest-project-protocol/>

### Other Literature Reviewed:

None

| Section    | Category   | Page #     | Measure # |
|------------|--|------------|-----------|
| <b>8.0</b> | <b>Construction</b>  | <b>410</b> |           |
| 8.1        | Construction   | 410        |           |
| 8.1.1      | Use Alternative Fuels for Construction Equipment                   | 410        | C-1       |
| 8.1.2      | Use Electric and Hybrid Construction Equipment                     | 420        | C-2       |
| 8.1.3      | Limit Construction Equipment Idling beyond Regulation Requirements | 428        | C-3       |
| 8.1.4      | Institute a Heavy-Duty Off-Road Vehicle Plan                       | 431        | C-4       |
| 8.1.5      | Implement a Construction Vehicle Inventory Tracking System         | 432        | C-5       |



# Construction

CEQA# MM C-2  
MP# TR-6, EE-1

**C-1**

**Construction Equipment**

## 8.0 Construction

### 8.1 Construction

#### 8.1.1 Use Alternative Fuels for Construction Equipment

**Range of Effectiveness:** 0 – 22% reduction in GHG emissions

**Measure Description:**

When construction equipment is powered by alternative fuels such as compressed natural gas rather than conventional petroleum diesel or gasoline, GHG emissions from fuel combustion may be reduced.

**Measure Applicability:**

[3] Construction vehicles

**Inputs:**

The following information needs to be provided by the Project Applicant:

- Fuel type and Horsepower of Construction Equipment
- Hours of operation

**Baseline Method:**

For all pollutants besides ROG emissions from gasoline-fueled equipment, total emission is equivalent to exhaust emission and is calculated as follows:

$$\text{Exhaust Emission} = \frac{\text{Exhaust}}{\text{Activity} \times \text{AvgHP}} \times \text{Hp} \times \text{Hr} \times \text{C}$$

Where:

Exhaust Emission= MT or tons of pollutant per year

Exhaust = Statewide daily emission from equipment for the relevant horsepower tier of diesel or gasoline fuel (tons/day). Obtained from OFFROAD2007.

Activity = Statewide daily average operating hours for the relevant horsepower tier (hours/day). Obtained from OFFROAD2007.

AvgHP = Average horsepower for the relevant horsepower tier (HP). Obtained from OFFROAD2007.

Hp = Horsepower of equipment.

Hr = Hours of operation.

C = Unit conversion factor

# Construction

CEQA# MM C-2  
MP# TR-6, EE-1

**C-1**

**Construction Equipment**

Note that this method assumes the load factor of the equipment is same as the default in OFFROAD2007.

Total GHG emission is calculated as follows:

$$\text{GHG Emission} = \text{CO}_2 \text{ Emission} + \text{CH}_4 \text{ Emission} \times 21 + \text{N}_2\text{O Emission} \times 310$$

Where:

GHG Emission = MT CO<sub>2</sub>e

CO<sub>2</sub> Emission = CO<sub>2</sub> emission calculated as described above with data from OFFROAD2007.

CH<sub>4</sub> Emission = CH<sub>4</sub> emission calculated as described above with data from OFFROAD2007.

N<sub>2</sub>O Emission = N<sub>2</sub>O emission calculated as described above with data from OFFROAD2007.

21 = Global warming potential of CH<sub>4</sub> following CCAR GPR 2009.

310 = Global warming potential of N<sub>2</sub>O following CCAR GPR 2009.

Total ROG emission from gasoline-fueled equipment is calculated as follows:

$$\text{Total ROG Emission} = \text{Exhaust ROG Emission} + \frac{\text{Resting} + \text{Diurnal} + \text{Hot Soak} + \text{Evaporative}}{\text{Activity} \times \text{AvgHP}} \times \text{Hp} \times \text{Hr} \times \text{C}$$

Where:

Total ROG Emission = Tons of ROG emission per year

Exhaust ROG Emission = ROG emission from exhaust calculated as described above (tons/year)

Resting = Statewide daily resting losses from equipment for the relevant horsepower tier (tons/day). Obtained from OFFROAD2007.

Diurnal = Statewide daily diurnal losses from equipment for the relevant horsepower tier (tons/day). Obtained from OFFROAD2007.

Hot Soak = Statewide daily hot soak losses from equipment for the relevant horsepower tier (tons/day). Obtained from OFFROAD2007.

Evaporative = Statewide daily evaporative losses from equipment for the relevant horsepower tier (tons/day). Obtained from OFFROAD2007.

Activity = Statewide daily average operating hours for the relevant horsepower tier (hours/day). Obtained from OFFROAD2007.

AvgHP = Average horsepower for the relevant horsepower tier (HP). Obtained from OFFROAD2007.

Hp = Horsepower of TRU.

Hr = Hours of operation.

C = Unit conversion factor

## Construction

CEQA# MM C-2  
MP# TR-6, EE-1

C-1

Construction Equipment

### Mitigation Method:

Mitigated emissions for this measure are calculated using the same method as baseline method, but with emission factors from compressed natural gas in OFFROAD2007.

### Emission Reduction Ranges and Variables:

GHG and criteria pollutant emission reductions from switching diesel or gasoline fuel to compressed natural gas fuel for different years are listed in accompanying tables. Only equipment with emission data for compressed natural gas and either diesel or gasoline fuel in OFFROAD2007 are included.

### Discussion:

The emission changes vary over a large range for different pollutants and equipment and between diesel and gasoline. In fact, GHG emissions for several types of equipment running on gasoline and all equipment running on diesel would increase from switching to compressed natural gas, as reflected by the negative reductions in the tables. On the other hand, SO<sub>2</sub> emissions are 100% reduced as there is no SO<sub>2</sub> emissions from equipment running on compressed natural gas according to OFFROAD2007. Other trends include no significant change in PM emissions for most gasoline equipment, considerable decrease in CO emissions from gasoline equipment but significant increase in CO emissions from diesel equipment. Therefore, the Project Applicant has to weigh the costs and benefits from switching to compressed natural gas on a case-by-case basis.

### Assumptions:

Data based upon the following references:

- California Air Resources Board. Off-road Emissions Inventory. OFFROAD2007. Available online at: <http://www.arb.ca.gov/msei/offroad/offroad.htm>
- California Climate Action Registry (CCAR). 2009. General Reporting Protocol. Version 3.1. Available online at: <http://www.climateregistry.org/tools/protocols/general-reporting-protocol.html>  
California Climate Action Registry Reporting Online Tool. 2006 PUP Reports. Available online at: <https://www.climateregistry.org/CARROT/public/reports.aspx>

### Preferred Literature:

GHG emissions from the combustion of conventional petroleum diesel and gasoline fuel can be calculated using CARB's OFFROAD model emission factors [1]. The model provides state-wide and regional emission factors that can be converted to grams per horsepower-hour. Multiplying this factor by the typical horsepower of the equipment and the estimated number of hours of operation gives the total GHG emissions. In this mitigation measure, compressed natural gas was chosen as the alternative fuel. Emission factors for compressed natural gas can also be obtained from OFFROAD The

## Construction

CEQA# MM C-2  
MP# TR-6, EE-1

**C-1**

**Construction Equipment**

GHG emissions reduction associated with this mitigation measure is therefore the difference in emissions from using petroleum diesel or gasoline versus using compressed natural gas. Other types of alternative fuels besides compressed natural gas exist. In order to take credit for this mitigation measure, the Project Applicant would need to provide detailed and substantial documentation showing expected reductions in GHG emissions as a result of running construction equipment on these alternative fuels rather than petroleum diesel or gasoline. One potential issue with quantifying this mitigation measure is the difference in fuel economy between petroleum diesel and alternative fuels.

### Alternative Literature:

Many USDOE, NREL, and USEPA reports exist which present data on exhaust emissions from engines operating with alternative fuels. The majority of these reports focuses on oxides of nitrogen (NO<sub>x</sub>) and particulate matter (PM) emissions and have limited CO<sub>2</sub> emissions and fuel economy data. One NREL report shows CO<sub>2</sub> emissions and fuel economy for three ethanol/diesel blends (7.7%, 10%, and 15%) in three off-road engines (6.8, 8.1, and 12.5 L) and compares the results to engine performance using conventional diesel fuel [5]. However, this report presented engine-specific data from a small study size. Issues with other reports include the study's focus on on-road engines rather than off-road engines which would be used in construction equipment. It would be difficult to generalize the data contained in these reports for a Project Applicant's ease of use.

### Notes:

- [1] CARB. OFFROAD 2007 Model. Available online at:  
<http://www.arb.ca.gov/msei/offroad/offroad.htm>. Accessed February 2010.

### Other Literature Reviewed:

- [2] USEPA. 2002. A Comprehensive Analysis of Biodiesel Impacts on Exhaust Emissions. Available online at:  
<http://www.epa.gov/otaq/models/analysis/biodsl/p02001.pdf>
- [3] USDOE. NREL: ReFUEL Laboratory: Data and Resources. Available online at:  
[http://www.nrel.gov/vehiclesandfuels/refuellab/data\\_resources.html](http://www.nrel.gov/vehiclesandfuels/refuellab/data_resources.html). Accessed March 2010.
- [4] USDOE. 2006. NREL: Effects of Biodiesel Blends on Vehicle Emissions. Available online at: <http://www.nrel.gov/vehiclesandfuels/npbf/pdfs/40554.pdf>
- [5] USDOE. 2003. NREL: The Effect of Biodiesel Composition on Engine Emissions from a DDC Series 60 Diesel Engine. Available online at:  
<http://www.nrel.gov/vehiclesandfuels/npbf/pdfs/31461.pdf>

# Construction

CEQA# MM C-2  
MP# TR-6, EE-1

## C-1

## Construction Equipment

**Table C-1.1**  
**Emission Reduction Due to Fuel Switch from Gasoline to Compressed Natural Gas**

| Equipment       | Horsepower | 2004 |                   |      |      |     |                 |
|-----------------|------------|------|-------------------|------|------|-----|-----------------|
|                 |            | CO   | CO <sub>2</sub> e | NOx  | PM   | ROG | SO <sub>2</sub> |
| Aerial Lifts    | <15        | 59%  | -27%              | 36%  | 91%  | 98% | 100%            |
|                 | 15 - 25    | 61%  | -40%              | 7%   | 90%  | 97% | 100%            |
| Air Conditioner | < 175      | 24%  | 14%               | 19%  | 0%   | 97% | 100%            |
| Baggage Tug     | < 120      | 46%  | 15%               | -4%  | 0%   | 93% | 100%            |
| Belt Loader     | < 120      | 52%  | 18%               | 3%   | 0%   | 95% | 100%            |
| Bobtail         | < 120      | 55%  | 17%               | 19%  | 0%   | 95% | 100%            |
| Cargo Loader    | < 120      | 41%  | 16%               | 2%   | 0%   | 93% | 100%            |
| Catering Truck  | < 250      | 31%  | 12%               | 25%  | 0%   | 94% | 100%            |
| Forklifts       | < 25       | 53%  | -46%              | 23%  | -85% | 92% | 100%            |
|                 | 25 - 50    | 94%  | 22%               | -33% | 0%   | 97% | 100%            |
|                 | 50 - 120   | 58%  | 19%               | 18%  | 0%   | 96% | 100%            |
|                 | 120 - 175  | 24%  | 17%               | 24%  | 0%   | 94% | 100%            |
| Fuel Truck      | <175       | 3%   | 18%               | 17%  | 0%   | 99% | 100%            |
| Generator Sets  | <120       | 52%  | 18%               | 14%  | 0%   | 96% | 100%            |
|                 | 120 - 175  | 22%  | 14%               | 21%  | 0%   | 95% | 100%            |
| Lav Truck       | <175       | 32%  | 18%               | 17%  | 0%   | 94% | 100%            |
| Lift            | <120       | 53%  | 17%               | 14%  | 0%   | 96% | 100%            |
| Passenger Stand | <175       | 27%  | 15%               | 22%  | 0%   | 96% | 100%            |
| Service Truck   | <250       | 13%  | 16%               | 26%  | 0%   | 95% | 100%            |

| Equipment       | Horsepower | 2010 |                   |       |      |      |                 |
|-----------------|------------|------|-------------------|-------|------|------|-----------------|
|                 |            | CO   | CO <sub>2</sub> e | NOx   | PM   | ROG  | SO <sub>2</sub> |
| Aerial Lifts    | <15        | 58%  | -27%              | 39%   | 91%  | 96%  | 100%            |
|                 | 15 - 25    | 58%  | -37%              | 32%   | 90%  | 95%  | 100%            |
| Air Conditioner | < 175      | 29%  | 14%               | 19%   | 0%   | 98%  | 100%            |
| Baggage Tug     | < 120      | 13%  | 13%               | -114% | 0%   | 84%  | 100%            |
| Belt Loader     | < 120      | 27%  | 15%               | -82%  | 0%   | 91%  | 100%            |
| Bobtail         | < 120      | 29%  | 16%               | 11%   | 0%   | 96%  | 100%            |
| Cargo Loader    | < 120      | 15%  | 14%               | -70%  | 0%   | 89%  | 100%            |
| Catering Truck  | < 250      | 35%  | 12%               | 29%   | 0%   | 95%  | 100%            |
| Forklifts       | < 25       | 53%  | -51%              | 3%    | -85% | 85%  | 100%            |
|                 | 25 - 50    | 95%  | 22%               | 18%   | 0%   | 98%  | 100%            |
|                 | 50 - 120   | 52%  | 18%               | 5%    | 0%   | 95%  | 100%            |
|                 | 120 - 175  | 27%  | 14%               | 23%   | 0%   | 94%  | 100%            |
| Fuel Truck      | <175       | 9%   | 16%               | 15%   | 0%   | 100% | 100%            |
| Generator Sets  | <120       | 40%  | 17%               | 16%   | 0%   | 97%  | 100%            |
|                 | 120 - 175  | 26%  | 14%               | 23%   | 0%   | 95%  | 100%            |
| Lav Truck       | <175       | 36%  | 15%               | -18%  | 0%   | 94%  | 100%            |
| Lift            | <120       | 44%  | 17%               | 16%   | 0%   | 96%  | 100%            |

# Construction

CEQA# MM C-2  
MP# TR-6, EE-1

## C-1

## Construction Equipment

|                 |      |     |     |     |    |     |      |
|-----------------|------|-----|-----|-----|----|-----|------|
| Passenger Stand | <175 | 32% | 15% | 25% | 0% | 97% | 100% |
| Service Truck   | <250 | 19% | 14% | 40% | 0% | 95% | 100% |

| Equipment       | Horsepower | 2015 |                   |      |      |      |                 |
|-----------------|------------|------|-------------------|------|------|------|-----------------|
|                 |            | CO   | CO <sub>2</sub> e | NOx  | PM   | ROG  | SO <sub>2</sub> |
| Aerial Lifts    | <15        | 58%  | -27%              | 39%  | 91%  | 96%  | 100%            |
|                 | 15 - 25    | 58%  | -37%              | 32%  | 90%  | 94%  | 100%            |
| Air Conditioner | < 175      | 31%  | 13%               | 23%  | 0%   | 99%  | 100%            |
| Baggage Tug     | < 120      | 8%   | 14%               | -93% | 0%   | 85%  | 100%            |
| Belt Loader     | < 120      | 22%  | 16%               | -69% | 0%   | 92%  | 100%            |
| Bobtail         | < 120      | 25%  | 16%               | 13%  | 0%   | 96%  | 100%            |
| Cargo Loader    | < 120      | 5%   | 14%               | -91% | 0%   | 88%  | 100%            |
| Catering Truck  | < 250      | 38%  | 11%               | 33%  | 0%   | 95%  | 100%            |
| Forklifts       | < 25       | 53%  | -51%              | 3%   | -85% | 84%  | 100%            |
|                 | 25 - 50    | 95%  | 22%               | 34%  | 0%   | 98%  | 100%            |
|                 | 50 - 120   | 52%  | 18%               | 6%   | 0%   | 95%  | 100%            |
|                 | 120 - 175  | 27%  | 14%               | 25%  | 0%   | 95%  | 100%            |
| Fuel Truck      | <175       | 12%  | 15%               | 13%  | 0%   | 100% | 100%            |
| Generator Sets  | <120       | 21%  | 16%               | 17%  | 0%   | 97%  | 100%            |
|                 | 120 - 175  | 29%  | 13%               | 24%  | 0%   | 96%  | 100%            |
| Lav Truck       | <175       | 36%  | 15%               | -24% | 0%   | 95%  | 100%            |
| Lift            | <120       | 37%  | 16%               | 16%  | 0%   | 96%  | 100%            |
| Passenger Stand | <175       | 34%  | 14%               | 28%  | 0%   | 98%  | 100%            |
| Service Truck   | <250       | 22%  | 13%               | 46%  | 0%   | 96%  | 100%            |

| Equipment       | Horsepower | 2020 |                   |      |      |      |                 |
|-----------------|------------|------|-------------------|------|------|------|-----------------|
|                 |            | CO   | CO <sub>2</sub> e | NOx  | PM   | ROG  | SO <sub>2</sub> |
| Aerial Lifts    | <15        | 58%  | -27%              | 39%  | 91%  | 96%  | 100%            |
|                 | 15 - 25    | 58%  | -37%              | 32%  | 90%  | 94%  | 100%            |
| Air Conditioner | < 175      | 32%  | 13%               | 24%  | 0%   | 99%  | 100%            |
| Baggage Tug     | < 120      | 7%   | 15%               | -49% | 0%   | 89%  | 100%            |
| Belt Loader     | < 120      | 21%  | 16%               | -27% | 0%   | 94%  | 100%            |
| Bobtail         | < 120      | 26%  | 16%               | 13%  | 0%   | 96%  | 100%            |
| Cargo Loader    | < 120      | 3%   | 15%               | -62% | 0%   | 91%  | 100%            |
| Catering Truck  | < 250      | 39%  | 11%               | 36%  | 0%   | 96%  | 100%            |
| Forklifts       | < 25       | 53%  | -51%              | 3%   | -85% | 84%  | 100%            |
|                 | 25 - 50    | 95%  | 22%               | 36%  | 0%   | 98%  | 100%            |
|                 | 50 - 120   | 52%  | 18%               | 8%   | 0%   | 95%  | 100%            |
|                 | 120 - 175  | 27%  | 14%               | 26%  | 0%   | 95%  | 100%            |
| Fuel Truck      | <175       | 12%  | 14%               | 9%   | 0%   | 100% | 100%            |
| Generator Sets  | <120       | -5%  | 16%               | 17%  | 0%   | 98%  | 100%            |
|                 | 120 - 175  | 30%  | 13%               | 25%  | 0%   | 97%  | 100%            |
| Lav Truck       | <175       | 36%  | 15%               | 3%   | 0%   | 96%  | 100%            |

# Construction

CEQA# MM C-2  
MP# TR-6, EE-1

## C-1

## Construction Equipment

|                 |      |     |     |     |    |     |      |
|-----------------|------|-----|-----|-----|----|-----|------|
| Lift            | <120 | 30% | 16% | 15% | 0% | 97% | 100% |
| Passenger Stand | <175 | 35% | 14% | 30% | 0% | 98% | 100% |
| Service Truck   | <250 | 23% | 13% | 42% | 0% | 96% | 100% |

| Equipment       | Horsepower | 2025 |                   |      |      |      |                 |
|-----------------|------------|------|-------------------|------|------|------|-----------------|
|                 |            | CO   | CO <sub>2</sub> e | NOx  | PM   | ROG  | SO <sub>2</sub> |
| Aerial Lifts    | <15        | 58%  | -27%              | 39%  | 91%  | 96%  | 100%            |
|                 | 15 - 25    | 58%  | -37%              | 32%  | 90%  | 94%  | 100%            |
| Air Conditioner | < 175      | 32%  | 13%               | 27%  | 0%   | 99%  | 100%            |
| Baggage Tug     | < 120      | 8%   | 15%               | -27% | 0%   | 92%  | 100%            |
| Belt Loader     | < 120      | 21%  | 17%               | -7%  | 0%   | 96%  | 100%            |
| Bobtail         | < 120      | 25%  | 16%               | 13%  | 0%   | 96%  | 100%            |
| Cargo Loader    | < 120      | 3%   | 16%               | -40% | 0%   | 93%  | 100%            |
| Catering Truck  | < 250      | 39%  | 11%               | 36%  | 0%   | 96%  | 100%            |
| Forklifts       | < 25       | 53%  | -51%              | 3%   | -85% | 84%  | 100%            |
|                 | 25 - 50    | 95%  | 21%               | 36%  | 0%   | 98%  | 100%            |
|                 | 50 - 120   | 52%  | 18%               | 8%   | 0%   | 95%  | 100%            |
|                 | 120 - 175  | 27%  | 14%               | 26%  | 0%   | 95%  | 100%            |
| Fuel Truck      | <175       | 13%  | 14%               | 13%  | 0%   | 100% | 100%            |
| Generator Sets  | <120       | -15% | 16%               | 18%  | 0%   | 98%  | 100%            |
|                 | 120 - 175  | 30%  | 13%               | 26%  | 0%   | 98%  | 100%            |
| Lav Truck       | <175       | 36%  | 15%               | 22%  | 0%   | 97%  | 100%            |
| Lift            | <120       | 27%  | 16%               | 15%  | 0%   | 97%  | 100%            |
| Passenger Stand | <175       | 35%  | 13%               | 30%  | 0%   | 99%  | 100%            |
| Service Truck   | <250       | 24%  | 12%               | 34%  | 0%   | 96%  | 100%            |

# Construction

CEQA# MM C-2  
MP# TR-6, EE-1

## C-1

## Construction Equipment

**Table C-1.2**  
**Emission Reduction Due to Fuel Switch from Diesel to Compressed Natural Gas**

| Equipment       | Horsepower | 2004   |                   |      |     |     |                 |
|-----------------|------------|--------|-------------------|------|-----|-----|-----------------|
|                 |            | CO     | CO <sub>2</sub> e | NOx  | PM  | ROG | SO <sub>2</sub> |
| Aerial Lifts    | <15        | -2749% | -27%              | 55%  | 36% | 73% | 100%            |
|                 | 15 - 25    | -2912% | -31%              | 46%  | 26% | 74% | 100%            |
| Air Conditioner | <175       | -451%  | -21%              | -30% | 84% | 87% | 100%            |
| Baggage Tug     | <120       | -507%  | -24%              | 10%  | 94% | 88% | 100%            |
| Belt Loader     | <120       | -469%  | -23%              | 6%   | 93% | 89% | 100%            |
| Bobtail         | <120       | -441%  | -22%              | 23%  | 93% | 91% | 100%            |
| Cargo Loader    | <120       | -625%  | -25%              | -4%  | 93% | 84% | 100%            |
| Catering Truck  | <250       | -1152% | -22%              | -44% | 70% | 78% | 100%            |
| Forklifts       | <50        | -21%   | -23%              | -51% | 93% | 95% | 100%            |
|                 | 50 - 120   | -594%  | -25%              | 5%   | 93% | 87% | 100%            |
|                 | 120 - 175  | -581%  | -22%              | -2%  | 88% | 89% | 100%            |
| Generator Sets  | <120       | -397%  | -12%              | -2%  | 92% | 91% | 100%            |
|                 | <175       | -415%  | -12%              | -11% | 85% | 89% | 100%            |
| Lav Truck       | <175       | -457%  | -22%              | -11% | 88% | 89% | 100%            |
| Lift            | <120       | -465%  | -23%              | -5%  | 92% | 89% | 100%            |

| Equipment       | Horsepower | 2010   |                   |      |      |     |                 |
|-----------------|------------|--------|-------------------|------|------|-----|-----------------|
|                 |            | CO     | CO <sub>2</sub> e | NOx  | PM   | ROG | SO <sub>2</sub> |
| Aerial Lifts    | <15        | -3037% | -27%              | 31%  | -29% | 59% | 100%            |
|                 | 15 - 25    | -3755% | -32%              | 40%  | -3%  | 60% | 100%            |
| Air Conditioner | <175       | -450%  | -20%              | -36% | 73%  | 85% | 100%            |
| Baggage Tug     | <120       | -556%  | -22%              | 22%  | 92%  | 88% | 100%            |
| Belt Loader     | <120       | -513%  | -22%              | 21%  | 92%  | 90% | 100%            |
| Bobtail         | <120       | -480%  | -19%              | 64%  | 91%  | 96% | 100%            |
| Cargo Loader    | <120       | -678%  | -24%              | 6%   | 91%  | 84% | 100%            |
| Catering Truck  | <250       | -1732% | -21%              | -38% | 53%  | 73% | 100%            |
| Forklifts       | <50        | -54%   | -21%              | 26%  | 90%  | 96% | 100%            |
|                 | 50 - 120   | -647%  | -22%              | 32%  | 90%  | 90% | 100%            |
|                 | 120 - 175  | -598%  | -21%              | 38%  | 82%  | 90% | 100%            |
| Generator Sets  | <120       | -430%  | -11%              | 11%  | 89%  | 91% | 100%            |
|                 | <175       | -436%  | -11%              | 0%   | 81%  | 89% | 100%            |
| Lav Truck       | <175       | -477%  | -21%              | 1%   | 84%  | 90% | 100%            |
| Lift            | <120       | -503%  | -22%              | 9%   | 90%  | 89% | 100%            |

# Construction

CEQA# MM C-2  
MP# TR-6, EE-1

## C-1

## Construction Equipment

| Equipment       | Horsepower | 2015   |                   |                 |      |     |                 |
|-----------------|------------|--------|-------------------|-----------------|------|-----|-----------------|
|                 |            | CO     | CO <sub>2</sub> e | NO <sub>x</sub> | PM   | ROG | SO <sub>2</sub> |
| Aerial Lifts    | <15        | -3040% | -27%              | 28%             | -86% | 57% | 100%            |
|                 | 15 - 25    | -4465% | -32%              | 32%             | -48% | 46% | 100%            |
| Air Conditioner | <175       | -450%  | -19%              | -41%            | 47%  | 85% | 100%            |
| Baggage Tug     | <120       | -590%  | -21%              | 30%             | 91%  | 89% | 100%            |
| Belt Loader     | <120       | -541%  | -21%              | 31%             | 90%  | 91% | 100%            |
| Bobtail         | <120       | -505%  | -19%              | 65%             | 89%  | 96% | 100%            |
| Cargo Loader    | <120       | -720%  | -22%              | 4%              | 88%  | 83% | 100%            |
| Catering Truck  | <250       | -1899% | -20%              | -54%            | 16%  | 72% | 100%            |
| Forklifts       | <50        | -85%   | -20%              | 41%             | 83%  | 94% | 100%            |
|                 | 50 - 120   | -682%  | -21%              | 23%             | 81%  | 89% | 100%            |
|                 | 120 - 175  | -596%  | -20%              | 36%             | 68%  | 91% | 100%            |
| Generator Sets  | <120       | -456%  | -11%              | 22%             | 84%  | 91% | 100%            |
|                 | <175       | -444%  | -10%              | 12%             | 71%  | 90% | 100%            |
| Lav Truck       | <175       | -483%  | -20%              | 10%             | 76%  | 91% | 100%            |
| Lift            | <120       | -531%  | -21%              | 17%             | 85%  | 89% | 100%            |

| Equipment       | Horsepower | 2020   |                   |                 |      |     |                 |
|-----------------|------------|--------|-------------------|-----------------|------|-----|-----------------|
|                 |            | CO     | CO <sub>2</sub> e | NO <sub>x</sub> | PM   | ROG | SO <sub>2</sub> |
| Aerial Lifts    | <15        | -3040% | -27%              | 28%             | -91% | 57% | 100%            |
|                 | 15 - 25    | -4722% | -32%              | 29%             | -91% | 39% | 100%            |
| Air Conditioner | <175       | -449%  | -19%              | -104%           | -81% | 88% | 100%            |
| Baggage Tug     | <120       | -621%  | -20%              | 31%             | 87%  | 90% | 100%            |
| Belt Loader     | <120       | -569%  | -20%              | 31%             | 85%  | 91% | 100%            |
| Bobtail         | <120       | -526%  | -19%              | 53%             | 84%  | 95% | 100%            |
| Cargo Loader    | <120       | -757%  | -21%              | -9%             | 78%  | 81% | 100%            |
| Catering Truck  | <250       | -1946% | -20%              | -120%           | -75% | 73% | 100%            |
| Forklifts       | <50        | -100%  | -20%              | 32%             | 60%  | 91% | 100%            |
|                 | 50 - 120   | -696%  | -21%              | -17%            | 55%  | 84% | 100%            |
|                 | 120 - 175  | -596%  | -20%              | -12%            | 31%  | 89% | 100%            |
| Generator Sets  | <120       | -476%  | -10%              | 25%             | 69%  | 91% | 100%            |
|                 | <175       | -446%  | -10%              | 5%              | 48%  | 90% | 100%            |
| Lav Truck       | <175       | -485%  | -19%              | -3%             | 56%  | 91% | 100%            |
| Lift            | <120       | -553%  | -20%              | 13%             | 72%  | 89% | 100%            |

# Construction

CEQA# MM C-2  
MP# TR-6, EE-1

## C-1

## Construction Equipment

| Equipment       | Horsepower | 2025   |                   |                 |       |     |                 |
|-----------------|------------|--------|-------------------|-----------------|-------|-----|-----------------|
|                 |            | CO     | CO <sub>2</sub> e | NO <sub>x</sub> | PM    | ROG | SO <sub>2</sub> |
| Aerial Lifts    | <15        | -3040% | -27%              | 28%             | -91%  | 57% | 100%            |
|                 | 15 - 25    | -4803% | -32%              | 27%             | -109% | 37% | 100%            |
| Air Conditioner | <175       | -450%  | -19%              | -346%           | -331% | 88% | 100%            |
| Baggage Tug     | <120       | -640%  | -19%              | 17%             | 79%   | 89% | 100%            |
| Belt Loader     | <120       | -587%  | -20%              | 16%             | 72%   | 90% | 100%            |
| Bobtail         | <120       | -548%  | -19%              | 32%             | 72%   | 93% | 100%            |
| Cargo Loader    | <120       | -763%  | -20%              | -40%            | 56%   | 78% | 100%            |
| Catering Truck  | <250       | -1936% | -20%              | -330%           | -294% | 72% | 100%            |
| Forklifts       | <50        | -106%  | -20%              | 19%             | -26%  | 89% | 100%            |
|                 | 50 - 120   | -703%  | -21%              | -69%            | -48%  | 79% | 100%            |
|                 | 120 - 175  | -597%  | -20%              | -172%           | -110% | 83% | 100%            |
| Generator Sets  | <120       | -483%  | -10%              | 13%             | 37%   | 90% | 100%            |
|                 | <175       | -446%  | -10%              | -37%            | -3%   | 90% | 100%            |
| Lav Truck       | <175       | -486%  | -19%              | -57%            | 5%    | 90% | 100%            |
| Lift            | <120       | -560%  | -20%              | -8%             | 37%   | 87% | 100%            |

# Construction

MP# TR-6, EE-1

**C-2**

**Construction Equipment**

## 8.1.2 Use Electric and Hybrid Construction Equipment

**Range of Effectiveness:** 2.5 – 80% of GHG emissions from equipment that is electric or hybrid if used 100% of the time

### Measure Description:

When construction equipment is powered by grid electricity rather than fossil fuel, direct GHG emissions from fuel combustion are replaced with indirect GHG emissions associated with the electricity used to power the equipment. When construction equipment is powered by hybrid-electric drives, GHG emissions from fuel combustion are reduced.

### Measure Applicability:

- Construction vehicles

### Inputs:

The following information needs to be provided by the Project Applicant:

- Electricity provider for the Project
- Fuel type and Horsepower of Construction Equipment
- Hours of operation

### Baseline Method:

$$\text{Baseline Emission} = \text{EF} \times \text{Hp} \times \text{LF} \times \text{Hr} \times \text{C}$$

Where:

Emission = MT CO<sub>2</sub>e or MT Criteria Pollutant

EF = Emission factor for the relevant fuel horsepower tier (g/hp-hr).  
Obtained from OFFROAD2007. See accompanying tables

Hp = Horsepower of equipment.

LF = Load factor of equipment for the relevant horsepower tier (dimensionless).  
Obtained from OFFROAD2007.

Hr = Hours of operation.

C = Unit conversion factor

### Mitigation Method:

#### Fully Electric Vehicle

Construction vehicles will run solely on electricity. The indirect GHG emission from electricity generation is:

$$\text{Mitigated GHG Emission} = \text{Utility} \times \text{Hp} \times \text{LF} \times \text{Hr} \times \text{C}$$

Where:

# Construction

MP# TR-6, EE-1

**C-2**

**Construction Equipment**

- GHG emissions = MT CO<sub>2</sub>e
- Utility = Carbon intensity of Local Utility (CO<sub>2</sub>e/kWh)
- Hp = Horsepower of equipment.
- LF = Load factor of equipment for the relevant horsepower tier (dimensionless).  
Obtained from OFFROAD2007.
- Hr = Hours of operation.
- C = Unit conversion factor

Criteria pollutant emissions will be 100% reduced for equipment running solely on electricity.

$$\text{GHG Reduction \%}^{106} = 1 - \frac{\text{Utility} \times \text{C}}{\text{EF} \times 10^{-6}}$$

## Hybrid-Electric Vehicle

GHG Reduction % = Percent Reduction in Fuel Consumption

## **Emission Reduction Ranges and Variables:**

### Fully Electric Vehicle

#### GHG

| Utility | Diesel | Compressed Natural Gas 4-strokes | Gasoline 2-strokes | Gasoline 4-strokes |          |           |            |            |
|---------|--------|----------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|----------|-----------|------------|------------|
|         |        |                                  |                    | <25 HP             | 25-50 HP | 50-120 HP | 120-175 HP | 175-500 HP |
| LADW&P  | 26.3%  | 37.9%                            | 2.5%               | 2.5%               | 46.5%    | 45.9%     | 44.4%      | 42.8%      |
| PG&E    | 72.9%  | 77.1%                            | 64.1%              | 64.1%              | 80.3%    | 80.1%     | 79.5%      | 78.9%      |
| SCE     | 61.8%  | 67.9%                            | 49.5%              | 49.5%              | 72.3%    | 72.0%     | 71.2%      | 70.4%      |
| SDGE    | 53.5%  | 60.9%                            | 38.5%              | 38.5%              | 66.3%    | 65.9%     | 64.9%      | 63.9%      |
| SMUD    | 67.0%  | 72.2%                            | 56.3%              | 56.3%              | 76.0%    | 75.8%     | 75.1%      | 74.3%      |

### Criteria pollutant

Emissions will be 100% reduced for equipment running on electricity.

### Hybrid-Electric Vehicle

#### GHG

The Project Applicant has to determine the fuel consumption reduced from using the hybrid-electric vehicle. The emission reductions for all pollutants are the same as the fuel reduction.

<sup>106</sup> This assumes energy from engine losses are the same.

## Construction

MP# TR-6, EE-1

C-2

Construction Equipment

### Discussion:

The CO<sub>2</sub> emission factor show in the accompanying tables obtained from OFFROAD2007 [1] shows the same emissions within each horsepower tier regardless of the scenario year or equipment model year. The contributions of CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O to overall GHG emissions is likely small (< 1% of total CO<sub>2</sub>e) from diesel construction equipment [2] and were therefore not included. Therefore, the CO<sub>2</sub>e emission reduction is dependent on the electricity provider for the Project, horsepower and fuel of the construction equipment only.

On the other hand, the criteria pollutant emission factors from OFFROAD2007 vary for different scenario and equipment model years. The criteria pollutant emission factors presented in the accompanying tables correspond to those of new equipment in the respective scenario years, i.e., model year is the same as scenario year. Since older equipment have higher emission factors due to deterioration and less regulation, the emission reduction calculated from this methodology is likely to be an underestimate.

### Assumptions:

Data based upon the following references:

- [1] California Air Resources Board. Off-road Emissions Inventory. OFFROAD2007. Available online at: <http://www.arb.ca.gov/msei/offroad/offroad.htm>
- [2] California Climate Action Registry (CCAR). 2009. General Reporting Protocol. Version 3.1. Available online at: <http://www.climateregistry.org/tools/protocols/general-reporting-protocol.html>
- [3] California Climate Action Registry Reporting Online Tool. 2006 PUP Reports. Available online at: <https://www.climateregistry.org/CARROT/public/reports.aspx>

### Preferred Literature:

Electric construction equipment is available commercially from companies such as Peterson Pacific Corporation and Komptech USA, which specialize in the mechanical processing equipment like grinders and shredders [4,5]. The amount of direct GHG emissions avoided can be calculated using CARB's OFFROAD2007 model, which provides state-wide and regional emission factors for a variety of construction equipment that can be converted to grams per horsepower-hour [6]. Multiplying this factor by the number of hours of operation gives the direct GHG emissions. Assuming the same number of operating hours as the diesel-powered equipment, the electricity required to run a piece of electric construction equipment can be calculated by multiplying the operating hours by the amperage required to run the equipment and the voltage rating (obtained from manufacturer technical specifications) to obtain total kWh required. Multiplying this value by the carbon-intensity factor of the local utility gives the amount of indirect GHG emissions associated with using the electric equipment. The

# Construction

MP# TR-6, EE-1

**C-2**

**Construction Equipment**

GHG emissions reduction associated with this mitigation measure is therefore the difference in emissions from these two scenarios.

Construction equipment powered by hybrid-electric drives is also commercially available from companies such as Caterpillar [7]. For example, Caterpillar reports that during an 8-hour shift, its D7E hybrid dozer burns 19.5% fewer gallons of fuel than a conventional dozer while achieving a 10.3% increase in productivity. The D7E model burns 6.2 gallons per hour compared to a conventional dozer which burns 7.7 gallons per hour. The percent reduction in fuel use is directly proportional to the percent reduction in GHG emissions. Assuming complete combustion to CO<sub>2</sub> and a carbon content of 87%, the CO<sub>2</sub> emissions reductions can be calculated. Fuel usage and savings are dependent on the make and model of the construction equipment used. The Project Applicant should calculate project-specific savings and provide manufacturer specifications indicating fuel burned per hour.

### Alternative Literature:

None

### Notes:

[4] Peterson Pacific Corp. Product Brochure Downloads. Available online at: [http://www.petersonpacific.com/content/MediaGallery\\_56\\_v.](http://www.petersonpacific.com/content/MediaGallery_56_v.) Accessed March 2010.

[5] Komptech USA. Products. Available online at: <http://www.komptech.com/usa/products.htm>. Accessed March 2010.

[6] CARB. OFFROAD 2007 Model. Available online at: <http://www.arb.ca.gov/msei/offroad/offroad.htm>. Accessed February 2010.

[7] Caterpillar. D7E Efficiency. Accessed February 2010. Available online at: <http://www.cat.com/D7E>

### Other Literature Reviewed:

None

# Construction

MP# TR-6, EE-1

## C-2

## Construction Equipment

**Table C-2.1**  
**Emissions Factors from Different Fuels**

| Fuel                            | HP      | CO <sub>2</sub> Emission Factor<br>(g/hp-hr) |
|---------------------------------|---------|--|
|                                 |         | All Years                                    |
| Compressed Natural Gas 4-stroke | All     | 674.66                                       |
| Diesel                          | All     | 568.30                                       |
| Gasoline 2-stroke               | All     | 429.44                                       |
| Gasoline 4-stroke               | <25     | 429.44                                       |
|                                 | 25-50   | 783.30                                       |
|                                 | 50-120  | 774.50                                       |
|                                 | 120-175 | 753.25                                       |
|                                 | 175-500 | 732.00                                       |

| Fuel                             | HP       | ROG Emission Factor<br>(g/hp-hr) |      |       |
|----------------------------------|----------|----------------------------------|------|-------|
|                                  |          | 2004                             | 2010 | 2015+ |
| Compressed Natural Gas 4-strokes | <15      | 0.14                             | 0.14 | 0.14  |
|                                  | 15-25    | 0.14                             | 0.14 | 0.14  |
|                                  | 25-50    | 0.06                             | 0.01 | 0.01  |
|                                  | 50-120   | 0.07                             | 0.01 | 0.01  |
|                                  | 120-175  | 0.06                             | 0.01 | 0.01  |
|                                  | 175-250  | 0.06                             | 0.01 | 0.01  |
|                                  | 250-500  | 0.06                             | 0.01 | 0.01  |
| Diesel                           | <15      | 0.57                             | 0.41 | 0.41  |
|                                  | 15-25    | 0.54                             | 0.48 | 0.48  |
|                                  | 25-50    | 0.54                             | 0.20 | 0.08  |
|                                  | 50-120   | 0.38                             | 0.16 | 0.08  |
|                                  | 120-175  | 0.18                             | 0.13 | 0.08  |
|                                  | 175-250  | 0.12                             | 0.08 | 0.06  |
|                                  | 250-500  | 0.10                             | 0.08 | 0.06  |
|                                  | 500-750  | 0.12                             | 0.08 | 0.06  |
|                                  | 750-1000 | 0.57                             | 0.08 | 0.06  |
| >1000                            | 0.57     | 0.08                             | 0.08 |       |
| Gasoline 2-stroke                | <2       | 6.70                             | 5.52 | 5.52  |
|                                  | 2-15     | 4.19                             | 3.59 | 3.59  |
|                                  | 15-25    | 4.07                             | 3.79 | 3.79  |
| Gasoline 4-stroke                | <5       | 6.70                             | 5.52 | 5.52  |
|                                  | 5-15     | 4.19                             | 3.59 | 3.59  |
|                                  | 15-25    | 4.07                             | 3.79 | 3.79  |

# Construction

MP# TR-6, EE-1

**C-2**

**Construction Equipment**

| Fuel | HP      | ROG Emission Factor<br>(g/hp-hr) |      |       |
|------|---------|----------------------------------|------|-------|
|      |         | 2004                             | 2010 | 2015+ |
|      | 25-50   | 1.49                             | 0.65 | 0.65  |
|      | 50-120  | 0.91                             | 0.24 | 0.24  |
|      | 120-175 | 0.72                             | 0.15 | 0.15  |
|      | 175-250 | 0.72                             | 0.15 | 0.15  |
|      | 250-500 | 0.72                             | 0.15 | 0.15  |

| Fuel                                   | HP       | CO Emission Factor<br>(g/hp-hr) |      |       |
|--|----------|---------------------------------|------|-------|
|  |          | 2004                            | 2010 | 2015+ |
| Compressed<br>Natural Gas<br>4-strokes | <15      | 300                             | 300  | 300   |
|  | 15-25    | 300                             | 300  | 300   |
|  | 25-50    | 7.02                            | 7.02 | 7.02  |
|  | 50-120   | 20                              | 20   | 20    |
|  | 120-175  | 16                              | 16   | 16    |
|  | 175-250  | 16                              | 16   | 16    |
|  | 250-500  | 16                              | 16   | 16    |
| Diesel                                 | <15      | 3.47                            | 3.47 | 3.47  |
|  | 15-25    | 2.34                            | 2.34 | 2.34  |
|  | 25-50    | 3.27                            | 2.86 | 2.72  |
|  | 50-120   | 3.23                            | 3.09 | 3.05  |
|  | 120-175  | 2.70                            | 2.70 | 2.70  |
|  | 175-250  | 0.92                            | 0.92 | 0.92  |
|  | 250-500  | 0.92                            | 0.92 | 0.92  |
|  | 500-750  | 0.92                            | 0.92 | 0.92  |
|  | 750-1000 | 2.70                            | 0.92 | 0.92  |
|  | >1000    | 2.70                            | 0.92 | 0.92  |
| Gasoline<br>2-stroke                   | <2       | 318                             | 236  | 236   |
|  | 2-15     | 274                             | 225  | 225   |
|  | 15-25    | 284                             | 238  | 238   |
| Gasoline<br>4-stroke                   | <5       | 318                             | 236  | 236   |
|  | 5-15     | 274                             | 225  | 225   |
|  | 15-25    | 284                             | 238  | 238   |
|  | 25-50    | 71                              | 38   | 38    |
|  | 50-120   | 38                              | 8.76 | 8.76  |
|  | 120-175  | 21                              | 21   | 21    |
|  | 175-250  | 21                              | 21   | 21    |
| 250-500                                | 21       | 21                              | 21   |       |

# Construction

MP# TR-6, EE-1

**C-2**

**Construction Equipment**

| Fuel                                | HP       | NOx Emission Factor<br>(g/hp-hr) |      |       |
|-------------------------------------|----------|----------------------------------|------|-------|
|                                     |          | 2004                             | 2010 | 2015+ |
| Compressed Natural Gas<br>4-strokes | <15      | 8.44                             | 8.44 | 8.44  |
|                                     | 15-25    | 8.44                             | 8.44 | 8.44  |
|                                     | 25-50    | 5.19                             | 1.95 | 1.95  |
|                                     | 50-120   | 4.57                             | 1.58 | 1.58  |
|                                     | 120-175  | 4.56                             | 1.58 | 1.58  |
|                                     | 175-250  | 4.56                             | 1.58 | 1.58  |
|                                     | 250-500  | 4.56                             | 1.58 | 1.58  |
| Diesel                              | <15      | 6.08                             | 4.37 | 4.37  |
|                                     | 15-25    | 5.79                             | 4.57 | 4.57  |
|                                     | 25-50    | 5.10                             | 4.88 | 4.80  |
|                                     | 50-120   | 5.64                             | 5.01 | 2.53  |
|                                     | 120-175  | 4.72                             | 4.44 | 2.27  |
|                                     | 175-250  | 4.58                             | 2.45 | 1.36  |
|                                     | 250-500  | 4.29                             | 2.45 | 1.36  |
|                                     | 500-750  | 4.51                             | 2.45 | 1.36  |
|                                     | 750-1000 | 8.17                             | 4.08 | 2.36  |
|                                     | >1000    | 8.17                             | 4.08 | 2.36  |
| Gasoline<br>2-stroke                | <2       | 2.32                             | 2.70 | 2.70  |
|                                     | 2-15     | 2.84                             | 2.90 | 2.90  |
|                                     | 15-25    | 2.32                             | 2.68 | 2.68  |
| Gasoline<br>4-stroke                | <5       | 2.32                             | 2.70 | 2.70  |
|                                     | 5-15     | 2.84                             | 2.90 | 2.90  |
|                                     | 15-25    | 2.32                             | 2.68 | 2.68  |
|                                     | 25-50    | 4.52                             | 1.33 | 1.33  |
|                                     | 50-120   | 5.06                             | 1.78 | 1.78  |
|                                     | 120-175  | 4.98                             | 1.94 | 1.94  |
|                                     | 175-250  | 4.98                             | 1.94 | 1.94  |
|                                     | 250-500  | 4.98                             | 1.94 | 1.94  |

# Construction

MP# TR-6, EE-1

**C-2**

**Construction Equipment**

| Fuel                                | HP       | PM Emission Factor<br>(g/hp-hr) |      |       |
|-------------------------------------|----------|---------------------------------|------|-------|
|                                     |          | 2004                            | 2010 | 2015+ |
| Compressed Natural Gas<br>4-strokes | <15      | 0.90                            | 0.90 | 0.90  |
|                                     | 15-25    | 0.90                            | 0.90 | 0.90  |
|                                     | 25-50    | 0.06                            | 0.06 | 0.06  |
|                                     | 50-120   | 0.06                            | 0.06 | 0.06  |
|                                     | 120-175  | 0.06                            | 0.06 | 0.06  |
|                                     | 175-250  | 0.06                            | 0.06 | 0.06  |
|                                     | 250-500  | 0.06                            | 0.06 | 0.06  |
| Diesel                              | <15      | 0.47                            | 0.38 | 0.38  |
|                                     | 15-25    | 0.38                            | 0.38 | 0.38  |
|                                     | 25-50    | 0.43                            | 0.35 | 0.16  |
|                                     | 50-120   | 0.39                            | 0.24 | 0.01  |
|                                     | 120-175  | 0.19                            | 0.16 | 0.01  |
|                                     | 175-250  | 0.11                            | 0.11 | 0.01  |
|                                     | 250-500  | 0.11                            | 0.11 | 0.01  |
|                                     | 500-750  | 0.11                            | 0.11 | 0.01  |
|                                     | 750-1000 | 0.38                            | 0.11 | 0.06  |
|                                     | >1000    | 0.38                            | 0.11 | 0.06  |
| Gasoline<br>2-stroke                | <2       | 0.74                            | 0.74 | 0.74  |
|                                     | 2-15     | 0.14                            | 0.14 | 0.14  |
|                                     | 15-25    | 0.14                            | 0.14 | 0.14  |
| Gasoline<br>4-stroke                | <5       | 0.74                            | 0.74 | 0.74  |
|                                     | 5-15     | 0.14                            | 0.14 | 0.14  |
|                                     | 15-25    | 0.14                            | 0.14 | 0.14  |
|                                     | 25-50    | 0.06                            | 0.06 | 0.06  |
|                                     | 50-120   | 0.06                            | 0.06 | 0.06  |
|                                     | 120-175  | 0.06                            | 0.06 | 0.06  |
|                                     | 175-250  | 0.06                            | 0.06 | 0.06  |
| 250-500                             | 0.06     | 0.06                            | 0.06 |       |

### 8.1.3 Limit Construction Equipment Idling beyond Regulation Requirements

**Range of Effectiveness:** Varies with the amount of Project Idling occurring and the amount reduced.

**Measure Description:**

Heavy duty vehicles will idle during loading/unloading and during layovers or rest periods with the engine still on. Idling requires fuel use and results in emissions. The California Air Resources Board (CARB) Heavy-Duty Vehicle Idling Emission Reduction Program limits diesel-fueled commercial motor vehicles idling time to 5 minutes. There are some exceptions to the regulation such as positioning or providing a power source for equipment or operations such as lift, crane, pump, drill, hoist or other auxiliary equipment. Reduction in idling time beyond required under the regulation would further reduce fuel consumption and thus emissions. The project applicant should develop an enforceable mechanism that monitors the idling time to ensure compliance with this mitigation measure.

**Measure Applicability:**

- Heavy Duty Commercial Vehicles

**Inputs:**

The following information needs to be provided by the Project Applicant:

- Idling time of vehicle

**Baseline Method:**

For all pollutants, the idling emission from each idling period is calculated as follows:

$$\text{Emission} = \text{EF} \times t \times C$$

Where:

- Emission = grams of pollutant per idling period
- EF = Idling emission factor for diesel-fueled heavy duty vehicles obtained from EMFAC (g/idling-hour).
- t = Baseline idling period (minute). This is 5 minutes for all vehicles which do not have auxiliary equipment powered by the primary engine exempted from the regulation. For exempted vehicles, the Project applicant shall determine the baseline idling period.
- C = Time conversion factor = 1/60

# Construction

MP# TR-6.2

**C-3**

**Construction Equipment**

## Mitigation Method:

Mitigated emissions for this measure are calculated using the same method as baseline method, but with mitigated idling period.

## Emission Reduction Ranges and Variables:

Emission reduction is calculated as follows:

$$\text{Reduction} = 1 - \frac{t_M}{t_B}$$

Where:

$t_M$  = mitigated idling period  
 $t_B$  = baseline idling period

## Discussion:

If a heavy duty truck is regulated under the CARB Idling Emission Reduction Program, and the Project Applicant has committed to enforce a reduced idling period to 3 minutes, then the emissions for all pollutants from idling emissions would be reduced by:

$$1 - \frac{3}{5} = 0.4 = 40\%$$

If the Project Applicant determines that the average idling period for a heavy duty vehicle with a hoist powered by the primary engine is 20 minutes, and has committed to enforce a reduced idling time to 15 minutes, then the emissions for all pollutants would be reduced by:

$$1 - \frac{15}{20} = 0.25 = 25\%$$

## Assumptions:

Data based upon the following references:

- California Air Resources Board (CARB) 2009. Heavy-Duty Vehicle Idling Emission Reduction Program. Available at: <http://www.arb.ca.gov/msprog/truck-idling/truck-idling.htm>
- CARB 2010. EMFAC2007 Model. Available at: [http://www.arb.ca.gov/msei/onroad/latest\\_version.htm](http://www.arb.ca.gov/msei/onroad/latest_version.htm)

## Preferred Literature:

Idling of heavy duty commercial vehicles requires fuel use and results in emissions. Project Applicant can obtain the average idling emission factor for diesel-fueled heavy

## Construction

MP# TR-6.2

**C-3**

**Construction Equipment**

duty trucks in the county where the Project would be located from EMFAC. The total idling emissions can be determined by multiplying this emission factor by the total idling period. The California Air Resources Board (CARB) Heavy-Duty Vehicle Idling Emission Reduction Program limits diesel-fueled commercial motor vehicles idling time to 5 minutes, with exceptions for some vehicles with auxiliary equipment powered by the primary engine [1]. The Project Applicant has to determine the appropriate baseline idling periods for such exempted vehicles. A plan should also be developed to ensure enforcement of the reduced idling period that the Project Applicant has committed to.

### **Alternative Literature:**

None

### **Notes:**

[1] California Air Resources Board (CARB) 2009. Heavy-Duty Vehicle Idling Emission Reduction Program. Available at: <http://www.arb.ca.gov/msprog/truck-idling/truck-idling.htm>

### **Other Literature Reviewed:**

None

## Construction

MP# TR-6.2, EE-1

**C-4**

**Construction Equipment**

### 8.1.4 Institute a Heavy-Duty Off-Road Vehicle Plan

#### **Range of Effectiveness:**

Not applicable on its own. This measure ensures compliances with other mitigation measures.

#### **Measure Description:**

The Project Applicant should provide a detailed plan that discusses a construction vehicle inventory tracking system to ensure compliances with construction mitigation measures. The system should include strategies such as requiring hour meters on equipment, documenting the serial number, horsepower, manufacture age, fuel, etc. of all onsite equipment and daily logging of the operating hours of the equipment.

#### **Measure Applicability:**

- This measure ensures compliances with other mitigation measures.
- Construction vehicles.

#### **Preferred Literature:**

None

#### **Alternative Literature:**

None

#### **Literature References:**

None

## Construction

### C-5

### Construction Equipment

#### 8.1.5 Implement a Construction Vehicle Inventory Tracking System

**Range of Effectiveness:**

Not applicable on its own. This measure ensures compliances with other mitigation measures.

**Measure Description:**

The Project Applicant should provide a detailed plan that discusses a construction vehicle inventory tracking system to ensure compliances with construction mitigation measures. The system should include strategies such as requiring engine run time meters on equipment, documenting the serial number, horsepower, manufacture age, fuel, etc. of all onsite equipment and daily logging of the operating hours of the equipment.

**Measure Applicability:**

- This measure ensures compliance with other mitigation measures.
- Construction vehicles.

**Preferred Literature:**

None

**Alternative Literature:**

None

**Literature References:**

None

| Section    | Category   | Page #     | Measure # |
|------------|--|------------|-----------|
| <b>9.0</b> | <b>Miscellaneous</b>   | <b>433</b> |           |
| 9.1        | Miscellaneous  | 433        |           |
| 9.1.1      | Establish a Carbon Sequestration Project                               | 433        | Misc-1    |
| 9.1.2      | Establish Off-Site Mitigation  | 435        | Misc-2    |
| 9.1.3      | Use Local and Sustainable Building Materials                           | 437        | Misc-3    |
| 9.1.4      | Require Best Management Practices in Agriculture and Animal Operations | 439        | Misc-4    |
| 9.1.5      | Require Environmentally Responsible Purchasing                         | 440        | Misc-5    |
| 9.1.6      | Implement an Innovative Strategy for GHG Mitigation                    | 442        | Misc-6    |



## Miscellaneous

MP# LU-5

### Misc-1

### Carbon Sequestration

## 9.0 Miscellaneous

### 9.1 Miscellaneous

#### 9.1.1 Establish a Carbon Sequestration Project

**Range of Effectiveness:** Varies depending on Project Applicant and projects selected. The GHG emissions reduction is subtracted from the overall baseline project emissions inventory.

**Measure Description:**

The Project Applicant would establish a carbon sequestration project. This might include (a) geologic sequestration or carbon capture and storage techniques in which CO<sub>2</sub> from point sources such as power plants and fuel processing plants is captured and injected underground, (b) terrestrial sequestration in which ecosystems such as wetlands and forestlands are established or preserved to serve as CO<sub>2</sub> sinks, (c) novel techniques involving advanced chemical or biological pathways, or (d) technologies yet to be discovered. The Project Applicant would commit to a desired amount of carbon sequestration in MT per year. This amount would be subtracted from the overall baseline project emissions inventory. In order to take credit for this measure, the Project Applicant should be required to establish a reporting and verification mechanism to quantify the amount of carbon sequestered. Furthermore, the Project Applicant should be required to prove additionality.<sup>107</sup>

**Measure Applicability:**

- Overall baseline project GHG emissions inventory

**Inputs:**

- Amount of CO<sub>2</sub>e sequestered (MT/year)

**Baseline Method:**

The Project Applicant should calculate the baseline project emissions inventory (CO<sub>2</sub>e<sub>baseline</sub>, the total baseline CO<sub>2</sub>e emissions in MT per year) using the methods described in the baseline methodology document.

**Mitigation Method:**

The amount of CO<sub>2</sub>e sequestered is subtracted from the overall project emissions inventory. Therefore, the percent GHG reduction is

---

<sup>107</sup> Additionality is the reduction in emissions by sources or enhancement of removals by sinks that is additional to any that would occur in the absence of the Project. In other words, the Project should not subsidize or take credit for emissions reductions which would have occurred regardless of the Project.

# Miscellaneous

MP# LU-5

## Misc-1

## Carbon Sequestration

$$\text{GHG emission reduction} = \frac{\text{CO}_2\text{e}_{\text{sequestered}}}{\text{CO}_2\text{e}_{\text{baseline}}}$$

Where:

- GHG emission reduction = Percentage reduction in overall GHG emissions from carbon sequestration project
- CO<sub>2</sub>e<sub>sequestered</sub> = Amount of CO<sub>2</sub>e sequestered (MT/year)  
Provided by Applicant
- CO<sub>2</sub>e<sub>baseline</sub> = Total baseline CO<sub>2</sub>e emissions (MT/year)

### Assumptions:

Data based upon the following references:

- USDOE. Fossil Energy: Carbon Sequestration. Available online at: <http://www.fossil.energy.gov/programs/sequestration/>

### Emission Reduction Ranges and Variables:

| Pollutant            | Category Emissions Reductions |
|----------------------|-------------------------------|
| CO <sub>2</sub> e    | To be determined by Applicant |
| All other pollutants | None                          |

### Preferred Literature:

The DOE Fossil Energy – Carbon Sequestration website describes the four core carbon sequestration technologies: geologic, carbon capture and storage, terrestrial, and novel biological and chemical pathways. The DOE website discusses current challenges and research projects associated with each of the carbon sequestration technologies, as well as the trade-offs between local environmental impacts and global environmental benefits.

### Alternative Literature:

None

### Other Literature Reviewed:

None

## Miscellaneous

### Misc-2

### Off-site Mitigation

#### 9.1.2 Establish Off-Site Mitigation

**Range of Effectiveness:** Varies depending on Project Applicant and projects selected. The GHG emissions reduction is subtracted from the overall baseline project emissions inventory.

**Measure Description:**

The Project Applicant may decide to establish GHG reduction measures similar to any of the measures discussed in this report. These reductions would take place outside of the Project Site. In order to take credit for this measure, the Project Applicant should be required to establish a method for registering and verifying the GHG emissions reduction. Furthermore, the Project Applicant should be required to prove additionality.<sup>108</sup>

**Measure Applicability:**

- Overall baseline project GHG emissions inventory

**Inputs:**

- Amount of CO<sub>2</sub>e reduced off-site (MT/year)

**Baseline Method:**

The Project Applicant should calculate the baseline project emissions inventory (CO<sub>2</sub>e<sub>baseline</sub>, the total baseline CO<sub>2</sub>e emissions in MT per year) using the methods described in the baseline methodology document.

**Mitigation Method:**

The amount of CO<sub>2</sub>e reduced off-site is subtracted from the overall project emissions inventory. Therefore, the percent GHG reduction is:

$$\text{GHG emission reduction} = \frac{\text{CO}_2\text{e}_{\text{reduced off-site}}}{\text{CO}_2\text{e}_{\text{baseline}}}$$

Where:

|   |   |   |
|---|---|---|
| GHG emission reduction                        | = | Percentage reduction in overall GHG emissions from off-site mitigation          |
| CO <sub>2</sub> e <sub>reduced off-site</sub> | = | Amount of CO <sub>2</sub> e reduced off-site (MT/year)<br>Provided by Applicant |
| CO <sub>2</sub> e <sub>baseline</sub>         | = | Total baseline CO <sub>2</sub> e emissions (MT/year)                            |

<sup>108</sup> Additionality is the reduction in emissions by sources or enhancement of removals by sinks that is additional to any that would occur in the absence of the Project. In other words, the Project should not subsidize or take credit for emissions reductions which would have occurred regardless of the Project.

# Miscellaneous

## Misc-2

### Off-site Mitigation

#### Emission Reduction Ranges and Variables:

| Pollutant            | Category Emissions Reductions   |
|----------------------|---|
| CO <sub>2</sub> e    | To be determined by Applicant   |
| All other pollutants | To be determined by Applicant. Reductions in criteria pollutant emissions may be achieved if the off-site mitigation involves removing or retrofitting combustion sources or reducing electricity use. <sup>109</sup> |

#### Preferred Literature:

None

<sup>109</sup> Note that the reduction in criteria pollutant emissions may not occur in the same air basin as the project.

## Miscellaneous

CEQA# MM C-3 & E-17  
MP# EE-1

### Misc-3

### Local & Sustainable Materials

#### 9.1.3 Use Local and Sustainable Building Materials

**Range of Effectiveness:** Varies depending on Project Applicant and strategies selected. Best Management Practice.

**Measure Description:**

Using building materials which are sourced and processed locally (i.e. close to the project site, as opposed to in another state or country) reduces transportation distances and therefore reduces GHG emissions from fuel combustion. Using sustainable building materials, such as recycled concrete or sustainably harvested wood, also contributes to GHG emissions reductions due to the less carbon-intensive nature of the production and harvesting of these materials. Unlike measures which reduce GHG emissions during the operational lifetime of a project, such as reducing building electricity and water usage, these mitigation efforts are realized prior to the actual operational lifetime of a project. Therefore, these GHG emissions are best quantified in terms of a life-cycle analysis. Life cycle analyses examine all stages of the life of a product, including raw material acquisition, manufacture, transportation, installation, use, and disposal or recycling. The Project Applicant should seek local agency guidance on comparing and/or combining operational emissions inventories and life cycle emissions inventories.

**Measure Applicability:**

- Life cycle emissions from building materials

**Inputs:**

The following information needs to be provided by the Project Applicant:

- Project location
- Material transport distance
- Material type
- Building assembly type and square footage

**Preferred Literature:**

Several software packages and web-based tools are available which can be used to quantify the life cycle emissions from building materials.

The Building for Environmental and Economic Sustainability (BEES) software developed by the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) can calculate global warming potential (in terms of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions in grams per product) for a variety of building products, including a multitude of cement varieties, fabrics, tiles, glass, wood, and shelving materials. Required inputs are the type of building material (e.g. generic 100% Portland cement, generic 20% limestone cement), and transportation distance. The user can compare between different types of materials and associated transportation distances.

## Miscellaneous

CEQA# MM C-3 & E-17  
MP# EE-1

### Misc-3

### Local & Sustainable Materials

The BEES software and user manual is available for public download here:

<http://www.bfrl.nist.gov/oae/software/bees/bees.html>

The Athena EcoCalculator for Assemblies software developed by the Athena Institute analyzes the environmental impacts of whole buildings in terms of global warming potential (in terms of CO<sub>2</sub>e) from raw material extraction, final material manufacturing, transportation, on-site construction, maintenance, and demolition and disposal. Required inputs include the project location, assembly type (columns and beams, floor, exterior wall, interior wall, window, or roof), type of material, and square footage of material. The Athena EcoCalculator compares CO<sub>2</sub>e emissions from the project-specific assembly to default assemblies of similar material and size. The Athena EcoCalculator is based on the more rigorous Athena Impact Estimator software, which requires detailed information about the building design including the number of columns and beams, supported span, wall height, and type of material used for all aspects. In contrast, the Athena EcoCalculator assumes default values for many of the architectural details.

A free public version of the Athena EcoCalculator is available for download here:

<http://www.athenasmi.org/tools/ecoCalculator/index.html>

#### Alternative Literature:

None

#### Other Literature Reviewed:

None

**Miscellaneous**

**Misc-4**

**BMP Agriculture &  
Animal Operations**

**9.1.4 Require Best Management Practices in Agriculture and Animal Operations**

## Miscellaneous

MP# MO-6.1

**Misc-5**

**Environmentally  
Responsible Purchasing**

### 9.1.5 Require Environmentally Responsible Purchasing

**Range of Effectiveness:** Varies depending on Project Applicant and strategies selected. Best Management Practice.

**Measure Description:**

Requiring environmentally responsible purchasing has the potential to have a net effect of reducing GHG emissions by reducing the life cycle emissions, operating emissions, and/or transportation emissions associated with a product. Examples of environmentally responsible purchases which reduce life cycle emissions include but are not limited to: purchasing products with sustainable packaging; purchasing post-consumer recycled copier paper, paper towels, and stationary; purchasing and stocking communal kitchens with reusable dishes and utensils; choosing sustainable cleaning supplies; and leasing equipment from manufacturers who will recycle the components at their “end of life.” Examples of environmentally responsible purchases which reduce a Project’s operating emissions include choosing ENERGY STAR appliances and Water Sense-certified water fixtures; choosing electronic appliances with built in sleep-mode timers; and purchasing “green power” (e.g. electricity generated from renewables or hydropower) from the utility. Choosing locally-made and distributed products reduces the transportation distances required to move the product from the distribution or manufacturing center to the Project, and therefore reduce GHG emissions associated with the transportation vehicles.

Since the magnitude of the energy and GHG reduction depends on the purchasing strategies implemented, the expected GHG reduction is not quantifiable at this time. Therefore, this mitigation measure should be incorporated as a Best Management Practice to encourage homeowners, commercial space tenants, and builders to make sustainable purchases and therefore reduce their contribution to GHG emissions. The Project Applicant could take quantitative credit for this mitigation measure if detailed and substantial evidence were provided.

**Measure Applicability:**

- Purchase of consumer and business goods and appliances

**Assumptions:**

Data based upon the following references:

- City of Chicago and ICLEI. Chicago Green Office Challenge: Waste. Available online at: <http://www.chicagogreenofficechallenge.org/pages/waste/50.php>
- Cool California.org. Small Business Money Saving Actions: Recycle and Cut Waste. Available online at: <http://www.coolcalifornia.org/article/recycle-and-cut-waste>

## Miscellaneous

MP# MO-6.1

**Misc-5**

**Environmentally  
Responsible Purchasing**

- Flex Your Power.org. Commercial Overview Energy Saving Tips: Office Equipment Tips. Available online at:  
[http://www.fypower.org/com/tools/energy\\_tips\\_results.html?tips=office](http://www.fypower.org/com/tools/energy_tips_results.html?tips=office)
- ENERGY STAR. 2007. Putting Energy into Profits: ENERGY STAR Guide for Small Businesses. Available online at:  
[http://www.energystar.gov/ia/business/small\\_business/sb\\_guidebook/smallbizguide.pdf](http://www.energystar.gov/ia/business/small_business/sb_guidebook/smallbizguide.pdf)

### **Emission Reduction Ranges and Variables:**

This is a Best Management Practice and therefore at this time there is no quantifiable reduction. Check with local agencies for guidance on any allowed reductions associated with implementation of best management practices.

### **Preferred Literature:**

The Chicago Green Office Challenge, Cool California.org, and Flex Your Power.org website resources provide many examples of office and small business purchasing strategies which reduce waste and energy use. The ENERGY STAR Guide provides more details about energy-efficient appliance choices and the option to purchase renewable or clean energy from the utility for a higher cost.

### **Alternative Literature:**

None

### **Other Literature Reviewed:**

None

## Miscellaneous

### Misc-6

### Innovative Strategy

#### 9.1.6 Implement an Innovative Strategy for GHG Mitigation

**Range of Effectiveness:** Varies depending on Project Applicant and strategies selected. The GHG emissions reduction may be quantifiable. If not quantifiable, this mitigation measure should be implemented as a Best Management Practice.

**Measure Description:**

The Project Applicant may develop a novel strategy to reduce GHG emissions at the project site or off-site. This strategy may incorporate technologies which have yet to be developed at the time of the publication of this report. In order to take quantifiable credit for this measure, the Project Applicant must provide detailed and substantial evidence showing the quantification and verification of the GHG emissions reduction. If the GHG emissions reduction is not quantifiable, it should be implemented as a Best Management Practice.

**Measure Applicability:**

- To be determined by Project Applicant

**Inputs:**

- Amount of CO<sub>2</sub>e reduced due to Innovative Strategy
- Baseline CO<sub>2</sub>e for applicable inventory sector

**Baseline Method:**

The Project Applicant should calculate the baseline CO<sub>2</sub>e emissions associated with the applicable GHG emissions inventory sector (CO<sub>2</sub>e<sub>baseline-sector</sub>, the baseline CO<sub>2</sub>e emissions in MT per year for the applicable sector) using the methods described in the baseline methodology document. For example, if the Innovative Strategy achieves GHG reductions by reducing building energy use, CO<sub>2</sub>e<sub>baseline-sector</sub> is the total CO<sub>2</sub>e emissions associated with baseline building energy use.

**Mitigation Method:**

The amount of CO<sub>2</sub>e reduced due to the Innovative Strategy is subtracted from applicable emissions inventory sector. Therefore, the percent GHG reduction is:

$$\text{GHG emission reduction} = \frac{\text{CO}_2\text{e}_{\text{reduced-sector}}}{\text{CO}_2\text{e}_{\text{baseline-sector}}}$$

Where:

|  |   |   |
|--|---|---|
| GHG emission reduction                       | = | Percentage reduction in sector GHG emissions due to Innovative Strategy                           |
| CO <sub>2</sub> e <sub>reduced-sector</sub>  | = | Amount of CO <sub>2</sub> e reduced due to Innovative Strategy (MT/year)<br>Provided by Applicant |
| CO <sub>2</sub> e <sub>baseline-sector</sub> | = | Baseline sector CO <sub>2</sub> e emissions (MT/year)   |

# Miscellaneous

## Misc-6

## Innovative Strategy

If the GHG emissions reduction cannot be quantified and/or verified, check with local agencies for guidance on any allowed reductions associated with implementation of Best Management Practices.

### Emission Reduction Ranges and Variables:

| Pollutant            | Category Emissions Reductions |
|----------------------|-------------------------------|
| CO <sub>2</sub> e    | To be determined by Applicant |
| All other pollutants | None                          |

### Preferred Literature:

None

| Section     | Category  | Page #     | Measure # |
|-------------|---|------------|-----------|
| <b>10.0</b> | <b>General Plans</b>                                    | <b>444</b> |           |
| 10.1        | General Plans   | 444        |           |
| 10.1.1      | Fund Incentives for Energy Efficiency                   | 444        | GP-1      |
| 10.1.2      | Establish a Local Farmer's Market                       | 446        | GP-2      |
| 10.1.3      | Establish Community Gardens                             | 448        | GP-3      |
| 10.1.4      | Plant Urban Shade Trees                                 | 450        | GP-4      |
| 10.1.5      | Implement Strategies to Reduce Urban Heat-Island Effect | 455        | GP-5      |



## General Plans

### GP-1

## 10.0 General Plans

In addition to fact sheets and BMPs, this document includes measures that are more applicable for General Plans. The following measures have substantial evidence of reductions when implemented at a General Plan level rather than a project level.

### 10.1 General Plans

#### 10.1.1 Fund Incentives for Energy Efficiency

**Range of Effectiveness:** Varies depending on Project Applicant and strategies selected. Best Management Practice.

**Measure Description:**

By funding incentives for energy-efficient choices in equipment, fixtures in buildings, or energy sources, a Project Applicant can promote reductions in GHG emissions associated with fuel combustion and electricity use. The Project Applicant may choose to contribute to an existing municipal energy fund or establish a new energy fund for the Project. The Project Applicant should check with the local air district regarding participating in established programs. These energy funds may provide financial incentives or grants for any number of energy efficiency measures including but not limited to: retrofitting or designing new buildings, parking lots, streets, and public areas with energy-efficient lighting; retrofitting or designing new buildings with low-flow water fixtures and high-efficiency appliances; retrofitting or purchasing new low-emissions equipment; purchasing electric or hybrid vehicles; and investing in renewable energy systems such as photovoltaics or wind turbines. Recipients of energy fund grants could include neighborhood developers, home and commercial space builders, homeowners, and utilities. Energy funds allow recipients flexibility in choosing efficiency strategies while still achieving the desired effects of reduced energy use and associated GHG emissions.

Since the magnitude of the energy and GHG reduction depends on the strategies selected by the energy fund recipients, the expected GHG reduction is not quantifiable at this time. Therefore, this mitigation measure should be incorporated as a Best Management Practice to encourage utilities, builders, residents, and commercial tenants to reduce their energy use and/or choose cleaner energy, and therefore reduce their contribution to GHG emissions. The Project Applicant could take quantitative credit for this mitigation measure if detailed and substantial evidence were provided.

**Measure Applicability:**

- GHG emissions from energy use (fuel combustion and electricity use)

**Assumptions:**

Data based upon the following references:

## General Plans

### GP-1

- City of Ann Arbor. Energy Office: Energy Fund. Available online at: [http://www.a2gov.org/government/publicservices/systems\\_planning/energy/Page\\_s/EnergyFund.aspx](http://www.a2gov.org/government/publicservices/systems_planning/energy/Page_s/EnergyFund.aspx)
- Go Solar California. California Solar Initiative. Available online at: <http://www.gosolarcalifornia.org/csi/index.html>
- USDOE. Database of State Initiatives for Renewables and Efficiency: California. Available online at: <http://www.dsireusa.org/incentives/index.cfm?re=1&ee=1&spv=0&st=0&srp=1&state=CA>
- California Clean Energy Fund. About Us. Available online at: <http://www.calcef.org/about.htm>

#### **Emission Reduction Ranges and Variables:**

This is a Best Management Practice and therefore there is no quantifiable reduction at this time. Check with local agencies for guidance on any allowed reductions associated with implementation of best management practices.

#### **Preferred Literature:**

The City of Ann Arbor's Energy Fund provides a good example of a municipal general energy fund which provides grants for a wide variety of energy efficiency and renewable energy investments. The California Solar Initiative and the Energy Efficient Appliance Rebate Program (found on the DOE Database of State Initiatives for Renewables and Efficiency) are examples of California state energy funds which incentivize specific types of purchases. The DOE database provides a listing of many more California municipal and local programs.

#### **Alternative Literature:**

None

#### **Other Literature Reviewed:**

- The Energy Foundation. Programs: Power. Available online at: <http://www.ef.org/programs.cfm>

## General Plans

CEQA# MM D-18  
MP# LU-2.1.4

### GP-2

#### 10.1.2 Establish a Local Farmer's Market

**Range of Effectiveness:** Varies depending on Project Applicant and strategies selected. Best Management Practice.

#### **Measure Description:**

Establishing a local farmer's market has the potential to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by providing project residents with a more local source of food, potentially resulting in a reduction in the number of trips and vehicle miles traveled by both the food and the consumers to grocery stores and supermarkets. If the food sold at the local farmer's market is produced organically, it can also contribute to greenhouse gas reductions by displacing carbon-intensive food production practices. As discussed in more detail below, these emissions reductions cannot be reasonably quantified at this time because they are based on several undefined parameters: the relative locations of the farmer's market, supermarket, and supermarket produce suppliers; the carbon intensity of food production practices; and the role of the farmer's market in a development, such as whether it supplements trips to the grocery store or completely displaces them.

#### **Measure Applicability:**

- Number of trips to supermarket and vehicle miles traveled
- Life cycle emissions of food production

#### **Discussion:**

Potential greenhouse gas emissions from establishing a local farmer's market can be divided into two types: emissions reductions from transportation and emissions reductions from food production practices. The transportation of food from a field to a store and the transportation of consumers from their homes to a store both contribute to greenhouse gas emissions. In many cases, especially in urban areas, a local farmer's market will reduce emissions associated with the distribution of food from the field to the consumer, since the farms represented at the local farmer's market are theoretically closer to the consumer than the farms which produce most of the food found at supermarkets and grocery stores. However, California has a large number of farms and orchards and in some cases the farms represented at a local farmer's market may not be different than those represented at the neighborhood grocery store. If a consumer obtains produce from a local farmer's market when they would otherwise drive a farther distance to purchase produce from a grocery store, the trip to the grocery stores is displaced, VMT is reduced, and GHG emissions reductions are achieved. However, if a consumer drives to the farmer's market and then to the grocery store (for example, to purchase food which the farmer's market cannot provide), the trip to the farmer's market is made in addition to the trip to the grocery store. Thus, an additional trip is made, VMT

## General Plans

CEQA# MM D-18  
MP# LU-2.1.4

### GP-2

is added, and greenhouse gas emissions are actually increased. It is unclear how local farmer's markets affect the food purchasing behavior of consumers, and therefore the effect of a farmer's market on transportation greenhouse gas emissions is not quantifiable at this time. The carbon intensity of food production practices also contributes to greenhouse gas emissions; however, these emissions are accounted for in the life cycle analysis of the food and cannot be directly compared to a development's operational greenhouse gas emissions inventory (such as the transportation emissions detailed above). If food at a local farmer's market is produced organically, it is likely that less carbon-intensive practices were used than at the large-scale farms and orchards which produce most food found at grocery stores and supermarkets. Examples of carbon-intensive gardening practices include heated greenhouses and the heavy use of fertilizers and pesticides derived from fossil fuels. Local farms which do not practice organic or sustainable farming may employ these more carbon-intensive practices. Thus, the magnitude of the life-cycle greenhouse gas emissions is difficult to quantify and compare to operational inventories.

#### **Preferred Literature:**

None

# General Plans

CEQA# MM D-19  
MP# LU-2.1.4

## GP-3

### 10.1.3 Establish Community Gardens

**Range of Effectiveness:** Varies depending on Project Applicant and strategies selected. Best Management Practice.

#### Measure Description:

Establishing a community garden has the potential to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by providing project residents with a local source of food, potentially resulting in a reduction in the number of trips and vehicle miles traveled by both the food and the consumers to grocery stores and supermarkets. Community gardens can also contribute to greenhouse gas reductions by displacing carbon-intensive food production practices. As discussed in more detail below, these emissions reductions cannot be reasonably quantified at this time because they are based on several undefined parameters: the relative locations of the community garden, supermarket, and supermarket produce suppliers; the carbon intensity of gardening and farming practices; and the role of a community garden in a development, such as whether it supplements trips to the grocery store or completely displaces them.

#### Measure Applicability:

- Number of trips to supermarket and vehicle miles traveled
- Life cycle emissions of food production

#### Discussion:

Potential greenhouse gas emissions from establishing a community garden can be divided into two types: emissions reductions from transportation and emissions reductions from food production practices. The transportation of food from a field to a store and the transportation of consumers from their homes to a store both contribute to greenhouse gas emissions. In most cases a community garden will reduce emissions associated with the distribution of food from the field to the consumer, since with community gardens the food goes directly from the field to the consumer, while in grocery stores and supermarkets the path is more likely field to regional distribution center to store to consumer. If a consumer obtains produce from a community garden when they would otherwise drive a farther distance to purchase produce from a grocery store, the trip to the grocery stores is displaced, VMT is reduced, and GHG emissions reductions are achieved. However, if a consumer drives to the community garden and then to the grocery store (for example, to purchase food which the community garden cannot provide), the trip to the community garden is made in addition to the trip to the grocery store. Thus, an additional trip is made, VMT is added, and greenhouse gas emissions are actually increased. Furthermore, if community gardens displace backyard gardens, they increase transportation emissions. It is unclear how community gardens affect the food purchasing behavior of consumers, and therefore the effect of a community garden on transportation greenhouse gas emissions is not quantifiable at

## General Plans

CEQA# MM D-19  
MP# LU-2.1.4

### GP-3

this time. The carbon intensity of food production practices also contributes to greenhouse gas emissions; however, these emissions are accounted for in the life cycle analysis of the food and cannot be directly compared to a development's operational greenhouse gas emissions inventory (such as the transportation emissions detailed above). Community gardens are likely to produce food using less carbon-intensive practices than the large-scale farms and orchards which produce most food found at grocery stores and supermarkets. Examples of carbon-intensive gardening practices include heated greenhouses and the heavy use of fertilizers and pesticides derived from fossil fuels; these practices are not likely to be used at community gardens. Although these qualitative conclusions can be drawn, the magnitude of the life-cycle greenhouse gas emissions is difficult to quantify and compare to operational inventories.

#### **Preferred Literature:**

None

## General Plans

CEQA# MM T-14  
MP# COS-3.2

### GP-4

#### 10.1.4 Plant Urban Shade Trees

**Range of Effectiveness:** The reduction in GHG emissions is not quantifiable at this time, therefore this mitigation measure should be implemented as a Best Management Practice. If the study data were updated to account for Title 24 standards, the GHG emissions reductions could be quantified but would vary based on location, building type, and building size.

#### **Measure Description:**

Planting shade trees around buildings has been shown to effectively lower the electricity cooling demand of buildings by blocking incident sunlight and reducing heat gain through windows, walls, and roofs. Deciduous trees with large canopies are a desirable choice of shade tree because they provide shade in the warm months and shed their leaves in the winter months to allow sunlight to pass through and warm the building. By reducing cooling demand, shade trees help reduce electricity demand from the local utility and therefore reduce GHG emissions which would otherwise be emitted during the production of that electricity.

A study entitled “Calculating energy-saving potentials of heat-island reduction strategies” conducted by the Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory (LBNL) Heat Island Group provides a method to quantify reductions in electricity use from planting shade trees around residences, offices, and retail stores. The electricity reductions are based on the LBNL model which assumes 4 shade trees are planted around residences, 8 trees are planted around offices, and 10 trees are planted around retail stores. The LBNL model is also based on electricity use data for two building stocks: Pre-1980 buildings (buildings constructed prior to 1980) and 1980+ buildings (buildings constructed on or after 1980). Other assumptions, including the geometry of the modeled trees and sunlight transmittance, are detailed in Section 2.5 of the study. This mitigation measure describes how to estimate greenhouse gas emissions reductions from planting shade trees based on the LBNL data. Since the model is based on electricity data for Pre-1980 and 1980+ buildings<sup>110</sup> it does not incorporate electricity use improvements due to the California 2001, 2005, or 2008 Title 24 measures. Given that buildings constructed in 2001 or later incorporate Title 24 electricity efficiency improvements, the electricity savings reported in the LBNL study are overestimates of the savings that would actually be achieved for these newer buildings.<sup>111</sup>

---

<sup>110</sup> This data for these buildings is based on U.S. Department of Energy and California Energy Commission studies conducted in 1987 through 2001.

<sup>111</sup> The CEC 2003 Impact Analysis Report estimates a state-average 14.9%-26% savings in electricity use for cooling in residential buildings and 6.7% savings in electricity use for cooling in non-residential

# General Plans

CEQA# MM T-14  
MP# COS-3.2

## GP-4

While the electricity savings in the study overestimates savings for newer buildings, the data does show that electricity savings (and associated greenhouse gas emissions savings) from planting shade trees are real. A follow-up study which uses similar methodologies with models updated with the Title 24 standards would provide data which could be used to more accurately quantify electricity savings for new buildings.

### Measure Applicability:

- Electricity use
- Limitation: It takes several years for trees to grow to the height necessary to provide shade to a building. Furthermore, without deed restrictions, the presence of shade trees around a building may not be permanent, as a new owner may decide to remove the trees or not replace them if they die.

### Inputs:

The following information needs to be provided by the Project Applicant:

- Type of building (residential, office, or retail store)
- Square footage of roof
- Heating Degree Days (HDD) or Cooling Degree Days (CDD) of Project location

### Baseline Method:

The CEC Residential Appliance Saturation Survey (RASS) and California Commercial Energy Use Survey (CEUS) datasets can be used to calculate the baseline electricity for building cooling. The data is available for different climate zones in California and electricity use from cooling alone can be extracted. The methodology for using RASS and CEUS to calculate  $GHG_{baseline}$  is described in the baseline document.

### Mitigation Method:

The electricity savings from reduced cooling demand are based on the location of the building. Table 4 of the LBNL study provides a list of cities and their HDD and CDD values. If a project's location is not listed, the Project Applicant should choose a representative city with climate similar to that of the project. Alternatively, the Project Applicant could determine the HDD and CDD of the project location from local meteorological data.

---

buildings due to the 2005 update to the 2001 Title 24 standards. The CEC 2007 Impact Analysis Report estimates a state-average 19.7%-22.7% savings in overall electricity use for residential buildings and a 8.3% savings in electricity use for cooling in non-residential buildings due to the 2008 update to the 2005 Title 24 standards.

# General Plans

CEQA# MM T-14  
MP# COS-3.2

## GP-4

Tables 6 through 16 of the LBNL study show the expected electricity savings (in kWh per 1000 sqft of roof) based on the following parameters:

- Building type (residential, office, or retail store)
- Climate method (HDD or CDD – either can be used)
- Heating method (Gas heated-buildings or electric-heated buildings)

The Project Applicant should select data based on the appropriate parameters above. The entry corresponding to the “Shade tree savings” row and “1980+” column will provide the electricity savings in kWh per 1000 sqft of roof for the specified building type, climate method, and heating method. Note that value is an overestimate of savings for buildings which were manufactured under Title 24 standards.

Then the reduction in GHG emissions is calculated as follows:

$$GHG_{\text{reduction}} = SF \times ElecSavings \times Utility$$

Where

$GHG_{\text{reduction}}$  = Reduction in GHG emissions from planting shade trees (MT)

SF = Sqft of roof

Provided by Applicant

$ElecSavings$  = Electricity savings (kWh / sqft roof)

From Tables 6 through 16 of LBNL study

Utility = Carbon intensity of local utility (MT CO<sub>2e</sub> / kWh)

From Table below

| Power Utility | Carbon-Intensity<br>(lbs CO <sub>2e</sub> /MWh) |
|---------------|---|
| LADW&P        | 1,238   |
| PG&E          | 456   |
| SCE           | 641   |
| SDGE          | 781   |
| SMUD          | 555   |

Therefore:

$$\text{Percent reduction in GHG emissions} = GHG_{\text{reduction}} / GHG_{\text{baseline}}$$

Since the Utility term is a factor of both  $GHG_{\text{reduction}}$  and  $GHG_{\text{baseline}}$ , the percent reduction in GHG emissions does not depend on the value of Utility.

# General Plans

**CEQA#** MM T-14  
**MP#** COS-3.2

**GP-4**

# General Plans

CEQA# MM T-14  
MP# COS-3.2

## GP-4

### Emission Reduction Ranges and Variables:

| Pollutant            | Category Emissions Reductions   |
|----------------------|---|
| CO <sub>2</sub> e    | <p>The following emissions reductions reflect the implementation of three heat island reduction strategies (installing reflective roofs, planting shade trees, and using high-albedo pavements) for the 1980+ stock buildings. The reduction from planting shade trees around new buildings is expected to be smaller than the estimate below. Additionally, savings are expected to be smaller for new buildings due to the Title 24 standards.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 20% for residential buildings</li> <li>• 5-12% for office buildings</li> <li>• 10-17% for retail buildings</li> </ul> |
| All other pollutants | Same as above <sup>112</sup>  |

### Assumptions:

Data based upon the following reference:

- H. Akbari, S. Konopacki. Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory. 2005. Calculating Energy-Saving-Potentials of Heat-Island Reduction Strategies. Journal of Energy Policy. Volume 33, p. 721-756.

### Preferred Literature:

The LBNL study conducted by Akbari and Konopacki of the Heat Island Group modeled energy savings from shade trees for residential, office, and retail building types. The model accounted for differences in climate by modeling in a range of heating-degree-days and cooling-degree days, and compared a basecase (building with no external shading) to a mitigated case (building with 4, 8, and 10 shade trees, depending on the building type). However, the study is based on pre-2001 data and does not account for updates to California's Title 24 standards. Furthermore, the model assumes a specific number of shade trees planted at specific orientations.

### Alternative Literature:

- CCAR. 2010. Urban Forest Project Protocol Version 1.1. Available online at: <http://www.climateactionreserve.org/how/protocols/adopted/urban-forest/current-urban-forest-project-protocol/>

Section D.3 of the protocol describes a method to quantify the reductions in cooling and heating demand due to the planting of shade trees. Computer simulations incorporating

<sup>112</sup> Criteria air pollutant emissions may also be reduced due to the reduction in energy use; however, the reduction may not be in the same air basin as the project.

## General Plans

CEQA# MM T-14  
MP# COS-3.2

### GP-4

building, climate, and shading effects were used to calculate the change in unit energy consumption (UEC) on a per tree basis. Total change in energy use is calculated by multiplying the change in UEC per tree by the total number of trees. Buildings were modeled in three stocks with similar building characteristics: buildings constructed prior to 1950, buildings constructed between 1950 and 1980, and buildings constructed after 1980. As with the primary reference above, the data does not account for electricity efficiency improvements due to California's Title 24 standards.

#### Other Literature Reviewed:

- E. G. McPherson, J. R. Simpson. USDA Forest Service. 2003. Potential Energy Savings in Buildings by an Urban Tree Planting Programme in California. *Journal of Urban Forestry & Urban Greening*. Volume 2, p. 73-86.
- H. Akbari. Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory. 2002. Shade Trees Reduce Building Energy Use and CO<sub>2</sub> Emissions from Power Plants. *Journal of Environmental Pollution*. Volume 116, p. 119-126.
- J. R. Simpson. Department of Environmental Horticulture at the University of California. 2002. Improved Estimates of Tree-Shade Effects on Residential Energy Use. *Journal of Energy and Buildings*. Volume 34, p. 1067-1076.

## General Plans

CEQA# MM E-8 & E-12  
MP# LU-6.1

### GP-5

#### 10.1.5 Implement Strategies to Reduce Urban Heat-Island Effect

**Range of Effectiveness:** The reduction in GHG emissions is not quantifiable at this time, therefore this mitigation measure should be implemented as a Best Management Practice. If the study data were updated to account for Title 24 standards, the GHG emissions reductions could be quantified but would vary based on location, building type, and building size.

**Measure Description:**

The urban heat island effect is the phenomenon in which a metropolitan area is warmer than its surrounding rural areas due to increased land surface which retains heat, such as concrete, asphalt, metal, and other materials found in buildings and pavements. This warming effect causes warmer locations, such as many cities in California, to require more energy for air conditioning and refrigeration than the surrounding rural areas. Higher energy requirements in turn result in higher CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from the generation of this energy.

Three strategies have been shown to have a positive impact on reducing localized temperatures and reducing the electricity demand for building cooling. These strategies are planting urban shade trees, installing reflective roofs, and using light-colored or high-albedo<sup>113</sup> pavements and surfaces. Planting shade trees around buildings and installing reflective roofs have both been found to result in direct electricity savings for buildings. The per building direct electricity savings from planting shade trees is discussed in a separate mitigation measure. Reflective roofs are covered under Title 24 Part 6 and the electricity savings is therefore incorporated in savings due to Title 24. The combination of the three strategies, however, has been shown to have a city-wide effect: a reduction in ambient air temperature. This reduction in air temperature results in buildings requiring less electricity for cooling, and is quantified as indirect savings in electricity use. The savings can be quantified on a per-building basis or on a city-wide basis.

A study entitled “Calculating energy-saving potentials of heat-island reduction strategies” conducted by the Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory (LBNL) Heat Island Group provides a method to quantify per-building reductions in electricity use from implementing these three strategies on a city-wide scale. In addition, the study reports modeled city-wide electricity savings. The electricity reductions are based on a LBNL model with certain assumptions about the number and orientation of shade trees

---

<sup>113</sup> The albedo ratio of a surface represents how strongly the surface reflects sunlight. Pavements with higher albedo ratios reflect more sunlight and therefore retain less heat.

## General Plans

CEQA# MM E-8 & E-12  
MP# LU-6.1

### GP-5

and the albedo values of roofs and pavements. Per-building electricity savings are also based on for two building stocks: Pre-1980 buildings (buildings constructed prior to 1980) and 1980+ buildings (buildings constructed on or after 1980).

This mitigation measure describes how to estimate greenhouse gas emissions reductions from implementing heat-island effect reduction strategies as reported in the LBNL study. Since the LBNL model is based on electricity data for Pre-1980 and 1980+ buildings<sup>114</sup> it does not incorporate electricity use improvements due to the California 2001, 2005, or 2008 Title 24 measures. Given that buildings constructed in 2001 or later incorporate Title 24 electricity efficiency improvements, the electricity savings reported in the LBNL study are overestimates of the savings that would actually be achieved for these newer buildings.<sup>115</sup>

While the electricity savings in the study overestimates savings for newer buildings, the data does show that electricity savings (and associated greenhouse gas emissions savings) from planting shade trees are real. A follow-up study which uses similar methodologies with models updated with the Title 24 standards would provide data which could be used to more accurately quantify electricity savings for new buildings.

#### Measure Applicability:

- Electricity use
- Limitation: It takes several years for trees to grow to the height necessary to provide shade to a building. Furthermore, without deed restrictions, the presence of shade trees around a building may not be permanent, as a new owner may decide to remove the trees or not replace them if they die.
- Limitation: it is assumed that the heat-island effect reduction strategies are implemented on a city-wide scale.

#### Inputs:

The following information needs to be provided by the Project Applicant:

- Type of building (residential, office, or retail store)
- Square footage of roof

<sup>114</sup> This data for these buildings is based on U.S. Department of Energy and California Energy Commission studies conducted in 1987 through 2001.

<sup>115</sup> The CEC 2003 Impact Analysis Report estimates a state-average 14.9%-26% savings in electricity use for cooling in residential buildings and 6.7% savings in electricity use for cooling in non-residential buildings due to the 2005 update to the 2001 Title 24 standards. The CEC 2007 Impact Analysis Report estimates a state-average 19.7%-22.7% savings in overall electricity use for residential buildings and a 8.3% savings in electricity use for cooling in non-residential buildings due to the 2008 update to the 2005 Title 24 standards.

# General Plans

CEQA# MM E-8 & E-12  
MP# LU-6.1

## GP-5

- Heating Degree Days (HDD) or Cooling Degree Days (CDD) of Project location

### Baseline Method:

The CEC Residential Appliance Saturation Survey (RASS) and California Commercial Energy Use Survey (CEUS) datasets can be used to calculate the baseline electricity for building cooling. The data is available for different climate zones in California and electricity use from cooling alone can be extracted. The methodology for using RASS and CEUS to calculate  $GHG_{baseline}$  is described in the baseline document.

### Mitigation Method:

The electricity savings from reduced cooling demand are based on the location of the building. Table 4 of the LBNL study provides a list of cities and their HDD and CDD values. If a project’s location is not listed, the Project Applicant should choose a representative city with climate similar to that of the project. Alternatively, the Project Applicant could determine the HDD and CDD of the project location from local meteorological data.

Tables 6 through 16 of the LBNL study show the expected electricity savings (in kWh per 1000 sqft of roof) based on the following parameters:

- Building type (residential, office, or retail store)
- Climate method (HDD or CDD – either can be used)
- Heating method (Gas heated-buildings or electric-heated buildings)

The Project Applicant should select data based on the appropriate parameters above. The entry corresponding to the “Indirect Savings” row and “1980+” column will provide the electricity savings in kWh per 1000 sqft of roof for the specified building type, climate method, and heating method. Note that value is an overestimate of savings for buildings which were manufactured under Title 24 standards.

Then the reduction in GHG emissions is calculated as follows:

$$GHG_{reduction} = SF \times ElecSavings \times Utility$$

Where

- $GHG_{reduction}$  = Reduction in GHG emissions from implementing heat island effect reduction strategies on a city-wide scale (MT)
- SF = Sqft of roof  
Provided by Applicant
- ElecSavings = Electricity savings (kWh / sqft roof)  
From Tables 6 through 16 of LBNL study
- Utility = Carbon intensity of local utility (MT CO<sub>2</sub>e / kWh)

## General Plans

CEQA# MM E-8 & E-12  
MP# LU-6.1

**GP-5**

From Table below

# General Plans

CEQA# MM E-8 & E-12  
MP# LU-6.1

## GP-5

| Power Utility | Carbon-Intensity<br>(lbs CO <sub>2</sub> e/MWh) |
|---------------|---|
| LADW&P        | 1,238   |
| PG&E          | 456   |
| SCE           | 641   |
| SDGE          | 781   |
| SMUD          | 555   |

Therefore:

$$\text{Percent reduction in GHG emissions} = \text{GHG}_{\text{reduction}} / \text{GHG}_{\text{baseline}}$$

Since the Utility term is a factor of both  $\text{GHG}_{\text{reduction}}$  and  $\text{GHG}_{\text{baseline}}$ , the percent reduction in GHG emissions does not depend on the value of Utility.

### City-Wide GHG reductions

The LBNL study estimates that city-wide reductions in electricity use (and associated GHG emissions) range from about 10-20%. This range is based on the percent indirect savings modeled for five pilot cities: Houston, Baton Rouge, Chicago, Sacramento, and Salt Lake City, as reported in Figure 2 of the LBNL study.

### Emission Reduction Ranges and Variables:

| Pollutant            | Category Emissions Reductions   |
|----------------------|---|
| CO <sub>2</sub> e    | <p>The following per-building emissions reductions reflect the implementation of three heat island reduction strategies (installing reflective roofs, planting shade trees, and using high-albedo pavements) for the 1980+ stock buildings. Actual savings are expected to be lower for new buildings due to the Title 24 standards.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 20% for residential buildings</li> <li>• 5-12% for office buildings</li> <li>• 10-17% for retail buildings</li> </ul> |
| All other pollutants | Same as above <sup>116</sup>  |

<sup>116</sup> Criteria air pollutant emissions may also be reduced due to the reduction in energy use; however, the reduction may not be in the same air basin as the project.

## General Plans

CEQA# MM E-8 & E-12  
MP# LU-6.1

### GP-5

#### Assumptions:

Data based upon the following reference:

- H. Akbari, S. Konopacki. Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory. 2005. Calculating Energy-Saving-Potentials of Heat-Island Reduction Strategies. Journal of Energy Policy. Volume 33, p. 721-756.
- S. Konopacki, H. Akbari. Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory. 2000. Energy Savings Calculations for Heat Island Reduction Strategies in Baton Rouge, Sacramento, and Salt Lake City. LBNL 42890.

#### Preferred Literature:

The LBNL study conducted by Akbari and Konopacki of the Heat Island Group modeled energy savings from shade trees for residential, office, and retail building types. The model accounted for differences in climate by modeling in a range of heating-degree-days and cooling-degree days, and compared a basecase (building with no external shading) to a mitigated case (building with 4, 8, and 10 shade trees, depending on the building type). However, the study is based on pre-2001 data and does not account for updates to California's Title 24 standards. Furthermore, the model assumes a specific number of shade trees planted at specific orientations.

#### Alternative Literature:

None

#### Other Literature Reviewed:

Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory. Heat Island Group: Benefits of Cooler Pavements. Available online at:  
<http://eetd.lbl.gov/HeatIsland/Pavements/Overview/Pavements99-01.html>.  
Accessed March 2010.

Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory. Heat Island Group: The Cost of Hot Pavements. Available online at: <http://heatisland.lbl.gov/Pavements/Cost.html>.  
Accessed March 2010.

USEPA. Draft. Reducing Urban Heat Islands: Compendium of Strategies, Cool Pavements. Available online at:  
<http://epa.gov/heatisland/resources/pdf/CoolPavesCompendium.pdf>

## **Appendix A**

### **List of Acronyms and Glossary of Terms**

## List of Acronyms

|                   |   |
|-------------------|---|
| ACM               | alternative calculation method                        |
| AF                | acre feet   |
| B20               | biodiesel (20%)                                       |
| BOD               | biochemical oxygen demand                             |
| BMP               | best management practice                              |
| C                 | carbon  |
| CAFE              | corporate average fuel economy                        |
| CAPCOA            | California Air Pollution Control Officers Association |
| CAR               | Climate Action Registry                               |
| CARB              | California Air Resources Board                        |
| CCAR              | California Climate Action Registry                    |
| CDWR              | California Department of Water Resources              |
| CEC               | California Energy Commission                          |
| CEQA              | California Environmental Quality Act                  |
| CEUS              | California Commercial End-Use Survey                  |
| CGBSC             | California Green Building Standards Code              |
| CH <sub>4</sub>   | methane   |
| CHP               | combined heat and power                               |
| CIWMB             | California Integrated Waste Management Board          |
| CNG               | compressed natural gas                                |
| CO <sub>2</sub>   | carbon dioxide  |
| CO <sub>2</sub> e | carbon dioxide equivalent                             |
| DE                | destruction efficiency                                |
| DEIR              | Draft Environmental Impact Report                     |
| DU                | dwelling unit   |
| EF                | emission factor                                       |
| EIA               | United States Energy Information Administration       |
| EIR               | Environmental Impact Report                           |
| EMFAC             | on-road vehicle emission factors model                |
| ET <sub>0</sub>   | reference evapotranspiration                          |
| ETWU              | estimated total water use                             |
| FCZ               | forecasting climate zone                              |
| GHG               | greenhouse gas  |
| GP                | General Plan  |
| GRP               | General Reporting Protocol                            |
| GWP               | global warming potential                              |
| HA                | hydrozone area  |
| HHV               | higher heating value                                  |
| hp                | horsepower  |
| HVAC              | heating, ventilating, and air conditioning            |
| IE                | irrigation efficiency                                 |
| IPCC              | Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change             |
| ITE               | Institute of Transportation Engineers                 |
| ITS               | intelligent transportation systems                    |
| kBTU              | thousand British thermal units                        |
| kW                | kilowatt  |
| kWh               | kilowatt-hour   |
| kWh/yr            | kilowatt-hours/year                                   |
| lbs               | pounds  |

|                  |   |
|------------------|---|
| LA               | landscape area  |
| LADWP            | Los Angeles Department of Water and Power               |
| LCA              | life cycle assessment                                   |
| LDA              | light-duty auto   |
| LDT              | light-duty truck  |
| LED              | light-emitting diode                                    |
| LFM              | landfill methane  |
| LNG              | liquefied natural gas                                   |
| LPG              | liquefied petroleum gas                                 |
| MAWA             | maximum applied water allowance                         |
| MMBTU            | million British thermal units                           |
| MSW              | mixed solid waste                                       |
| MTCE             | metric tonnes carbon equivalent                         |
| N <sub>2</sub> O | nitrous oxide   |
| NO <sub>x</sub>  | nitrogen oxides   |
| NRDC             | Natural Resources Defense Council                       |
| NREL             | National Renewable Energy Laboratory                    |
| OLED             | organic light-emitting diode                            |
| OFFROAD          | off-road vehicle emission factors model                 |
| PF               | plant factor  |
| PG&E             | Pacific Gas and Electric                                |
| PM               | particulate matter                                      |
| PUP              | Power/Utility Protocol                                  |
| RASS             | Residential Appliance Saturation Survey                 |
| SCAQMD           | South Coast Air Quality Management District             |
| SCE              | Southern California Edison                              |
| SDGE             | San Diego Gas and Electric                              |
| SLA              | special landscape area                                  |
| SMAQMD           | Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District |
| SMUD             | Sacramento Municipal Utility District                   |
| scf              | standard cubic feet                                     |
| SHP              | separate heat and power                                 |
| SO <sub>2</sub>  | sulfur dioxide  |
| sqft             | square feet   |
| TDM              | transportation demand management                        |
| TDV              | time dependent valuation                                |
| TOD              | transit-oriented development                            |
| tonnes           | metric tonnes; 1,000 kilograms                          |
| TRU              | truck refrigeration unit                                |
| URBEMIS          | Urban Emissions Model                                   |
| US               | United States   |
| USDOE            | United States Department of Energy                      |
| USEPA            | United States Environmental Protection Agency           |
| VCAPCD           | Ventura County Air Pollution Control District           |
| VTPI             | Victoria Transport Policy Institute                     |
| VMT              | vehicle miles traveled                                  |
| VTR              | vehicle trip reduction                                  |
| WARM             | Waste Reduction Model                                   |
| WMO              | World Meteorological Organization                       |
| yr               | year  |

## Glossary of Terms

### **Alternative Calculation Method**

Software used to demonstrate compliance with the California Building Energy Efficiency Standards (Title 24). The software must comply with the requirements listed in the Alternative Calculation Method Approval Manual.

### **Additionality<sup>a</sup>**

The reduction in emissions by sources or enhancement of removals by sinks that is additional to any that would occur in the absence of the project. The project should not subsidize or take credit for emissions reductions which would have occurred regardless of the project.

### **Albedo<sup>a</sup>**

The fraction of solar radiation reflected by a surface or object, often expressed as a ratio or fraction. Snow covered surfaces have a high albedo; the albedo of soils ranges from high to low; vegetation covered surfaces and oceans have a low albedo. The Earth's albedo varies mainly through varying cloudiness, snow, ice, leaf area, and land cover changes. Paved surfaces with high albedos reflect solar radiation and can help reduce the urban heat island effect.

### **Below Market Rate Housing**

Housing rented at rates lower than the market rate. Below market rate housing is designed to assist lower-income families. When below market rate housing is provided near job centers or transit, it provides lower income families with desirable job/housing match or greater opportunities for commuting to work through public transit.

### **Biochemical Oxygen Demand**

Represents the amount of oxygen that would be required to completely consume the organic matter contained in wastewater through aerobic decomposition processes. Under the same conditions, wastewater with higher biochemical oxygen demand (BOD) concentrations will generally yield more methane than wastewater with lower BOD concentrations. BOD<sub>5</sub> is a measure of BOD after five days of decomposition.

### **Biogenic Emissions<sup>b</sup>**

Carbon dioxide emissions produced from combusting a variety of biofuels, such as biodiesel, ethanol, wood, wood waste and landfill gas.

### **Carbon Dioxide Equivalent**

A measure for comparing carbon dioxide with other greenhouse gases. Tonnes carbon dioxide equivalent is calculated by multiplying the tonnes of a greenhouse gas by its associated global warming potential.

### **California Environmental Quality Act**

A statute passed in 1970 that requires state and local agencies to identify the significant environmental impacts of their actions and to avoid or mitigate those impacts, if feasible.

### **Carbon Neutral Power**

A power generation system which has net zero carbon emissions. Examples of existing carbon neutral power systems are photovoltaics, wind turbines, and hydropower systems.

### **Carbon Sink**

Any process or mechanism that removes carbon dioxide from the atmosphere. A forest is an example of a carbon sink, because it sequesters carbon dioxide from the atmosphere.

### **“Carrot”**

The purpose of a carrot is to provide an incentive which encourages a particular action. Parking cash-out would be considered a “carrot” since the employee receives a monetary incentive for not driving to work, but is not punished for maintaining status quo.

### **Combined Heat and Power**

Also known as cogeneration. Combined heat and power is the generation of both heat and electricity from the same process, such as combustion of fuel, with the purpose of utilizing or selling both simultaneously. In combined heat and power systems, the thermal energy byproducts of a process are captured and used, where they would be wasted in a separate heat and power system. Examples of combined heat and power systems include gas turbines, reciprocating engines, and fuel cells.

### **Compact Infill**

A Project which is located within or contiguous with the central city. Examples may include redevelopment areas, abandoned sites, or underutilized older buildings/sites.

### **Climate Zone**

Geographic area of similar climatic characteristics, including temperature, weather, and other factors which affect building energy use. The California Energy Commission identified 16 Forecasting Climate Zones (FCZs) for use in the CEUS and RASS analyses. The designation of these FCZs was based in part on the utility service area.

### **Cordon Pricing**

Tolls charged for entering a particular area (a “cordon”), such as a downtown.

### **Density**

The amount of persons, jobs, or dwellings per unit of land area. This is an important metric for determining traffic-related parameters.

### **Destination Accessibility**

A measure of the number of jobs or other attractions reachable within a given travel time. Destination accessibility tends to be highest at central locations and lowest at peripheral ones.

### **Efficacy**

The capacity to produce a desired effect.

### **ENERGY STAR**

A joint program of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and the U.S. Department of Energy which sets national standards for energy efficient consumer products. ENERGY STAR certified products are guaranteed to meet the efficiency standards specified by the program.

### **Elasticity**

The percentage change of one variable in response to a percentage change in another variable. Elasticity = percent change in variable A / percent change in variable B (where the

## Appendix A

change in B leads to the change in A). For example, if the elasticity of VMT with respect to density is -0.12, this means a 100% increase in density leads to a 12% decrease in VMT.

### **Evapotranspiration<sup>c</sup>**

The loss of water from the soil both by evaporation and by transpiration from the plants growing in the soil.

### **General Plan**

A set of long-term goals and policies that guide local land use decisions. The 2003 *General Plan Guidelines* developed by the California Office of Planning and Research provides advice on how to write a general plan that expresses a community's long-term vision, fulfills statutory requirements, and contributes to creating a great community.

### **Global Warming Potential<sup>b</sup>**

The ratio of radiative forcing that would result from the emission of one kilogram of a greenhouse gas to that from the emission of one kilogram of carbon dioxide over a fixed period of time.

### **Graywater**

Non-drinkable water that can be collected and reused onsite for irrigation, flushing toilets, and other purposes. This water has not been processed through a waste water treatment plant.

### **Greenhouse Gas**

For the purposes of this report, greenhouse gases are the six gases identified in the Kyoto Protocol: carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>), nitrous oxide (N<sub>2</sub>O), methane (CH<sub>4</sub>), hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs), perfluorocarbons (PFCs), and sulfur hexafluoride (SF<sub>6</sub>).

### **Headway**

The amount of time (in minutes) that elapses between two public transit vehicles servicing a given route and given line. Headways for buses and rail are generally shorter during peak periods and longer during off-peak periods. Headway is the inverse of frequency (headway = 1/frequency), where frequency is the number of arrivals over a given time period (i.e. buses per hour).

### **Intelligent Transportation System**

A broad range of communications-based information and electronics technologies integrated into transportation system infrastructure and vehicles to relieve congestion and improve travel safety.

### **Job Center**

An area with a high degree and density of employment.

### **Kilowatt Hour**

A unit of energy. In the U.S., the kilowatt hour is the unit of measure used by utilities to bill consumers for energy use.

### **Land Use Index**

Measures the degree of land use mix of a development. An index of 0 indicates a single land use while 1 indicates a full mix of uses.

### **Lumen**

A unit of luminous flux. A measure of the brilliance of a source of visible light, or the power of light perceived by the human eye.

### **Master Planned Community**

Large communities developed specifically incorporating housing, office parks, recreational area, and commercial centers within the community. Master planned communities tend to encompass a large land area with the intent of being self-sustaining. Many master planned communities may have lakes, golf courses, and large parks.

### **Mixed Use**

A development that incorporates more than one type of land use. For example, a small mixed use development may have buildings with ground-floor retail and housing on the floors above. A larger mixed use development will locate a variety of land uses within a short proximity of each other. This may include integrating office space, shopping, parks, and schools with residential development. The mixed-use development should encourage walking and other non-auto modes of transport from residential to office/commercial/institutional locations (and vice versa).

### **Ordinance**

A local law usually found in municipal code.

### **Parking Spillover**

A term used to describe the effects of implementing a parking management strategy in a sub-area that has unintended consequences of impacting the surrounding areas. For example, assume parking meters are installed on all streets in a commercial/retail block with no other parking strategies implemented. Customers will no longer park in the metered spots and will instead “spillover” to the surrounding residential neighborhoods where parking is still unrestricted.

### **Photovoltaic<sup>c</sup>**

A system that converts sunlight directly into electricity using cells made of silicon or other conductive materials (solar cells). When sunlight hits the cells, a chemical reaction occurs, resulting in the release of electricity.

### **Recycled Water**

Non-drinkable water that can be reused for irrigation, flushing toilets, and other purposes. It has been processed through a wastewater treatment plant and often needs to be redistributed.

### **Ride Sharing**

Any form of carpooling or vanpooling where additional passengers are carried on the trip. Ride-sharing can be casual and formed independently or be part of an employer program where assistance is provided to employees to match up commuters who live in close proximity of one another.

## Appendix A

### **Renewable Energy<sup>a</sup>**

Energy sources that are, within a short time frame relative to the Earth's natural cycles, sustainable, and include non-carbon technologies such as solar energy, hydropower, and wind, as well as carbon-neutral technologies such as biomass.

### **Self Selection**

When an individual selects himself into a group.

### **Separate Heat and Power**

The typical system for acquiring heat and power. Thermal energy and electricity are generated and used separately. For example, heat is generated from a boiler while electricity is acquired from the local utility. Separate heat and power systems are used as the baseline of comparison for combined heat and power systems.

### **Sequestration<sup>a</sup>**

The process of increasing the carbon content of a carbon reservoir other than the atmosphere. Biological approaches to sequestration include direct removal of carbon dioxide from the atmosphere through afforestation, reforestation, and practices that enhance soil carbon in agriculture. Physical approaches include separation and disposal of carbon dioxide from flue gases or from processing fossil fuels to produce hydrogen- and carbon dioxide-rich fractions and longterm storage in underground in depleted oil and gas reservoirs, coal seams, and saline aquifers.

### **“Stick”**

The purpose of a stick is to establish a penalty for a status quo action. Workplace parking pricing would be considered a “stick” since the employee is now monetarily penalized for driving to work.

### **Suburban**

An area characterized by dispersed, low-density, single-use, automobile dependent land use patterns, usually outside of the central city (a suburb).

### **Suburban Center**

The suburban center serves the population of the suburb with office, retail and housing which is denser than the surrounding suburb.

### **Title 24**

Title 24 Part 6 is also known as the California Building Energy Efficiency Standard, which regulates building energy efficiency standards. Regulated energy uses include space heating and cooling, ventilation, domestic hot water heating, and some hard-wired lighting. Title 24 determines compliance by comparing the modeled energy use of a ‘proposed home’ to that of a minimally Title 24 compliant ‘standard home’ of equal dimensions. Title 24 focuses on building energy efficiency per square foot; it places no limits upon the size of the house or the actual energy used per dwelling unit. The current Title 24 standards were published in 2008.

### **Transit-Oriented Development**

A development located near and specifically designed around a rail or bus station. Proximity alone does not characterize a development as transit-oriented. The development and surrounding neighborhood should be designed for walking and bicycling and parking management strategies should be implemented. The development should be located within a short walking distance to a high-quality, high frequency, and reliable bus or rail service.

### **Transportation Demand Management**

Any transportation strategy which has an intent to increase the transportation system efficiency and reduce demand on the system by discouraging single-occupancy vehicle travel and encouraging more efficient travel patterns, alternative modes of transportation such as walking, bicycling, public transit, and ridesharing. TDM measures should also shift travel patterns from peak to off-peak hours and shift travel from further to closer destinations.

### **Transit Ridership**

The number of passengers who ride in a public transportation system, such as buses and subways.

### **Tree and Grid Network**

Describes the layout of streets within and surrounding a project. Streets that are characterized as a tree network actually look like a tree and its branches. Streets are not laid out in any uniform pattern, intersection density is low, and the streets are less connected. In a grid network, streets are laid out in a perpendicular and parallel grid pattern. Streets tend to intersect more frequently, intersection density is higher, and the streets are more connected.

### **Urban**

An area which is located within the central city with higher density of land uses than you would find in the suburbs. It may be characterized by multi-family housing and located near office and retail.

### **Urban Heat Island Effect**

The phenomenon in which a metropolitan area is warmer than its surrounding rural areas due to increased land surface which retains heat, such as concrete, asphalt, metal, and other materials found in buildings and pavements.

### **Vehicle Miles Traveled**

The number of miles driven by vehicles. This is an important traffic parameter and the basis for most traffic-related greenhouse gas emissions calculations.

### **Vehicle Occupancy**

The number of persons in a vehicle during a trip, including the driver and passengers.

### Notes:

<sup>a</sup> Definition adapted from: IPCC. 2001. Third Assessment Report: Climate Change 2001 (TAR). Annex B: Glossary of Terms. Available online at: <http://www.ipcc.ch/pdf/glossary/tar-ipcc-terms-en.pdf>

<sup>b</sup> Definition adapted from: CCAR. 2009. General Reporting Protocol, Version 3.1. Available online at: [http://www.climateregistry.org/resources/docs/protocols/grp/GRP\\_3.1\\_January2009.pdf](http://www.climateregistry.org/resources/docs/protocols/grp/GRP_3.1_January2009.pdf)

<sup>c</sup> Definition adapted from: USEPA. 2010. Greening EPA Glossary. Available online at: <http://www.epa.gov/oaintrnt/glossary.htm>

## Appendix B

### Greenhouse Gas Mitigation Measures Task 0: Standard Approach to Calculate Unmitigated Emissions



# Greenhouse Gas Mitigation Measures Task 0: Standard Approach to Calculate Unmitigated Emissions

Prepared for:  
**California Pollution Control Officers  
Association (CAPCOA)**

Prepared by:  
**ENVIRON International Corporation  
San Francisco, California**

**And**

**Fehr & Peers  
San Francisco & Walnut Creek,  
California**

Date:  
**August 2010**

# Contents

|         | <b>Page</b>   |      |
|---------|---|------|
| 1       | Introduction  | B-1  |
| 2       | GHG Equivalent Emissions  | B-1  |
| 3       | Units of measurement: MT of CO <sub>2</sub> and CO <sub>2</sub> e                 | B-2  |
| 4       | Indirect GHG Emissions from Electricity Use                                       | B-2  |
| 5       | Short-Term Emissions  | B-3  |
| 5.1     | Construction Activities   | B-3  |
| 5.1.1   | Estimating GHG Emissions from Off-Road Construction Equipment                     | B-3  |
| 5.1.2   | Estimating GHG emissions from Electric Off-Road Construction Equipment            | B-4  |
| 5.1.3   | GHG Emissions from On-Road Vehicles Associated with Construction                  | B-4  |
| 5.2     | Vegetation Change   | B-6  |
| 5.2.1   | Quantifying the One-Time Release by Changes in Carbon Sequestration Capacity      | B-6  |
| 5.2.2   | Calculating CO <sub>2</sub> Sequestration by Trees                                | B-8  |
| 5.3     | Built Environment   | B-8  |
| 5.3.1   | Natural Gas Boilers   | B-10 |
| 5.4     | Area Sources  | B-11 |
| 5.4.1   | Natural Gas Fireplaces/Stoves   | B-11 |
| 5.4.2   | Landscape Maintenance   | B-11 |
| 5.5     | Water   | B-11 |
| 5.5.1   | Indoor  | B-12 |
| 5.5.2   | Outdoor   | B-12 |
| 5.5.2.1 | Landscape Watering – Turf Grass   | B-13 |
| 5.5.2.2 | Landscape Watering – General  | B-14 |
| 5.5.3   | Recycled Water  | B-15 |
| 5.5.4   | Process   | B-15 |
| 5.6     | Wastewater  | B-15 |
| 5.6.1   | Direct Emissions  | B-15 |
| 5.6.2   | Indirect Emissions  | B-16 |
| 5.7     | Public Lighting   | B-16 |
| 5.8     | Municipal Vehicles  | B-16 |
| 5.9     | On-Road Mobile Sources  | B-17 |
| 5.9.1   | Estimating GHG Emissions from Mobile Sources                                      | B-19 |
| 5.10    | GHG Emissions from Specialized Land Uses  | B-20 |
| 5.10.1  | Golf Courses  | B-20 |
| 5.10.2  | Calculating CO <sub>2</sub> Emissions from Irrigation of the Golf Course          | B-20 |
| 5.10.3  | Calculating CO <sub>2</sub> Emissions from Maintenance of the Golf Course         | B-21 |
| 5.10.4  | Calculating CO <sub>2</sub> Emissions from Building Energy Use at the Golf Course | B-22 |
| 5.11    | Pools   | B-22 |
| 5.11.1  | Recreation Center Characterization  | B-23 |
| 5.11.2  | Electricity Use of Pools  | B-23 |
| 5.11.3  | Natural Gas Use of Pools  | B-23 |
| 5.11.4  | Conversion of Electricity and Natural Gas Use to Greenhouse Gas Emissions         | B-24 |

# 1 Introduction

ENVIRON International Corporation (ENVIRON) and Fehr & Peers worked with the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA) to quantify reductions associated with greenhouse gas (GHG) mitigation measures that can be applied to California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Environmental Impact Report (EIR) analyses. The first part of this overall task defines a standard approach to calculate the baseline emissions before mitigation. This report contains the recommendations for methodologies and approaches to assess the baseline GHG emissions.

This report and its methodologies form the basis for the subsequent tasks associated with quantification of GHG mitigation measures. To the extent possible, default values are included with this report and in the mitigation measure Fact Sheets.

This report presents methods to be used to calculate short-term and one-time emissions sources as well as emissions that will occur annually after construction (operational emissions). The one-time emission sources include changes in carbon sequestration due to vegetation changes and emissions associated with construction. The annual operational emissions include the emissions associated with building energy use including natural gas and electricity, emissions associated with mobile sources, emissions associated with water use and wastewater treatment, emissions associated with area sources such as natural gas fired hearths, landscape maintenance equipment, swimming pools, and golf courses.

## 2 GHG Equivalent Emissions

The term “GHGs” includes gases that contribute to the greenhouse effect, such as carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>), methane (CH<sub>4</sub>), and nitrous oxide (N<sub>2</sub>O), as well as gases that are only man-made and that are emitted through the use of modern industrial products, such as hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs), chlorinated fluorocarbons (CFCs), and sulfurhexafluoride (SF<sub>6</sub>). These last three families of gases, while not naturally present in the atmosphere, have properties that also cause them to trap infrared radiation when they are present in the atmosphere, thus making them GHGs. These six gases comprise the major GHGs that are recognized by the Kyoto Accords (water is not included).<sup>1</sup> There are other GHGs that are not recognized by the Kyoto Accords, due either to the smaller role that they play in climate change or the uncertainties surrounding their effects. Atmospheric water vapor is not recognized by the Kyoto Accords because there is not an obvious correlation between water concentrations and specific human activities. Water appears to act in a positive feedback manner; higher temperatures lead to higher water vapor concentrations in the atmosphere, which in turn can cause more global warming.<sup>2</sup> California has recently recognized nitrogen trifluoride as another regulated greenhouse gas.

---

<sup>1</sup> This Kyoto Protocol sets legally binding targets and timetables for cutting the greenhouse gas emissions of industrialized countries. The US has not approved the Kyoto treaty.

<sup>2</sup> From the IPCC Third Assessment Report: [http://www.grida.no/climate/ipcc\\_tar/wg1/143.htm](http://www.grida.no/climate/ipcc_tar/wg1/143.htm) and [http://www.grida.no/climate/ipcc\\_tar/wg1/268.htm](http://www.grida.no/climate/ipcc_tar/wg1/268.htm)

Residents and the employees and patrons of commercial and municipal buildings and services use electricity, heating, water, and are transported by motor vehicles. These activities directly or indirectly emit GHGs. The most significant GHG emissions resulting from such residential and commercial developments are emissions of carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>), methane (CH<sub>4</sub>) and nitrous oxide (N<sub>2</sub>O). GHG emissions are typically measured in terms of MT of CO<sub>2</sub> equivalents (CO<sub>2</sub>e), calculated as the product of the mass emitted of a given GHG and its specific global warming potential (GWP).

The effect that each of these gases can have on global warming is a combination of the mass of their emissions and their global warming potential (GWP). GWP indicates, on a MT for MT basis, how much a gas is predicted to contribute to global warming relative to how much warming would be predicted to be caused by the same mass of CO<sub>2</sub>. CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O are substantially more potent GHGs than CO<sub>2</sub>, with GWPs of 21 and 310, respectively according to the IPCC's Second Assessment Report (SAR).<sup>3</sup> In emissions inventories, GHG emissions are typically reported in terms of pounds (lbs) or MT<sup>4</sup> of CO<sub>2</sub> equivalents (CO<sub>2</sub>e). CO<sub>2</sub>e are calculated as the product of the mass emitted of a given GHG and its specific GWP. While CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O have much higher GWPs than CO<sub>2</sub>, CO<sub>2</sub> is emitted in such vastly higher quantities that it accounts for the majority of GHG emissions in CO<sub>2</sub>e, both from developments and human activity in general. Since most regulatory agencies and protocols use the SAR GWP values as a basis, this assessment will also use SAR GWP values even though more recent values exist. However, SAR did not consider nitrogen trifluoride, however there are no sources of nitrogen trifluoride that would typically need to be quantified.

### **3 Units of measurement: MT of CO<sub>2</sub> and CO<sub>2</sub>e**

In many sections of this report, including the final summary sections, emissions are presented in units of CO<sub>2</sub>e either because the GWPs of CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O were accounted for explicitly, or the CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O are assumed to contribute a negligible amount of GWP when compared to the CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from that particular emissions category.

Emissions and reductions are calculated in terms of metric tons. As such, "MT" will be used to refer to metric tons (1,000 kilograms). "Tons" will be used to refer to short tons (2,000 pounds [lbs]).

### **4 Indirect GHG Emissions from Electricity Use**

As noted above, indirect GHG emissions are created as a result of electricity use. When electricity is used in a building, the electricity generation typically takes place offsite at the power plant; electricity use in a building generally causes emissions in an indirect manner. The project should use information specific for each local utility provider for different parts of

---

<sup>3</sup> GWP values from IPCC's Second Assessment Report (SAR, 1996) are still used by international convention and are used in this protocol, even though more recent (and slightly different) GWP values were developed in the IPCC's Fourth Assessment Report (FAR, 2007)

<sup>4</sup> In this report, "MT" will be used to refer to metric MT (1,000 kilograms). "Tons" will be used to refer to short tons (2,000 pounds).

California. Accordingly, indirect GHG emissions from electricity usage are calculated using the utility specific carbon-intensity factor based Power/Utility Protocol (PUP) report from California Climate Action Registry (CCAR)<sup>5</sup> for the 2006 baseline year. ENVIRON does not recommend using the 2004 PUP reports since this year was one of the first year's utilities reported emissions, as such, the data is likely less accurate than subsequent years since utilities had a chance to refine data collection methods for the later years. Furthermore, a large coal burning power plant in Mojave was going offline in 2005 which was factored into the Scoping Plan analysis. Therefore, ENVIRON suggests using the 2006 PUP reports since it likely represents a more accurate dataset year. This emission factor takes into account the baseline year's mix of energy sources used to generate electricity for a specific utility and the relative carbon intensities of these sources. The emission factor will be determined as a CO<sub>2</sub>e incorporating the CO<sub>2</sub>, CH<sub>4</sub>, and N<sub>2</sub>O emissions.

| Power Utility | Carbon-Intensity<br>(lbs CO <sub>2</sub> e/MWh) |
|---------------|---|
| LADW&P        | 1,238   |
| PG&E          | 456   |
| SCE           | 641   |
| SDGE          | 781   |
| SMUD          | 555   |

## 5 Short-Term Emissions

Short-term or one-time emissions from the development of a Project are associated with vegetation removal and re-vegetation on the Project site and construction-related activities.

### 5.1 Construction Activities

Construction activities occur during the early stage of a project. Construction activities include any demolition, site grading, building construction, and paving. These construction activities have several main sources of GHG emissions. Off-road construction equipment such as dozers, pavers, and backhoes are used on-site during construction. These pieces of equipment typically are diesel fueled although other fuels are occasionally used. Besides the off-road construction, there are on-road vehicles. These vehicles are used for worker commuting, delivering of material to the site, and hauling material away from the site. The methodology to calculate these sources of emissions is described in the next sections.

#### 5.1.1 Estimating GHG Emissions from Off-Road Construction Equipment

This section describes how emissions from off-road equipment used during demolition, site grading, building construction and paving are calculated. This section can be used for any fuel

<sup>5</sup> California Climate Action Registry (CCAR) Database. PUP Report.

burning equipment such as diesel, gasoline, or compressed natural gas (CNG). For electric equipment please see the method in the next section.

First, the number and type of equipment that will be used in the construction, as well as the duration of the entire construction project, is needed. Absent other data, ENVIRON recommends that each piece of equipment will operate for 8 hours a day, five days a week throughout the construction duration. An equipment hour is defined as one hour of a piece of equipment being used. Specifications for each type of construction equipment (horsepower, load factor, and GHG emission factor) are provided by OFFROAD2007<sup>6</sup>. CO<sub>2</sub> and CH<sub>4</sub> emissions for each type of construction equipment are calculated as follows:

$$\text{Equipment Emissions [grams]} = \frac{\text{Total equipment hours}}{\text{hours}} \times \frac{\text{emission factor [grams per brake horsepower-hour]}}{\text{horsepower}} \times \text{load factor}^7$$

The grams of CO<sub>2</sub> and CH<sub>4</sub> are multiplied by their respective GWP and then the two emissions are summed to derive the final CO<sub>2</sub>e emissions from the piece of off-road equipment. Since OFFROAD2007 does not provide an emission factor for N<sub>2</sub>O which is a minor subset of nitrogen oxides (NO<sub>x</sub>) emissions and the contribution to the overall GHG emissions is likely small, it is therefore not included in calculations that used OFFROAD2007. These were accounted for with alternative fuels since they have a larger proportion of N<sub>2</sub>O and CH<sub>4</sub>.

### 5.1.2 Estimating GHG emissions from Electric Off-Road Construction Equipment

In order to estimate the indirect GHG emissions associated with electricity consumption of electrical powered equipment, the following inputs are required. First, the total operating hours of the electrical piece of equipment is needed. Secondly, the amount of kilowatts the equipment uses per time is needed. These two pieces are used along with the carbon intensity factor for the local utility provider as follows:

$$\text{Equipment Emissions} = \frac{\text{Total equipment hours}}{\text{equipment hours}} \times \frac{\text{average power draw (kW/hr)}}{\text{draw (kW/hr)}} \times \text{Utility EF (g CO}_2\text{e per kWhr)}$$

### 5.1.3 GHG Emissions from On-Road Vehicles Associated with Construction

Emissions from on-road vehicles associated with construction include workers commuting to the site, vendors delivering materials, and hauling away of materials. GHGs are emitted from these vehicles in two ways: running emissions, produced by driving the vehicle, and startup emissions, produced by turning the vehicle on. Idling emissions will not be considered since

<sup>6</sup> OFFROAD2007 is a model developed by the Air Resources Board which contains emission factors for off-road equipment. It is available at : <http://www.arb.ca.gov/msei/offroad/offroad.htm>

<sup>7</sup> Load factor is the percentage of the maximum horsepower rating at which the equipment normally operates.

regulations exist which limit idling<sup>8</sup> and they would represent a small contribution to the GHG emissions. The majority of these on-road vehicle emissions are running emissions.

Running emissions are calculated using the same method for all trip types. The total Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) for the trip type category is estimated, and then multiplied by the representative GHG emission factors for the vehicles expected to be driven. The total VMT for a given trip type is calculated as follows:

$$VMT = \text{Number of round trips} \times \text{average round trip length (miles)}$$

The number of trips should be based on project specific information. Default values associated with each land use type can be obtained construction cost estimators or default values in emission estimator programs. Average round trip length should be based on project specific information or county specific default values. After total VMT is calculated, GHG emissions for on-road vehicles associated with construction can be calculated from the following equation:

$$CO_2 \text{ emissions} = VMT \times EF_{\text{running}}$$

Where:

VMT = vehicle miles traveled

$EF_{\text{running}}$  = running emission factor for vehicle fleet for trip type

The CO<sub>2</sub> calculation involves the following assumptions:

- a. Vehicle Fleet Defaults:
  - a. Workers commute half with light duty trucks (LDTs) and half commute in light duty autos (LDAs). Half of the LDTs are type 1 and the other half type 2.
  - b. Vendors are all heavy-heavy duty vehicles.
  - c. Hauling is all heavy-heavy duty vehicles.
- b. The emission factor depends upon the speed of the vehicle. A default value of 35 miles per hour will be used.
- c. EMFAC emission factors from the construction year will be used for  $EF_{\text{running}}$ .

---

<sup>8</sup> The Air Resources Board adopted in 2004 and modified in 2005 an Air Toxic Control Measure that limits idling in diesel vehicles to 5-minutes. <http://www.arb.ca.gov/msprog/truck-idling/truck-idling.htm>

The emissions associated with CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O are calculated in a similar manner or assumed to represent 5% of the total CO<sub>2</sub>e emissions. They are then converted to CO<sub>2</sub>e by multiplying by their respective global warming potential.

Startup emissions are CO<sub>2</sub> emitted from starting a vehicle. For the various trips during all phases, the startup emissions are calculated using the following assumptions:

- a. The same vehicle fleet assumptions as used in running emissions.
- b. Two engine startups per day with a 12 hour wait before each startup.<sup>9</sup>

The USEPA recommends assuming that CH<sub>4</sub>, N<sub>2</sub>O, and HFCs account for 5% of GHG emissions from on-road vehicles, taking into account their GWPs.<sup>10</sup> To incorporate these additional GHGs into the calculations, the total GHG footprint is calculated by dividing the CO<sub>2</sub> emissions by 0.95.

## 5.2 Vegetation Change

ENVIRON suggests following the IPCC protocol for vegetation since it has default values that work well with the information typically available for development projects. This method is similar to the CCAR Forest Protocol<sup>11</sup> and the Center for Urban Forest Research Tree Carbon Calculator<sup>12</sup>, but it has more general default values available that will generally applicable to all areas of California without requiring detailed site-specific information<sup>13</sup>.

### 5.2.1 Quantifying the One-Time Release by Changes in Carbon Sequestration Capacity

The one-time release of GHGs due to permanent changes in carbon sequestration capacity is calculated using the following four steps:<sup>14</sup>

1. *Identify and quantify the change in area of various land types due to the development (i.e. alluvial scrub, non-native grassland, agricultural, etc.).* These area changes include not only the area of land that will be converted to buildings, but also areas disrupted by the construction of utility corridors, water tank sites, and associated borrow and grading areas.

---

<sup>9</sup> The emission factor grows with the length of time the engine is off before each ignition.

<sup>10</sup> USEPA. 2005. *Emission Facts: Greenhouse Gas Emissions from a Typical Passenger Vehicle*. Office of Transportation and Air Quality. February.

<sup>11</sup> CCAR. 2007. Forest Sector Protocol Version 2.1. September. Available at: [http://www.climateregistry.org/resources/docs/protocols/industry/forest/forest\\_sector\\_protocol\\_version\\_2.1\\_sept2007.pdf](http://www.climateregistry.org/resources/docs/protocols/industry/forest/forest_sector_protocol_version_2.1_sept2007.pdf)

<sup>12</sup> Available at: <http://www.fs.fed.us/ccrc/topics/urban-forests/ctcc/>

<sup>13</sup> The CCAR Forest Protocol and Urban Forest Research Tree Carbon Calculator are not used since their main focus is annual emissions for carbon offset considerations. As such they are designed to work with very specific details of the vegetation that is not available at a CEQA level of analysis.

<sup>14</sup> This section follows the IPCC guidelines, but has been adapted for ease of use for these types of Projects.

Areas temporarily disturbed that will eventually recover to become vegetated will not be counted as vegetation removed as there is no net change in vegetation or land use.<sup>15</sup>

2. *Estimate the biomass associated with each land type.* For the purposes of this report, ENVIRON suggests using the available general vegetation types found in the IPCC publication Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories (IPCC Guidelines).<sup>16</sup>

California vegetation is heavily dominated by scrub and chaparral vegetation which may not be accurately characterized by default forest land properties. Consequently, ecological zones and biomass based subdivisions identified in the IPCC Guidelines were used to sub-categorize the vegetation as scrub dominated. These subcategories should be used to determine the CO<sub>2</sub> emissions resulting from land use impacts.

3. *Calculate CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from the net change of vegetation.* When vegetation is removed, it may undergo biodegradation,<sup>17</sup> or it may be combusted. Either pathway results in the carbon (C) present in the plants being combined with oxygen (O<sub>2</sub>) to form CO<sub>2</sub>. To estimate the mass of carbon present in the biomass, biomass weight is multiplied by the mass carbon fraction, 0.5.<sup>18</sup> The mass of carbon is multiplied by 3.67<sup>19</sup> to calculate the final mass of CO<sub>2</sub>, assuming all of this carbon is converted into CO<sub>2</sub>.
4. Calculate the overall change in sequestered CO<sub>2</sub>. – For all types of land that change from one type of land to another,<sup>20</sup> initial and final values of sequestered CO<sub>2</sub> are calculated using the equation below.

Overall Change in Sequestered CO<sub>2</sub> [MT CO<sub>2</sub>]

$$= \sum_i (SeqCO_2)_i \times (area)_i - \sum_j (SeqCO_2)_j \times (area)_j$$

Where:

|                    |   |  |
|--------------------|---|--|
| SeqCO <sub>2</sub> | = | mass of sequestered CO <sub>2</sub> per unit area [MT CO <sub>2</sub> /acre] |
| area               | = | area of land for specific land use type [acre]                               |
| i                  | = | index for final land use type  |
| j                  | = | index for initial land use type  |

<sup>15</sup> This assumption facilitates the calculation as a yearly growth rate and CO<sub>2</sub> removal rate does not have to be calculated. As long as the disturbed land will indeed return to its original state, this assumption is valid for time periods over 20 years.

<sup>16</sup> Available online at <http://www.ipcc-nggip.iges.or.jp/public/2006gl/vol4.htm>

<sup>17</sup> Cleared vegetation may also be deposited in a landfill or compost area, where some anaerobic degradation which will generate CH<sub>4</sub> may take place. However, for the purposes of this section, we are assuming that only aerobic biodegradation will take place which will result in CO<sub>2</sub> emissions only.

<sup>18</sup> The fraction of the biomass weight that is carbon. Here, a carbon fraction of 0.5 is used for all vegetation types from CCAR Forest Sector Protocol.

<sup>19</sup> The ratio of the molecular mass of CO<sub>2</sub> to the molecular mass of carbon is 44/12 or 3.67.

<sup>20</sup> For example from forestland to grassland, or from cropland to permanently developed.

## 5.2.2 Calculating CO<sub>2</sub> Sequestration by Trees

Planting individual trees will sequester CO<sub>2</sub>. Changing vegetation as described above results in a one-time carbon-stock change. Planting trees is also considered to result in a one-time carbon-stock change. Default annual CO<sub>2</sub> sequestration rates on a per tree basis, based on values provided by the IPCC are used<sup>21</sup>. An average of 0.035 MT CO<sub>2</sub> per year per tree can be used for trees planted, if the tree type is not known.

Urban trees are only net carbon sinks when they are actively growing. The IPCC assumes an active growing period of 20 years. Thereafter, the accumulation of carbon in biomass slows with age, and will be completely offset by losses from clipping, pruning, and occasional death. Actual active growing periods are subject to, among other things, species, climate regime, and planting density. In this report, the IPCC default value of 20 years is recommended. For large tree sequestration projects, the Project may consider using the Forest or Urban tree planting protocols developed by Climate Action Registry (CAR). These protocols have slightly different assumptions regarding steady state, tree growth, and replacement of trees..

## 5.3 Built Environment

The amount of energy used, and the associated GHG emissions emitted per square foot of available space vary with the type of building. For example, food stores are far more energy intensive than warehouses, which have little climate-conditioned space. Therefore, this analysis is specific to the type of building.

GHGs are emitted as a result of activities in buildings for which electricity and natural gas are used as energy sources. Combustion of any type of fuel emits CO<sub>2</sub> and other GHGs directly into the atmosphere; when this occurs within a building (such as by natural gas consumption) this is a direct emission source<sup>22</sup> associated with that building. GHGs are also emitted during the generation of electricity from fossil fuels. When electricity is used in a building, the electricity generation typically takes place offsite at the power plant; electricity use in a building generally causes emissions in an indirect manner.

Energy use in buildings is divided into energy consumed by the built environment and energy consumed by uses that are independent of the construction of the building such as plug-in appliances. In California, Title 24 part 6 governs energy consumed by the built environment, mechanical systems, and some fixed lighting. This includes the space heating, space cooling, water heating, and ventilation systems. Non-building energy use, or “plug-in” energy use can be further subdivided by specific end-use (refrigeration, cooking, office equipment, etc.). The following two steps are performed to quantify the energy use due to buildings:

---

<sup>21</sup> The Center for Urban Forest Research Tree Carbon Calculator is not suggested since it requires knowledge on specific tree species to estimate carbon sequestered. This information is typically not available during the preparation of CEQA documents.

<sup>22</sup> California Climate Action Registry (CCAR) General Reporting Protocol (GRP), Version 3.1 (January). Available at: [http://www.climateregistry.org/resources/docs/protocols/grp/GRP\\_3.1\\_January2009.pdf](http://www.climateregistry.org/resources/docs/protocols/grp/GRP_3.1_January2009.pdf), Chapter 8

1. Calculate energy use from systems covered by Title 24<sup>23</sup> (HVAC system, water heating system, and the lighting system).
2. Calculate energy use from office equipment, plug-in lighting, and other sources not covered by Title 24.

The resulting energy use quantities are then converted to GHG emissions by multiplying by the appropriate emission factors obtained by incorporating information on local electricity providers for electricity, and by natural gas emission factors for natural gas combustion.

ENVIRON recommends using default values for Title 24 and non-Title 24 energy use for various building types. These will take into account the building size and climate zone. There are several sources of information that can be used to obtain building energy intensity. Each is described briefly below.

The *California Commercial Energy Use Survey (CEUS)* data is provided by the California Energy Commission (CEC). It is based on a survey conducted in 2002 for existing commercial buildings in various climate zones. Electricity and natural gas use per square foot for each end use in each building type and climate zone is extracted from the CEUS data. Since the data is provided by end use, it is straightforward to calculate the Title 24 and non-Title 24 regulated energy intensity for each building type.

*Commercial Buildings Energy Consumption Survey (CBECS)* is a survey of non-residential buildings that was conducted in 2003 by the Energy Information Administration (EIA). Electricity and natural gas use per square foot can be extracted from this data. The energy use estimates are assumed to represent 2001 Title 24 compliant buildings. Using CBECS, the percent of electricity and natural gas used for each end use can be calculated. It is then straightforward to calculate the Title 24 and non-Title 24 electricity and natural gas intensity for each building type. Similar surveys exist for manufacturing and residential energy use.

The *Residential Appliance Saturation Survey (RASS)* refers to the California Energy Commission Consultant Report entitled “California Statewide Residential Appliance Saturday Study”. Data from RASS is used to calculate the total electricity and natural gas use for residential buildings on a per dwelling unit. The RASS study estimates the unit energy consumption (UEC) values for individual households surveyed and also provides the saturation number for each type of end use. The saturation number indicates the proportion of households that have a demand for each type of end-use category. As the data is provided by end use, it is straightforward to calculate the Title 24 and non-Title 24 electricity and natural gas intensity for each building type.

*Alternative Calculation Method (ACM)* software is available that makes estimates of the energy consumption by a model Title 24 compliant building. These programs provide

---

<sup>23</sup> Title 24, Part 6, of the California Code of Regulations: California's Energy Efficiency Standards for Residential and Nonresidential Buildings. <http://www.energy.ca.gov/title24/>

annual energy use for the heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) system in each building; therefore, estimates from ACM software represent Title 24-regulated energy use. These do not calculate the non-Title 24 energy use for the buildings.

The Department of Energy produced the *Building America Research Benchmark Definition* (BARBD) technical manual, which presents empirical equations for electricity and natural gas usage. As the data is provided by end use, it is straightforward to calculate the Title 24 and non-Title 24 electricity and natural gas intensity for each building type.

Literature surveys may also be used for building and land use types not well represented by the above sources.

ENVIRON suggests using the CEUS and RASS datasets for these calculations since the data is available for several land use categories in different climate zones in California.

The Title 24 standards have been updated twice (in 2005 and 2008) since some of these data were compiled. CEC has published reports estimating the percentage deductions in energy use resulting from these new standards. Based on CEC's discussion on average savings for Title 24 improvements, these CEC savings percentages by end use can be used to account for reductions in electricity use due to updates to Title 24. Since energy use for each different system type (ie, heating, cooling, water heating, and ventilation) as well as appliances is defined, this method will easily allow for application of mitigation measures aimed at reducing the energy use of these devices in a prescriptive manner.

Based on the electricity intensity, CO<sub>2</sub>e intensity values (CO<sub>2</sub>e emissions per square foot or dwelling unit, as applicable, per year) for each building type can be calculated. Electricity intensity data is multiplied by an electricity emission factor to generate CO<sub>2</sub>e intensity values. The total CO<sub>2</sub>e emissions from each building type are calculated by multiplying the CO<sub>2</sub>e intensity values by the appropriate metric (building square footage for non-residential buildings or number of dwelling units for residential buildings). Summing the CO<sub>2</sub>e emissions from all building types gives the total CO<sub>2</sub>e emissions from electricity use in Title 24 and non-Title 24 sources in buildings.

Based on the natural gas intensity, CO<sub>2</sub>e intensity values (CO<sub>2</sub>e emissions per square foot or dwelling unit, as applicable, per year) for each building type can be calculated. Natural gas intensity data is multiplied by a natural gas emission factor to generate CO<sub>2</sub>e intensity values. The total CO<sub>2</sub>e emissions from each building type are calculated by multiplying the CO<sub>2</sub> intensity values by the appropriate metric (building square footage for non-residential buildings or number of dwelling units for residential buildings). Summing the CO<sub>2</sub>e emissions from all building types gives the total CO<sub>2</sub>e emissions from natural gas use in Title 24 and non-Title 24 sources in buildings.

### 5.3.1 Natural Gas Boilers

GHG emissions from the combustion of natural gas are calculated as the product of natural gas consumption, natural gas heat content, and carbon-intensity factor. The Project Applicant has

to determine the natural gas consumption, while the heat content and carbon-intensity factor can be obtained from the CCAR General Reporting Protocol.

## **5.4 Area Sources**

Area sources are local combustion of fuel. The area sources covered in this section include natural gas fireplaces/stoves and landscape maintenance equipment. Natural gas usage from the primary building heating is not included in this category since it is already included with building energy use. Each of these area sources is discussed further.

### **5.4.1 Natural Gas Fireplaces/Stoves**

GHG emissions associated with natural gas fired fireplaces are calculated using emission factors from CCAR. The average BTU per hour for fireplaces in homes needs to be specified. Default values for annual fireplace usage varies for each County. Natural gas is assumed to have 1,020 BTU per standard cubic foot<sup>24</sup>.

### **5.4.2 Landscape Maintenance**

Landscape maintenance includes fuel combustion emissions from equipment such as lawn mowers, roto tillers, shredders/grinders, blowers, trimmers, chain saws, and hedge trimmers, as well as air compressors, generators, and pumps.

Similar to construction off-road equipment, emission factors are based on the OFFROAD2007 model. These are combined with the hours of operation for each equipment piece as well as the horsepower and load factors. The GHG emissions will be calculated based on the emission factors for the equipment and fuel reported from OFFROAD2007 and the appropriate GWP. Default usages (hours of operation) should be determined for the landscape equipment based on the Project needs.

## **5.5 Water**

Delivering and treating water for use at the project site requires energy. This embodied energy associated with the distribution of water to the end user is associated with the electricity to pump and treat the water. GHG emissions due to water use are related to the energy used to convey, treat and distribute water. Thus, these emissions are indirect emissions from the production of electricity to power these systems.

The amount of electricity required to treat and supply water depends on the volume of water involved. Three processes are necessary to supply water to users: (1) supply and conveyance of the water from the source; (2) treatment of the water to potable standards; and (3) distribution of the water to individual users.

---

<sup>24</sup> USEPA. 1998. AP-42 Emission Factors. Chapter 1.4 Natural Gas Combustion.

Therefore, to quantify the GHG emissions associated with the distribution of water to an end user, the carbon intensity of electricity is used along with the amount of electricity used in pumping and treating the water. Since consumption of water varies greatly for each land use type, default values need to be determined with several listed in the mitigation measure fact sheets. Since buildings may have different percentages of water associated with indoor and outdoor water usage, the water usage is quantified separately. In addition since mitigation measures associated with water use may be directed separately toward indoor and outdoor water usage, this will be beneficial for this task.

### 5.5.1 Indoor

Indirect emissions resulting from electricity use are determined by multiplying electricity use by the CO<sub>2</sub>e emission factor provided by the local electricity supplier. Energy use per unit of water for different aspects of water treatment (e.g. source water pumping and conveyance, water treatment, distribution to users) is determined using the stated volumes of water and energy intensities values (i.e., energy use per unit volume of water) provided by reports from the California Energy Commission (CEC) on energy use for California's water systems.<sup>25</sup> The CEC report estimates the electricity required to extract and convey one million gallons of water. Using this energy intensity factor, the expected indoor water demand, and the utility-specific carbon-intensity factor, GHG emissions from indoor water supply and conveyance may be calculated.

The amount of electricity required to treat and distribute one million gallon of potable water is estimated in the CEC report. Based on the estimated indoor water demand, these energy intensity factors, and the utility-specific carbon intensity factor, GHG emissions from indoor water treatment and distribution may be calculated.

The sum of emissions due to supplying, conveying, treating, and distributing indoor water gives the total emissions due to indoor water use.

### 5.5.2 Outdoor

Indirect emissions resulting from electricity use are determined by multiplying electricity use by the CO<sub>2</sub> emission factor provided by the local electricity supplier. Energy use per unit of water for different aspects of water treatment (e.g. source water pumping and conveyance, water treatment, distribution to users) is determined using the stated volumes of water and energy intensities values (i.e., energy use per unit volume of water) provided by reports from the California Energy Commission (CEC) on energy use for California's water systems.<sup>26</sup> The

---

<sup>25</sup> CEC 2005. California's Water-Energy Relationship. Final Staff Report. CEC-700-2005-011-SF, CEC 2006. Refining Estimates of Water-Related Energy Use in California. PIER Final Project Report. Prepared by Navigant Consulting, Inc. CEC-500-2006-118. December.

<sup>26</sup> CEC 2005. California's Water-Energy Relationship. Final Staff Report. CEC-700-2005-011-SF, CEC 2006. Refining Estimates of Water-Related Energy Use in California. PIER Final Project Report. Prepared by Navigant Consulting, Inc. CEC-500-2006-118. December.

energy needed to supply and convey the water will be used to pump this water from the sources and distribute it throughout the development. The CEC report estimates the electricity required to extract and convey one million gallons of water. Using this energy intensity factor, the expected outdoor water demand, and the utility-specific carbon-intensity factor, GHG emissions from outdoor water supply and conveyance may be calculated.

The amount of electricity required to treat and distribute one million gallon of potable water (see recycled water for non-potable water) is estimated in the CEC report. Based on the estimated outdoor water demand, these energy intensity factors, and the utility-specific carbon intensity factor, GHG emissions from outdoor water treatment and distribution may be calculated.

The sum of emissions due to supplying, conveying, treating, and distributing outdoor water gives the total emissions due to outdoor water use.

### 5.5.2.1 Landscape Watering – Turf Grass

The amount of outdoor water used in the landscape watering of turf grass is calculated based on the California Department of Water Resources (CDWR) 2009 Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance<sup>27</sup> and the CDWR 2000 report “A Guide to Estimating Irrigation Water Needs of Landscape Plantings in California: The Landscape Coefficient Method and WUCOLS III.”<sup>28</sup> Using this methodology, the amount of water required to support the baseline turf water demand ( $Water_{baseline}$ ) is calculated as follows:

$$ETC = Kc \times ET_0$$

Where:

- |                 |   |   |
|-----------------|---|---|
| ETC             | = | Crop Evapotranspiration, the total amount of water the baseline turf loses during a specific time period due to evapotranspiration <sup>29</sup> (inches water/day)   |
| KC              | = | Crop Coefficient, factor determined from field research, which compares the amount of water lost by the crop (e.g. turf) to the amount of water lost by a reference crop (unitless).<br>Species-specific; provided in CDWR 2000 |
| ET <sub>0</sub> | = | Reference Evapotranspiration, the amount of water lost by a reference crop (inches water/day)<br>Region-specific; provided in Appendix A of CDWR 2009   |

<sup>27</sup> California Department of Water Resources. 2009. Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance. Available online at: <http://www.water.ca.gov/wateruseefficiency/docs/MWEL09-10-09.pdf>

<sup>28</sup> California Department of Water Resources. 2000. A Guide to Estimating Irrigation Water Needs of Landscape Plantings in California: The Landscape Coefficient Method and WUCOLS III. Available online at: [http://www.water.ca.gov/pubs/conservation/a\\_guide\\_to\\_estimating\\_irrigation\\_water\\_needs\\_of\\_landscape\\_plantings\\_in\\_california\\_wucols/wucols00.pdf](http://www.water.ca.gov/pubs/conservation/a_guide_to_estimating_irrigation_water_needs_of_landscape_plantings_in_california_wucols/wucols00.pdf)

<sup>29</sup> Evapotranspiration is water lost to the atmosphere due to evaporation from soil and transpiration from plant leaves. For a more detailed definition, see this California Irrigation Management Information System (CIMIS) website: <http://www.cimis.water.ca.gov/cimis/infoEtoOverview.jsp;jsessionid=91682943559928B8A9A243D2A2665E19>

Then:

$$\text{Water}_{\text{baseline}} = \text{ETC} \times \text{Areabaseline} \times 0.62 \times 365$$

Where:

|                                  |   |  |
|----------------------------------|---|--|
| $\text{Water}_{\text{baseline}}$ | = | Volume of water required to support the baseline turf (gallons/year) |
| $\text{Area}_{\text{baseline}}$  | = | Area of existing or standard turf (square feet)                      |
| 0.62                             | = | conversion factor (gallons/squarefoot.inches water)                  |
| 365                              | = | conversion factor (days/year)  |

Based on the estimated outdoor water demand for watering turf grass, the outdoor water energy intensity factors described above, and the utility-specific carbon intensity factor, GHG emissions from watering turf grass in lawns may be calculated.

### 5.5.2.2 Landscape Watering – General

The amount of outdoor water used in the landscape watering of landscapes and lawns is calculated based on the California Department of Water Resources (CDWR) 2009 Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance.<sup>30</sup> Using this methodology, the amount of water required to support the baseline lawn water demand ( $\text{Water}_{\text{baseline}}$ ) is defined as the Maximum Applied Water Allowance (MAWA) and is calculated as follows:

$$\text{Water}_{\text{baseline}} = \text{MAWA} = \text{ET}_0 \times 0.62 \times [(0.7 \times \text{LA}) + (0.3 \times \text{SLA})]$$

Where:

|                                  |   |  |
|----------------------------------|---|--|
| $\text{Water}_{\text{baseline}}$ | = | Volume of water required to support the baseline lawn (gallons/year)                             |
| MAWA                             | = | Maximum Applied Water Allowance (gallons/year)   |
| $\text{ET}_0$                    | = | Annual Reference Evapotranspiration <sup>31</sup> from Appendix A of CDWR 2009 (inches per year) |
| 0.7                              | = | ET Adjustment Factor (ETAF)  |
| LA                               | = | Landscape Area <sup>32</sup> includes Special Landscape Area <sup>33</sup> (square feet)         |

<sup>30</sup> California Department of Water Resources. 2009. Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance. Available online at: <http://www.water.ca.gov/wateruseefficiency/docs/MWEL09-10-09.pdf>

<sup>31</sup> Evapotranspiration is water lost to the atmosphere due to evaporation from soil and transpiration from plant leaves. For a more detailed definition, see this California Irrigation Management Information System (CIMIS) website: <http://www.cimis.water.ca.gov/cimis/infoEtoOverview.jsp;jsessionid=91682943559928B8A9A243D2A2665E19>

<sup>32</sup> § 491 Definitions in CDWR 2009: "Landscape Area (LA) means all the planting areas, turf areas, and water features in a landscape design plan subject to the Maximum Applied Water Allowance calculation. The landscape area does not include footprints of buildings or structures, sidewalks, driveways, parking lots, decks, patios, gravel or stone walks, other pervious or non-pervious hardscapes, and other non-irrigated areas designed for non-development (e.g., open spaces and existing native vegetation)."

<sup>33</sup> § 491 Definitions in CDWR 2009: "Special Landscape Area (SLA) means an area of the landscape dedicated

|      |   |  |
|------|---|--|
| 0.62 | = | Conversion factor (to gallons per square foot)                                   |
| SLA  | = | Portion of the landscape area identified as Special Landscape Area (square feet) |
| 0.3  | = | the additional ETAF for Special Landscape Area                                   |

Based on the estimated outdoor water demand for watering lawns, the outdoor water energy intensity factors described above, and the utility-specific carbon intensity factor, GHG emissions from watering lawns may be calculated.

### 5.5.3 Recycled Water

After use, wastewater is treated and reused as reclaimed water. Any reclaimed water produced is generally redistributed to users via pumping. An estimate of the non-potable water demand to be met through the distribution of recycled water is needed. Estimates of the amount of energy needed to redistribute and, if necessary, treat reclaimed water is 400 kW-hr per acre foot.<sup>34</sup> Based on the estimated demand for reclaimed water, the estimated electricity demand and the utility-specific carbon-intensity factor, non-potable reclaimed water redistribution emissions are calculated.

### 5.5.4 Process

Industrial land uses can use a large amount of water for their processes. The water used for this will not be quantified since there is not sufficient water use data for this type of land use for the development of a default value. Water use is highly dependent on the specific industry..

## 5.6 Wastewater

Emissions associated with wastewater treatment include indirect emissions necessary to power the treatment process and direct emissions from degradation of organic material in the wastewater.

### 5.6.1 Direct Emissions

Direct emissions from wastewater treatment include emissions of CH<sub>4</sub> and biogenic CO<sub>2</sub>. The method described by the Local Government Operations Protocol developed by the California Air Resources Board is suggested with default values assigned since detailed plant specific data will typically not be available.<sup>35</sup> The assumed daily 5-day carbonaceous biological oxygen

---

solely to edible plants, areas irrigated with recycled water, water features using recycled water and areas dedicated to active play such as parks, sports fields, golf courses, and where turf provides a playing surface.”

<sup>34</sup> CEC 2005. California’s Water-Energy Relationship. Final Staff Report. CEC-700-2005-011-SF.

<sup>35</sup> California Air Resources Board. 2008. *Local Government Operations Protocol - for the quantification and reporting of greenhouse gas emissions inventories*. Version 1.0. September 2008. Developed in partnership by California Air Resources Board, California Climate Action Registry, ICLEI - Local Governments for Sustainability, The Climate Registry

demand (BOD<sub>5</sub>) of 200 mg/L-wastewater is multiplied by the protocol defaults for maximum CH<sub>4</sub>-producing capacity (0.6 kg-CH<sub>4</sub>/kg-BOD<sub>5</sub>) and other default values to obtain the direct CH<sub>4</sub> emission. The amount of digester gas produced per volume of wastewater, and amount of N<sub>2</sub>O per volume of wastewater needs to be determined. These values are then multiplied by the Global Warming Potential factor<sup>36</sup> of 21 for CH<sub>4</sub> or 310 for the GWP of N<sub>2</sub>O that would be generated otherwise to obtain the annual CO<sub>2</sub> equivalent emissions.

## 5.6.2 Indirect Emissions

Indirect GHG emissions result from the electricity necessary to power the wastewater treatment process. The electricity required to operate a wastewater treatment plant is estimated to be 1,911 kW-hr per million gallons.<sup>37</sup> Based on the expected amount of wastewater requiring treatment, which will be assumed to be equal to the indoor potable water demand absent other data, the energy intensity factor and the utility-specific carbon-intensity factor, indirect emissions due to wastewater treatment are calculated.

## 5.7 Public Lighting

Lighting sources contribute to GHG emissions indirectly, via the production of the electricity that powers these lights. Lighting sources considered in this source category include streetlights, traffic lights, and parking lot lights. The annual electricity use may be estimated using the number of heads, the power requirements of each head, and the assumption that they operate for 12 hours a day on average for 365 days per year or 24 hours for traffic lights. The emission factor for public lighting is the utility-specific carbon-intensity factor. Multiplying the electricity usage by the emission factor gives an estimate of annual CO<sub>2</sub>e emissions from public lighting.

## 5.8 Municipal Vehicles

GHG emissions from municipal vehicles are due to direct emissions from the burning of fossil fuels. Municipal vehicles considered in this source category include vehicles such as police cars, fire trucks, and garbage trucks. Data from reports by Medford, MA; Duluth, MN; Northampton, MA; and Santa Rosa, California<sup>38</sup> show that the CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from municipal

---

<sup>36</sup> Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. IPCC Second Assessment - Climate Change 1995.

<sup>37</sup> CEC 2006. Refining Estimates of Water-Related Energy Use in California. PIER Final Project Report. Prepared by Navigant Consulting, Inc. CEC-500-2006-118. December.

<sup>38</sup> City of Medford. 2001. Climate Action Plan. October. <http://www.massclimateaction.org/pdf/MedfordPlan2001.pdf>  
City of Northampton. 2006. Greenhouse Gas Emissions Inventory. Cities for Climate Protection Campaign. June. <http://www.northamptonma.gov/uploads/listWidget/3208/NorthamptonInventoryClimateProtection.pdf>  
City of Santa Rosa. Cities for Climate Protection: Santa Rosa. [http://ci.santa-rosa.ca.us/City\\_Hall/City\\_Manager/CCPFinalReport.pdf](http://ci.santa-rosa.ca.us/City_Hall/City_Manager/CCPFinalReport.pdf)  
Skoog, C. 2001. Greenhouse Gas Inventory and Forecast Report. City of Duluth Facilities Management and The International Council for Local Environmental Initiatives. October. <http://www.ci.duluth.mn.us/city/information/ccp/GHGEmissions.pdf>

vehicles would be approximately<sup>39</sup> 0.05 MT per capita per year. Using these studies and the expected population, emissions from municipal vehicles may be calculated.

## 5.9 On-Road Mobile Sources

This section estimates GHG emissions from on-road mobile sources. The on-road mobile source emissions considered a project will be from the typical daily operation of motor vehicles by project residents and non-residents. The GHG emissions based upon all vehicle miles traveled associated with residential and non-residential trips regardless of internal or external destinations or purpose of trip are estimated. Traffic patterns, trip rates, and trip lengths are based upon the methods discussed below.

The CCAR GRP<sup>40</sup> recommends estimating GHG emissions from mobile sources at an individual vehicle level, assuming knowledge of the fuel consumption rate for each vehicle as well as the miles traveled per car. Since these parameters are not known for a future development, the CCAR guidance can not be used as recommended.

### Estimating Trip Rates

The majority of transportation impact analysis conducted for CEQA documents in California apply trip generation rates provided by the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) in their regularly updated report *Trip Generation*. The report is based on traffic counts data collected over four decades at built developments throughout the United States. This data is typically based on single-use developments, in suburban locations with ample free parking and with minimal transit service and demand management strategies in place. As a result, the ITE trip generation rates represent upper bound trip generation rates for an individual land use type. This represents a good basis against which to measure the trip-reducing effects of any one or more of the mitigation strategies that will be quantified in subsequent tasks. Therefore, we recommend ITE trip rates as the baseline condition against which the effectiveness of CAPCOA's mitigation measures is applied.

There are some CEQA traffic studies that use data other than ITE trip generation rates. Below we briefly discuss the possible use of these alternative datasets. These traffic studies typically use trip generation data from one of the following sources:

*SANDAG Traffic Generators*. In the San Diego region, most studies use data from the SANDAG *Traffic Generators* report. This report is similar to the ITE *Trip Generation* in that it uses primarily suburban, single use developments, except that this dataset is based on traffic counts conducted in the San Diego region rather than throughout the United States. In studies where the SANDAG data is used, CAPCOA reviewers should apply the trip reduction estimates presented in subsequent tasks directly to the SANDAG trip generation rates.

---

<sup>39</sup> In an effort to be conservative, the largest per capita number from these four reports was used.

<sup>40</sup> California Climate Action Registry (CCAR). 2009. *General Reporting Protocol*. Version 3.1. January.

Travel Forecast Models. For some large development projects or general plans, the local or regional travel model is used to estimate the number of trips generated as well as trip lengths and vehicle speeds at which the individual trips occur. These models account for whether the trip segment occurs on a freeway or local streets as well as the degree of congestion. The values for trip generation rates and trip lengths using ITE and average trip lengths can be used to assess the model estimates of vehicle trip generation and VMT. These comparisons should recognize that the travel models explicitly account for various factors that reduce trip-making and VMT, including the demographic characteristics of the site occupants, location and accessibility of the development site relative to other destinations in the region, the mix of land uses within the site and its surrounding area, and possibly the availability of effective transit service. When performing a comparison using the ITE trip rates and average trip lengths, the reviewer should take into consideration that these factors have already been accounted for in the modeling. Therefore, we recommend applying ITE trip rates and lengths along with the adjustments recommended elsewhere in this document (accounting for site location, design and demographics) as a means of reality-checking transportation model results.

Traffic counts at comparable developments. Some traffic assessments elect to conduct traffic counts at existing developments that are similar to the proposed development. When reviewing impact assessments produced using such information, the reviewer should take into account the extent to which the surveyed development(s) already contain trip generation and trip length reducing measures. Care needs to be used to avoid double-counting reductions.

### **Estimating VMT from Mobile Sources**

Data on average trip lengths are used to translate trip generation rates into vehicle miles of travel (VMT). These trip lengths should be obtained from published sources of average trip lengths for different types of trip types (i.e., commute trips, shopping trips, and others) for each region within the state. Vehicle miles traveled (VMT) are calculated by multiplying ITE trip rates by the typical trip lengths.

Some mechanisms that reduce trip generation rates and trip lengths below these standard ITE-trip rates and current average trip lengths might be considered to be intrinsic parts of the development proposal rather than mitigation measures, such as project location (e.g., infill or transit oriented development [TOD]), density, mix of uses, and urban design. These are not considered part of the baseline condition, but are recognized and quantified as project design features (PDFs). This approach has the following advantages: 1) it creates a consistent basis of analysis for all development projects regardless of location and self-mitigating features already included in the project proposal, and 2) it highlights all elements of a project that reduce trip generation rates and vehicle miles traveled.

### **Other Factors Influencing Mobile Source GHG Emissions**

Beyond trip generation, trip length and VMT, other factors that affect GHG emissions include traffic flow, vehicle fuel consumption rates, and fuel type.

Traffic speed and efficiency profiles are largely influenced by: a) the project location and degree of prevailing congestion in its vicinity, b) the degree to which the project implements traffic level-

of-service mitigation measures often triggered by CEQA review, and c) actions taken by local, regional governments and Caltrans to reduce corridor or area-wide congestion.

The simplified mitigation assessment methods developed for this study use several categories of emissions factors per VMT that account for a) the generalized project location (core infill, inner ring suburbs, outer suburbs, rural), and b) and region-specific fleet and emissions rate if available.

While it is beyond the scope of this document to provide CAPCOA the ability to perform traffic speed and efficiency analysis, the study report advises CAPCOA on the type of analysis to expect to see in CEQA documents on development projects. CEQA impact and mitigation assessment methods should continue to perform air quality analysis using tools such as EMFAC that reference prevailing traffic speed profiles, especially for infill development and congested corridors, while applying appropriate credit for congestion reducing measures included in the project mitigation requirements, funded capital improvements plans, and fiscally constrained Regional Transportation Plans (RTPs.)

### 5.9.1 Estimating GHG Emissions from Mobile Sources

The CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from mobile sources were calculated with the trip rates, trip lengths and emission factors for running and starting emissions from EMFAC2007 as follows:

$$CO_2 \text{ emissions} = VMT \times EF_{\text{running}}$$

Where:

VMT = vehicle miles traveled  
EF<sub>running</sub> = emission factor for running emissions

The CO<sub>2</sub>e calculation involves the following assumptions:

- The emission factor depends upon the speed of the vehicle.
- EMFAC emission factors from the baseline year will be used for EF<sub>running</sub> based on County specific fleet mix for different trip types and adjusted to account for applicable regulations that are not currently incorporated yet into EMFAC.

Startup emissions are CO<sub>2</sub> emitted from starting a vehicle. Startup emissions are calculated using the following assumptions:

- The number of starts is equal to the number of trips made annually.
- The breakdown in vehicles is EMFAC fleet mix for County specific fleet mix.
- The emission factor for startup is calculated based on a weighted average of time between starts for each trip type (commute trips versus all other types).

Fleet distribution types will be based on EMFAC2007 or the most recent EMFAC version available. For mobile sources, the USEPA recommends assuming that CH<sub>4</sub>, N<sub>2</sub>O, and HFCs

account for 5% of GHG emissions from on-road vehicles, taking into account their GWPs.<sup>41</sup> To incorporate these additional GHGs into the calculations, the total GHG footprint is calculated by dividing the CO<sub>2</sub> emissions by 0.95.

Emission factors for alternative fuel can be obtained from the CCAR General Reporting Protocol. For comparison with alternative fuel, N<sub>2</sub>O and CH<sub>4</sub> emissions should be calculated separately as their emissions from alternative fuel are generally higher than from gasoline or diesel.

Low-emission-vehicle programs, such as neighborhood electric vehicles (NEV) or car sharing programs, will only be considered in accounting for GHG reductions if included in project-specific design or mitigation measures.

## 5.10 GHG Emissions from Specialized Land Uses

Below are methods to quantify GHG emissions from some additional land use categories that may be commonly found in development projects. These include golf courses and swimming pools. The methods proposed to determine GHG emissions associated with these sources is discussed in the following sections. The GHG emissions will typically fall into other categories such as landscape maintenance, water usage, and buildings, but since the data sources are different, they are explicitly described.

### 5.10.1 Golf Courses

Emission flux resulting from the construction of the golf course is not discussed, nor is the sequestration of CO<sub>2</sub> into the turf, trees, or lakes of the golf course. Operational CO<sub>2</sub> emissions were calculated for three areas: irrigation, maintenance (mowing), and on-site buildings' energy use. All three components are discussed in this section.

### 5.10.2 Calculating CO<sub>2</sub> Emissions from Irrigation of the Golf Course

The release of GHGs due to irrigation practices was calculated in two steps:

1. Identify the quantity of water needed.
2. Calculate the emissions associated with pumping the water.

1. *Identify the quantity of water needed.* Standard water use for an 18-hole golf course ranges from 250 to 450 acre-ft yearly. A survey of golf course superintendents conducted in the summer of 2003 by the Northern and Southern California Golf Associations revealed an annual average California usage of 345 acre-ft.<sup>42</sup> Numerous factors will affect the actual water usage

---

<sup>41</sup> USEPA. 2005. *Emission Facts: Greenhouse Gas Emissions from a Typical Passenger Vehicle*. Office of Transportation and Air Quality. February.

<sup>42</sup> Northern California Golf Association. *Improving California Golf Course Water Efficiency*, pg 14. <http://www.owue.water.ca.gov/docs/2004Apps/2004-079.pdf>

of a specific golf course, and it is likely to vary by year. ENVIRON recommends using the average usage of 345 acre-ft per year annually.

2. *Calculate the associated emissions.* Using the information identified above, ENVIRON calculates total emissions from irrigation of an 18-hole golf course as follows:

*Estimate total dynamic head:* This is the combination of lift (300 feet) and desired pressure. Standard athletic field sprinklers require a base pressure of approximately 65 psi.<sup>43</sup>

$$\begin{array}{rcl} 60 \text{ psi} \times 2.31 \text{ ft/psi}^{44} & = & 139 \text{ ft} \\ + \text{ lift} & & = \underline{300 \text{ ft}} \\ \text{Total dynamic head} & = & 439 \text{ ft} \end{array}$$

*Identify fuel unit and multiply by head:* Possible pumping fuels include electricity, natural gas, diesel, and propane. In these calculations, ENVIRON assumes that all pumps will use electricity. Based on the literature, ENVIRON recommends using a pumping energy use of 1.551 kW-hr/acre-ft/ft.<sup>45</sup>

$$1.551 \text{ kW-hr/acre-ft/ft} \times 439 \text{ ft} = 681 \text{ kW-hr/acre-foot}$$

*Multiply energy demand by emission factor and convert to MT:* The energy demand per acre-ft calculated above is multiplied by the emission factor for the electricity generation source and converted to MT.

$$\frac{681 \text{ kW-hr/acre-ft} \times 0.666 \text{ lbs CO}_2/\text{kW-hr}}{2204.62 \text{ lbs/ton}} = 0.21 \text{ MT CO}_2/\text{acre-ft}$$

The anticipated annual water demand will be multiplied by these values and then combined this with the calculated emission factor yields total annual emissions from irrigation of the golf course. Other outdoor land uses that require irrigation can follow a similar procedure.

### 5.10.3 Calculating CO<sub>2</sub> Emissions from Maintenance of the Golf Course

Maintenance emissions include the emissions resulting from the mowing of turf grass. The release of GHGs due to mowing was calculated in three steps:

1. Identify the area of turf and frequency of mowing.
2. Identify the efficiency of a typical mower.

<sup>43</sup> Full Coverage Irrigation. Partial List of Customers Using FCI Nozzles. <http://www.fcinozzles.com/clients.asp>.

<sup>44</sup> Conversion factor: 1 psi = 2.31 feet of head. Kele & Associates Technical Reference: Liquid Level Measurement. <http://www.kele.com/tech/monitor/Pressure/LiqLevMs.pdf>

<sup>45</sup> Kansas State University Irrigation Management Series. Comparing Irrigation Energy Costs. Table 4. <http://www.oznet.ksu.edu/library/ageng2/mf2360.pdf>

3. Calculate the emissions associated with mowing.

1. *Identify the area of turf and frequency of mowing:* An Arizona State economic analysis of golf courses reports that on average 2/3 of the land within a golf course is maintained.<sup>46</sup> ENVIRON suggests assuming that the course will be mowed twice weekly, although high maintenance areas such as greens will be mowed more frequently.<sup>47</sup> ENVIRON recommends a growing season of 52 weeks/year.<sup>48</sup>

2. *Identify the efficiency of a typical mower.* Typical mower calculations are based on the specifications for a lightweight fairway mower (model 3235C) reported by John Deere's Golf & Turf division.<sup>49</sup> A typical mower will use one tank (18 gallons) of diesel per day (assumed to be 8 hours). Given the size specifications of the mower and assuming an average speed of 5.5 mph, such a mower can cover 44 acres on 18 gallons of diesel.

3. *Calculate the emissions associated with mowing.* Using the information collected above and a CO<sub>2</sub> emission factor for diesel combustion<sup>50</sup>, ENVIRON calculates the emission factor for mowing the golf course:

$$\frac{2 \text{ mowings/}}{\text{week}} \times \frac{52 \text{ weeks/}}{\text{year}} \times \frac{18 \text{ gallons diesel/}}{44 \text{ acre-mowing}} \times \frac{22.4 \text{ lbs CO}_2/\text{gallon diesel}}{2204 \text{ lbs/ton}} = \frac{0.43 \text{ MT}}{\text{acre-year}} \text{ CO}_2$$

### 5.10.4 Calculating CO<sub>2</sub> Emissions from Building Energy Use at the Golf Course

Any of the non-residential building energy use data sources described in the Buildings section may be used to estimate energy intensity at the golf course.

### 5.11 Pools

Recreation centers may include various pools, spas, and restroom buildings; ENVIRON assumes that pools are the main consumers of energy in recreation centers. This section describes the methods used to estimate the GHGs associated with pools in recreation centers.

The energy used to heat and maintain a swimming pool depends on several factors, including (but not limited to): whether the pool is indoors or outdoors, size of the pool (surface area and depth), water temperature, and energy efficiency of pool pump and water heater, and whether

<sup>46</sup> Total acreage divided by total acreage maintained. Arizona State University, Dr. Troy Schmitz. Economic Impacts and Environmental Aspects of the Arizona Golf Course Industry. <http://agb.poly.asu.edu/workingpapers/0501.pdf>.

<sup>47</sup> Based on Best Practices video. <http://buckeyeturf.osu.edu/podcast/?p=51>

<sup>48</sup> Based on 95% of Southern California Survey respondents report an irrigation season greater than 9-10 months. <http://www.owue.water.ca.gov/docs/2004Apps/2004-079.pdf>

<sup>49</sup> John Deere Product Specifications. 3235C Lightweight Fairway Mower. [http://www.deere.com/en\\_US/ProductCatalog/GT/series/gt\\_lwfm\\_c\\_series.html](http://www.deere.com/en_US/ProductCatalog/GT/series/gt_lwfm_c_series.html)

<sup>50</sup> EIA. Fuel and Energy Source Codes and Emission Coefficients. <http://www.eia.doe.gov/oiaf/1605/factors.html>

solar heating is used. By making assumptions for these parameters and using known or predicted values for energy use, ENVIRON estimates the electricity and natural gas use of an outdoor pool.

### 5.11.1 Recreation Center Characterization

In the calculations described below, ENVIRON assumes that the proposed pools will be outdoor pools with dimensions 50 meters by 22.9 meters (a typical, competition-size pool). ENVIRON bases electricity calculations on a pool that ran its standard water filter for 24 hours per day, 365 days per year. As there is little data publicly available on the energy use of commercial swimming pools, ENVIRON extrapolates energy consumption from information obtained from two sources: 1) Data on electricity used by pool pumps from Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E),<sup>51</sup> and 2) Data on the annual cost to heat a commercial pool located in Carlsbad, CA.<sup>52</sup>

### 5.11.2 Electricity Use of Pools

A PG&E study on energy efficiency of a pool pump at the Lyons Pool in Oakland, CA, found an annual electricity use of 110,400 kilowatt hours per year (kWh per yr).<sup>53</sup> The study pool is smaller than the assumed size of the proposed pool (actual size of the Lyons Pool is 35 yards by 16 yards). Accordingly, ENVIRON scales the electricity use to reflect the larger size of the proposed pool.

### 5.11.3 Natural Gas Use of Pools

The estimated annual cost of heating a standard competition-size pool is \$184,400 (or 72% of the total cost of pool operations).<sup>54</sup> ENVIRON used the average PG&E commercial rate for natural gas of \$0.95 per therm to convert this cost into annual natural gas use (hundred cubic feet per year [ccf/year]).<sup>55</sup> The commercial rate averages the variable cost due to energy usage and time of year. This corresponds to approximately 184,400 ccf per year.<sup>56</sup>

This value is comparable to that obtained from the pool industry.<sup>57</sup> The estimated cost of heating a residential pool using a natural gas heater is about one dollar per square foot of water

---

<sup>51</sup> PG&E. 2006. Energy Efficient Commercial Pool Program, Preliminary Facility Report. Lyons Pool, "City of Oakland/Oakland Unified School District." October.

<sup>52</sup> Mendioroz, R. 2006. Fueling Change: A Number of Design Schemes and Alternative-Energy Strategies Can Help Operators Beat the Price of Natural Gas. Athletic Business. March.

<sup>53</sup> PG&E. 2006. Energy Efficient Commercial Pool Program, Preliminary Facility Report. Lyons Pool, "City of Oakland/Oakland Unified School District." October.

<sup>54</sup> Mendioroz, R. 2006. Fueling Change: A Number of Design Schemes and Alternative-Energy Strategies Can Help Operators Beat the Price of Natural Gas. Athletic Business. March.

<sup>55</sup> Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E). 2007. Gas Rate Finder. Vol 36-G, No. 9. September.  
<http://www.pge.com/tariffs/GRF0907.pdf>

<sup>56</sup> At the commercial rate given 1 ccf costs \$1.

<sup>57</sup> SolarCraft Services Inc. 2007. Phone conversation with Chris Bumas on September 18, 2007. Novato, CA  
<http://www.solarcraft.com/>

surface area per month (\$/sqft-month) in residential therms.<sup>58</sup> Applying this value to a competition-size pool yields an annual natural gas use of 147,600 ccf/year.

#### 5.11.4 Conversion of Electricity and Natural Gas Use to Greenhouse Gas Emissions

ENVIRON used utility-specific electricity and natural gas emission factors to calculate the total CO<sub>2</sub> emissions for each pool. A summary of the calculations is shown below:

$$\text{Emissions from Electricity} \left( \frac{\text{Tonnes CO}_2 / \text{yr}}{1,000 \text{ sqft}} \right) = \frac{\text{Energy Use (ccf / yr)} \times \text{Emission Factor (lbs CO}_2\text{e / ccf)} \times \text{Conversion Factor (tonne / 2205 lbs)}}{\text{Surface Area of Pool (1,000 sqft)}}$$

$$\text{Emissions from Natural Gas} \left( \frac{\text{Tonnes CO}_2 / \text{yr}}{1,000 \text{ sqft}} \right) = \frac{\text{Energy Use (ccf / yr)} \times \text{Emission Factor (lbs CO}_2\text{e / ccf)} \times \text{Conversion Factor (tonne / 2205 lbs)}}{\text{Surface Area of Pool (1,000 sqft)}}$$


---

<sup>58</sup> The residential price for one therm of natural gas.

## Appendix C

### Transportation Appendices

## Appendix C.1 Transportation Calculations



## Appendix C.1 – Transportation Calculations

Table C-1 provides further detail into the calculations of percent reduction in vehicle miles traveled (VMT) for each of the fact sheets (that have references to the appendix). Many of the strategies in the table below do not provide the full equations for percent reduction in vehicle miles traveled. Only the equations or variables which require further detail are outlined here. The table also provides detail on any assumptions which are made to perform the calculations and the basis of such assumptions. An additional section below Table C-1 provides a detailed discussion of the calculations made for the transit accessibility strategy.

| Table C-1<br>Transportation Calculations             |    |   |   |  |  |
|--|----|---|---|--|--|
| Strategy   | T# | Equation  | Variable  | Value  | Source/Notes   |
| Increase Density<br>(Land Use/Location)              | A2 | A = Percentage increase in housing units per acre = (number of housing units per acre – number of housing units per acre for typical ITE development) / (number of housing units per acre for typical ITE development)  | number of housing units per acre for typical ITE development      | 7.6 = blended average density of residential development in the US in 2003 | A.C. Nelson. "Leadership in a New Era." <i>Journal of the American Planning Association</i> , Vol. 72, Issue 4, 2006, pp. 393-407 – as cited in <i>Growing Cooler</i>  |
|  |    | A = Percentage increase in jobs per job acre = (number of jobs per job acre – number of jobs per job acre for typical ITE development) / (number of jobs per job acre for typical ITE development)  | number of jobs per job acre for typical ITE development           | 20 = average jobs per job acre   | Year 2005 Land Use, Sacramento County Travel Demand Model, 2008  |
| Improve Design of Development<br>(Land Use/Location) | A3 | A = Percentage increase in intersections versus a typical ITE suburban development = (intersections per square mile of project – intersections per square mile of typical ITE suburban development) / (intersections per square mile of typical ITE suburban development) | intersections per square mile of typical ITE suburban development | 36 = ITE site average intersection density                                 | Based on Fehr & Peers methodology for analysis in the report: <i>Proposed Trip Generation, Distribution, and Transit Mode Split Forecasts for the Bayview Waterfront Project Transportation Study</i> , Fehr & Peers, 2009 |

**Table C-1  
Transportation Calculations**

| Strategy   | T# | Equation  | Variable  | Value   | Source/Notes  |
|--|----|---|---|---|---|
| Increase Diversity (Mixed Use) (Land Use/Location)     | A5 | A = Percentage increase in land use index versus single use development = (project land use index – single land use index) / single land use index  | single land use index                                       | $0.15 = - [1*(\ln 1) + 0.01*(\ln 0.01)+...+0.01*(\ln 0.01)] / \ln(6)$ | --  |
| Increase Destination Accessibility (Land Use/Location) | A6 | A = Percentage decrease in distance to downtown or major job center = (distance to downtown/job center for typical ITE development – distance to downtown/job center for project) / (distance to downtown/job center for typical ITE development) | distance to downtown/job center for typical ITE development | 12 miles (average work trip length from NHTS)                         | 2000-2001 California Statewide Travel Survey, 2001 NHTS Summary of Travel Trends, p.15 (Table 5)  |
| Increase Transit Accessibility (Land Use/Location)     | A7 | A = Increase in transit mode share = % transit mode share for project - % transit mode share for typical ITE development  | % transit mode share for typical ITE development            | 1.3%  | NHTS, 2001<br><a href="http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tsip/tab/documents/travelsurveys/Final2001_StwTravelSurveyWkdayRpt.pdf">http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tsip/tab/documents/travelsurveys/Final2001_StwTravelSurveyWkdayRpt.pdf</a> , p.150 (Suburban – SCAG, SANDAG, Fresno County.) |
|  |    | B = Adjustment from transit mode share to VMT = 1 / average vehicle occupancy * conversion from VT to VMT = 0.67  | Divide by average vehicle occupancy to translate to VT      | 1 / average vehicle occupancy = 1 / 1.5 = 0.67                        | NHTS, <a href="http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tsip/tab/documents/travelsurveys/2000_Household_Survey.pdf">http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tsip/tab/documents/travelsurveys/2000_Household_Survey.pdf</a> , p.iii   |
|  |    |   | conversion from VT to VMT                                   | 1   | Assume all trip lengths are equal (vehicle trips to VMT) <sup>1</sup>   |

<sup>1</sup> To convert to vehicle miles traveled, we assume that all vehicle trips will average out to typical trip length (“assume all trip lengths are equal”). Thus, we can assume that a percentage reduction in vehicle trips will equal the same percentage reduction in vehicle miles traveled.

**Table C-1  
Transportation Calculations**

| Strategy  | T# | Equation  | Variable                     | Value  | Source/Notes   |
|---|----|---|------------------------------|--|--|
| Unbundle Parking Cost from Property Cost (Parking Pricing/Policy)     | C3 | A = Adjustment from Vehicle Ownership to VMT = average trips per 2 vehicles * 1 vehicle per average trips =(9.8 trips/ 2 vehicles) * (1 vehicle / 5.7 trips) = 0.85 | Average trips per X vehicles | Households with 2 vehicles take 9.8 trips while households with 1 vehicle take 5.7 trips per day | i.e. A reduction of 1 vehicle leads to an 0.85 reduction in vehicle trips<br><a href="http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tsip/tab/documents/travel_surveys/2000_Household_Survey.pdf">http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tsip/tab/documents/travel_surveys/2000_Household_Survey.pdf</a> , table 8.7 |
| Expand Transit Network (Transit System Improvements)                  | D2 | D = Adjustment for Transit Ridership Increase to VMT  | --                           | 0.67   | see Increase Transit Accessibility   |
| Enhance Transit Service Frequency/Speed (Transit System Improvements) | D3 | E = Adjustment for Transit Ridership Increase to VMT  | --                           | 0.67   | see Increase Transit Accessibility   |
| Implement Bus Rapid Transit (Transit System Improvements)             | D4 | D = Adjustment for Transit Ridership Increase to VMT  | --                           | 0.67   | see Increase Transit Accessibility   |
| Implement Required Trip Reduction Programs (Trip Reduction Programs)  | E2 | C = Adjustment from vehicle mode share to commute VMT   | --                           | 1  | Assume all trip lengths are equal (vehicle mode share to vehicle trips to VMT) <sup>i</sup>  |
| Provide a Transit Fare Subsidy (Trip Reduction Programs)              | E3 | C = Adjustment from commute VT to commute VMT   | --                           | 1  | Assume all trip lengths are equal (vehicle trips to VMT) <sup>i</sup>  |
| Implement Commute Trip Reduction Marketing (Trip Reduction Programs)  | E7 | C = Adjustment from commute VT to commute VMT   | --                           | 1  | Assume all trip lengths are equal (vehicle trips to VMT) <sup>i</sup>  |

**Table C-1  
Transportation Calculations**

| Strategy   | T#  | Equation   | Variable  | Value          | Source/Notes  |
|--|-----|--|---|----------------|---|
| Provide Employer-Sponsored Vanpool/Shuttle (Trip Reduction Programs) | E8  | C = Adjustment from vanpool mode share to commute VMT  | --  | 0.67           | see Increase Transit Accessibility  |
| Implement Bike-Sharing Programs (Trip Reduction Programs)            | E10 | % VMT Reduction = A * B * C = 2% * 7% * 20% = 0.03%  | --  | --             | --  |
|  |     | A = 2% = Net new bicycle mode share = (existing mode share * % increase in bicycle mode share) – existing mode share | Existing mode share                                   | Estimate at 1% | Pucher et al., 2010   |
|  |     |  | % increase in bicycle mode share                      | 135 – 300%     | Pucher et al., 2010, Table 4 (see fact sheet for calculations)  |
|  |     | B = % of new bicycle trips shifting from vehicles (from literature)  | --  | 6-7%           | Pucher et al., 2010 and Bike-Share in NYC, 2009, Table 4, p.45  |
|  |     |  | adjustments to convert from vehicle mode share to VMT | 1              | Assume all trip lengths are equal (vehicle mode share to vehicle trips to VMT) <sup>i</sup>   |
|  |     | C = adjustments to convert from vehicle mode share to VMT * adjustment for shorter than average trip lengths = 1*20% | adjustment for shorter than average trip lengths      | 1.94/9.9 = 20% | Adjustment to reflect ratio of bike trip length to average trip length (this strategy will only replace the shorter vehicle trips that can be reasonably replaced by a bicycle). [1.94 miles (average bike trip length from Moving Cooler Appendices B-28 referencing NHTS) / 9.9 miles (average household trip length from NHTS Transferability, 2001 NHTS, <a href="http://nhts-gis.ornl.gov/transferability/Default.aspx">http://nhts-gis.ornl.gov/transferability/Default.aspx</a> )] |



**Table C-1  
Transportation Calculations**

| Strategy   | T#  | Equation  | Variable                      | Value                           | Source/Notes  |
|--|-----|---|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|---|
| Provide End of Trip Facilities (Trip Reduction Programs) | E11 | *utilizing the same equation in bike sharing program section, set A = 1.3% = (7.1% - 5.8%)<br><br>% VMT Reduction = A * B * C = 1.3% * 7% * 20% = 0.02%                   | --                            | --                              | --  |
| Establish Schoolpool (Trip Reduction Programs)           | E13 | B = Adjustments to convert from participation to daily VMT to annual school VMT = [(avg # of families per carpool - 1) / avg # of families per carpool] *% of school days | avg # of families per carpool | 2.5                             | TDM Case Studies, DRCOG, p.13   |
|  |     |   | % of school days              | 75% = 39 school weeks/ 52 weeks | TDM Case Studies, DRCOG, p.13   |
| Provide School Buses (Trip Reduction Programs)           | E14 | B = Adjustments to convert from participation to daily VMT to annual school VMT = % of school days  | % of school days              | 75% = 39 school weeks/ 52 weeks | TDM Case Studies, DRCOG, p.13   |
| Cordon Pricing (Road Pricing Management)                 | F2  | A = % increase in pricing for passenger vehicles to cross cordon  | --                            | 100 – 500%                      | <i>Moving Cooler</i> uses peak hour price per mile instead of crossing price. The percentage change can still be calculated to provide a general estimate for a high range % change. Assuming a baseline of \$0.10, calculated percentage increase to \$0.49 - \$0.65 ( <i>Moving Cooler</i> ) and adjusted with rounding |
|  |     | C = % of VMT Impacted by Cordon Pricing and Mode Shift Adjustments = %VMT impacted by congestion pricing * Mode shift adjustment = 8.8% (peak period) and 21% (all day)   | --                            | --                              | --  |


**Table C-1  
Transportation Calculations**

| Strategy | T# | Equation  | Variable                             | Value             | Source/Notes   |
|----------|----|---|--------------------------------------|-------------------|--|
|          |    | Peak period = 25% * 35% = 8%                    | %VMT impacted by congestion pricing  | 25%               | 20% of trips are work trips (NHTS Transferability, 2001 NHTS, <a href="http://nhts-gis.ornl.gov/transferability/Default.aspx">http://nhts-gis.ornl.gov/transferability/Default.aspx</a> ) and round up assuming other trips travel during peak periods |
|          |    |   | Mode shift adjustment                | 35% = 20% + 30%/2 | Of the estimated trips affected to the increase in price, assume 50% is either a time of day shift/route shift/no change, 30% convert to HOV trips (with average 2 ppl per HOV), and 20% are trip reductions/shift to transit, walk or bike            |
|          |    | Static all day price (London) = 60% * 35% = 21% | % VMT impacted by congestion pricing | 60%               | Conservatively assume 60% of trips fall in the peak periods and mid-day  |
|          |    |   | Mode shift adjustment                | 35%= 20% + 30%/2  | Of the estimated reduced trips due to the increase in price, assume 50% is either a time of day shift/route shift/no change, 30% convert to HOV trips (with average 2 people per HOV), and 20% are trip reductions/shift to transit, walk or bike      |

Increase Transit Accessibility (Land Use/Location)

|                     |  |
|---------------------|--|
| Distance to transit | Transit mode share calculation equation (where x = distance of project to transit) |
| 0 – 0.5 miles       | -50*x + 38   |

|   |                   |
|---|-------------------|
| 0.5 to 3 miles                              | $-4.4 * x + 15.2$ |
| > 3 miles                                   | no impact         |
| Source: Lund et al, 2004; Fehr & Peers 2010 |                   |



Data was taken from Table 5-25 of Lund et al, 2004. The table provided transit commute mode shares for those living with 1/2 mile of a rail station for 5 sites surveyed within California. Removing the extreme low and high percentages, this provided a range of transit commute mode share of 13% to 38%. A simple linear extrapolation was conducted to provide a relationship for distance to transit (between 0 and 1/2 mile) to transit mode share, via the equation: transit mode share =  $-50 * \text{distance to transit} + 38$ . The table also provided transit mode shares for those living from 1/2 to 3 miles from a station, a range from 2% to 13%. Using the same methodology, a relationship for distance to transit (between 1/2 mile and 3 miles) to transit mode share is provided via the equation: transit mode share =  $-4.4x + 15.2$ .

## **Appendix C.2**

### **Trip Adjustment Factors**

## Appendix C.2 – Trip Adjustment Factors

The trip adjustment factors are not explicitly used for calculations of reduction in vehicle miles traveled (VMT) but serve as an added resource point for users of this document. For example, we report all commute trip reduction (CTR) program strategies as a percentage reduction in commute VMT. If the user would like to translate this to project level VMT (assuming the project is NOT an office park), and the user does not have statistics about the project area readily available, then the trip adjustment factors table can be utilized.

Example: Assume the user is providing a 15% reduction in commute VMT for a implementation of a ride share program. To calculate an estimated reduction in project level VMT, the user can multiple 15% by 20% (NHTS average % of work trips) and again multiply by 12.0 / 9.9 (average work trip length/average trip length) to adjust for both the portion of trips which are work related and that work trips tend to be longer than average trips.

| <b>TABLE C-2. TRIP ADJUSTMENT FACTORS</b>  |                   |                                |                               |                                       |
|--|-------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
|  | NHTS <sup>1</sup> | Sacramento Region <sup>2</sup> | San Diego Region <sup>3</sup> | Rural (Kings County, CA) <sup>4</sup> |
| Average Work Trip Length (vehicle)   | 12.0              | 10.4                           | 8.4                           | -                                     |
| Average Trip Length (vehicle)  | 9.9               | 6.8                            | 6.9                           | 8.7                                   |
| Average % of Work Trips  | 20%               | 20%                            | -                             | 12%                                   |
| Average % of School Trips  | 9.8%              | -                              | -                             | -                                     |
| Average Length of School Trips (Vehicle)   | 6.0               | -                              | 4.2                           | -                                     |
| Average Vehicle Occupancy (All Trips)  | 1.5               | 1.4                            | 1.5                           | -                                     |
| Source:<br>1. 2000-2001 California Statewide Travel Survey, 2001 NHTS Summary of Travel Trends<br>2. SACMET model, Fehr & Peers, 2010.<br>3. SANDAG Brief Guide of Vehicular Traffic Generation Rates for the San Diego Region (April 2002)<br>4. NHTS Transferability, 2001 NHTS, <a href="http://nhts-gis.ornl.gov/transferability/Default.aspx">http://nhts-gis.ornl.gov/transferability/Default.aspx</a> |                   |                                |                               |                                       |



Appendix C

**Appendix C.3**  
**Induced Travel Memo**

## MEMORANDUM

Date: February 3, 2010

To: CAPCOA Team

From: Tien-Tien Chan, Jerry Walters, and Meghan Mitman

**Subject: Induced Travel Material**

SF10-0475

---

Induced travel is a term used to describe how travel demand responds to roadway capacity expansion and roadway improvements. Consistent with the theory of supply and demand, the general topic of research concerning induced travel is that reducing the cost of travel (i.e., reduced travel time due to a new road improvement) will increase the amount of travel. In other words, road improvements alone can prompt traffic increases. To what degree and under what circumstances these increases occur is a matter of debate and the key subject of most induced travel research. We have attached the following documents which represent research on induced travel effects:

- *Comparative Evaluations on the Elasticity of Travel Demand* – study conducted for the Utah DOT which included national literature review of induced travel studies
- *Are Induced-Travel Studies Inducing Bad Investments?* – article by Cervero in Access Magazine: Transportation Research at the University of California
- *Road Expansion, Urban Growth, Growth, and Induced Travel: A Path Analysis* – APA Journal paper by Cervero, also discusses the impacts of induced growth and induced investments

The reader should be aware that conditions may vary considerably and the extent of induced travel depends on a variety of factors, including: the degree of prior congestion in the corridor, its duration over hours of the day, its extent over lane miles of the corridor, the degree to which unserved traffic diverts to local streets and the degree of congestion on those routes, the availability of alternate modes within the corridor, whether corridor is radial and oriented toward downtown with high parking cost and limited availability or circumferential, planned level of growth in the corridor, whether the corridor is interstate or interregional, whether it is a truck route, and other factors.

GHG reduction strategies such as transportation system management (e.g. signal coordination, adaptive signal control) may also have the potential for inducing travel. For such strategies, if the estimated improvement exceeds 10% benefit in travel time reduction, we recommend conducting project specific analysis on induced travel prior to establishing GHG reduction benefits.

# Appendix D

## Building Mitigation Measure Quantification Methods

This Appendix summarizes the steps and assumptions used in two of the mitigation strategies – exceed Title 24 energy efficiency standards (BE-1) and installing energy efficient appliances (BE-4).

### **Background**

GHGs are emitted as a result of activities in residential and commercial buildings when electricity and natural gas are used as energy sources. New California buildings must be designed to meet the building energy efficiency standards of Title 24, also known as the California Building Standards Code. Title 24 Part 6 regulates energy uses including space heating and cooling, hot water heating, ventilation, and hard-wired lighting. By committing to a percent improvement over Title 24, a development reduces its energy use and resulting GHG emissions.

The Title 24 standards have been updated twice (in 2005 and 2008)<sup>1</sup> since some of these data used to estimate energy use were compiled. California Energy Commission (CEC) has published reports estimating the percentage deductions in energy use resulting from these new standards. Based on CEC's discussion on average savings for Title 24 improvements, these CEC savings percentages by end use can be used to account for reductions in electricity and natural gas use due to the two most recent updates to Title 24. Since energy use for each different system type (ie, heating, cooling, water heating, and ventilation) as well as appliances is defined in this survey, the use of survey data with updates for Title 24 will easily allow for application of mitigation measures aimed at reducing the energy use of these devices in a prescriptive manner.

Another mitigation measure to reduce a building's energy consumption as well as the associated GHG emissions from natural gas combustion and electricity production is to use energy-efficient appliances. For residential dwellings, typical builder-supplied appliances include refrigerators and dishwashers. Clothes washers and ceiling fans would be applicable if the builder supplied them. For commercial land uses, only energy-efficient refrigerators have been evaluated for grocery stores.

---

<sup>1</sup> California Energy Commission. 2003. Impact Analysis: 2005 Update to the California Energy Efficiency Standards for Residential and Nonresidential Buildings. Available at:

[http://www.energy.ca.gov/title24/2005standards/archive/rulemaking/documents/2003-07-11\\_400-03-014.PDF](http://www.energy.ca.gov/title24/2005standards/archive/rulemaking/documents/2003-07-11_400-03-014.PDF)

California Energy Commission. 2006. California Commercial End-Use Survey. Prepared by Itron Inc. Available at:

<http://www.energy.ca.gov/ceus/>

## Methodology

### Datasets

The Residential Appliance Saturation Survey (RASS)<sup>2</sup> and California Commercial Energy Use Survey (CEUS)<sup>3</sup> datasets were used to estimate the energy intensities of residential and non-residential buildings, respectively, since the data is available for several land use categories in different climate zones in California. The RASS dataset further differentiates the energy use intensities between single-family, multi-family and townhome residences.

The Energy Star and Other Climate Protection Partnerships 2008 Annual Report<sup>4</sup> and subsequent Annual Reports were reviewed for typical reductions for energy-efficient appliances. ENERGY STAR residential refrigerators, clothes washers, dishwashers, and ceiling fans use 15%, 25%, 40%, and 50% less electricity than standard appliances, respectively. ENERGY STAR commercial refrigerators use 35% less electricity than standard appliances.

### Calculations

#### *Exceeding Title 24 Energy Efficiency Standards (BE-1)*

RASS and CEUS datasets were used to obtain the energy intensities of different end use categories for different building types in different climate zones. Energy intensities from CEUS are given per square foot per year and used as presented. RASS presents Unit Energy Consumption (UEC) per dwelling unit per year and saturation values; the energy intensities used in this analysis are products of the UEC and saturation values.

Data for some climate zones is not presented in the CEUS and RASS studies. However, data from adjacent climate zones is assumed to be representative and substituted as follows:

For non-residential building types:

- Climate Zone 11 used Climate Zone 9 data.
- Climate Zone 12 used Climate Zone 9 data.
- Climate Zone 14 used Climate Zone 1 data.
- Climate Zone 15 used Climate Zone 10 data.

For residential building types:

- Climate Zone 6 used Climate Zone 2 data.
- Climate Zone 14 used Climate Zone 1 data.
- Climate Zone 15 used Climate Zone 10 data.

RASS and CEUS data are based on 2002 consumption data. Because older buildings tend to be less energy efficient, and the majority of the buildings in the survey were likely constructed

---

<sup>2</sup> California Statewide Residential Appliance Saturation Study Reporting Center. Available at:

<http://websafe.kemainc.com/RASSWEB/DesktopDefault.aspx>

<sup>3</sup> California Energy Commission. 2006. California Commercial End-Use Survey. Prepared by Itron Inc. Available at:

<http://www.energy.ca.gov/ceus/>

<sup>4</sup> United States Environmental Protection Agency 2009. ENERGY STAR and Other Climate Protection Partnerships: 2008 Annual Report. Available at: <http://www.epa.gov/cpd/pdf/2008AnnualReportFinal.pdf>

## Appendix D

before 2001, the RASS and CEUS data likely overestimate energy use for a 2001 Title 24-compliant building.

To account for updates since the 2001 Title 24 standards, percentage reductions for each end use category taken directly from the CEC's "Impact Analysis for 2005 Energy Efficiency Standards" and "Impact Analysis 2008 Update to the California Energy Efficiency Standards for Residential and Nonresidential Buildings" reports were applied to the CEUS and RASS datasets for improvements from 2001 to 2005, and 2005 to 2008, respectively (see Tables D-1 and D-2). For the CEUS data, exterior lighting was assumed to be covered by Title 24 lighting and therefore has the full percentage reductions taken. Interior lighting was assumed to be 50% Title 24 and 50% non-Title 24 uses. Therefore only half of the reduction for lighting was applied. The resulting 2008 numbers were then used as baseline energy intensities for this mitigation strategy. The total baseline energy intensities are calculated as follows:

$$\text{Baseline} = \sum [T24_{2001} \times (1 - R_{2001-2005}) \times (1 - R_{2005-2008})] + \sum NT24$$

Where:

- Baseline = Total baseline energy intensities of building category
- $T24_{2001}$  = Energy intensities of Title 24 regulated end use from RASS or CEUS
- $R_{2001-2005}$  = Reduction from 2001 to 2005
- $R_{2005-2008}$  = Reduction from 2005 to 2008
- NT24 = Non-Title 24 regulated end use energy intensities

Table D-1  
 Reduction in Title 24 Regulated End Use for Non-Residential Buildings

| Energy Source     | End Use           | Reduction from 2001 to 2005 | Reduction from 2005 to 2008 |
|-------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Electricity       | Heating           | 4.9%                        | 37.2%                       |
|                   | Ventilation       | 5.0%                        | 1.5%                        |
|                   | Refrigeration     | 0.0%                        | 0.0%                        |
|                   | Process           | 0.0%                        | 0.0%                        |
|                   | Office Equipment  | 0.0%                        | 0.0%                        |
|                   | Motors            | 0.0%                        | 0.0%                        |
|                   | Miscellaneous     | 0.0%                        | 0.0%                        |
|                   | Interior Lighting | 4.9%                        | 5.9%                        |
|                   | Water Heating     | 0.0%                        | 0.0%                        |
|                   | Cooking           | 0.0%                        | 0.0%                        |
|                   | Air Compressors   | 0.0%                        | 0.0%                        |
|                   | Cooling           | 6.7%                        | 8.3%                        |
| Exterior Lighting | 9.8%              | 11.7%                       |                             |
| Natural Gas       | Cooking           | 0.0%                        | 0.0%                        |
|                   | Cooling           | 10.4%                       | 9.3%                        |
|                   | Heating           | 3.1%                        | 15.9%                       |
|                   | Water Heating     | 0.0%                        | 0.0%                        |
|                   | Process           | 0.0%                        | 0.0%                        |
|                   | Miscellaneous     | 0.0%                        | 0.0%                        |

Table D-2  
Reduction in Title 24 Regulated End Use for Residential Buildings

| Energy Source | End Use<br>(As presented in RASS Dataset) | Reduction from 2001 to 2005 |               |           | Reduction from 2005 to 2008 |               |           |
|---------------|---|-----------------------------|---------------|-----------|-----------------------------|---------------|-----------|
|               |   | Multi-family                | Single family | Town home | Multi-family                | Single family | Town home |
| Electricity   | Conv. Electric heat                       | 24.3%                       | 19.8%         | 24.3%     | 19.7%                       | 22.7%         | 19.7%     |
|               | HP Eheat                                  | 24.3%                       | 19.8%         | 24.3%     | 19.7%                       | 22.7%         | 19.7%     |
|               | Aux Eheat                                 | 24.3%                       | 19.8%         | 24.3%     | 19.7%                       | 22.7%         | 19.7%     |
|               | Furnace Fan                               | 24.3%                       | 19.8%         | 24.3%     | 19.7%                       | 22.7%         | 19.7%     |
|               | Central A/C                               | 24.3%                       | 19.8%         | 24.3%     | 19.7%                       | 22.7%         | 19.7%     |
|               | Room A/C                                  | 24.3%                       | 19.8%         | 24.3%     | 19.7%                       | 22.7%         | 19.7%     |
|               | Evap Cooling                              | 24.3%                       | 19.8%         | 24.3%     | 19.7%                       | 22.7%         | 19.7%     |
|               | Water Heat                                | 0.0%                        | 0.0%          | 0.0%      | 0.0%                        | 0.0%          | 0.0%      |
|               | Solar Water Heater                        | 0.0%                        | 0.0%          | 0.0%      | 0.0%                        | 0.0%          | 0.0%      |
|               | Dryer                                     | 0.0%                        | 0.0%          | 0.0%      | 0.0%                        | 0.0%          | 0.0%      |
|               | Clothes Washer                            | 0.0%                        | 0.0%          | 0.0%      | 0.0%                        | 0.0%          | 0.0%      |
|               | Dish Washer                               | 0.0%                        | 0.0%          | 0.0%      | 0.0%                        | 0.0%          | 0.0%      |
|               | First Refrigerator                        | 0.0%                        | 0.0%          | 0.0%      | 0.0%                        | 0.0%          | 0.0%      |
|               | Second Refrigerator                       | 0.0%                        | 0.0%          | 0.0%      | 0.0%                        | 0.0%          | 0.0%      |
|               | Freezer                                   | 0.0%                        | 0.0%          | 0.0%      | 0.0%                        | 0.0%          | 0.0%      |
|               | Pool Pump                                 | 0.0%                        | 0.0%          | 0.0%      | 0.0%                        | 0.0%          | 0.0%      |
|               | Spa                                       | 0.0%                        | 0.0%          | 0.0%      | 0.0%                        | 0.0%          | 0.0%      |
|               | Outdoor Lighting                          | 0.0%                        | 0.0%          | 0.0%      | 0.0%                        | 0.0%          | 0.0%      |
|               | Range/Oven                                | 0.0%                        | 0.0%          | 0.0%      | 0.0%                        | 0.0%          | 0.0%      |
|               | TV  | 0.0%                        | 0.0%          | 0.0%      | 0.0%                        | 0.0%          | 0.0%      |
|               | Spa Electric Heat                         | 0.0%                        | 0.0%          | 0.0%      | 0.0%                        | 0.0%          | 0.0%      |
|               | Microwave                                 | 0.0%                        | 0.0%          | 0.0%      | 0.0%                        | 0.0%          | 0.0%      |
|               | Home Office                               | 0.0%                        | 0.0%          | 0.0%      | 0.0%                        | 0.0%          | 0.0%      |
|               | PC  | 0.0%                        | 0.0%          | 0.0%      | 0.0%                        | 0.0%          | 0.0%      |
| Water Bed     | 0.0%                                      | 0.0%                        | 0.0%          | 0.0%      | 0.0%                        | 0.0%          |           |
| Well Pump     | 0.0%                                      | 0.0%                        | 0.0%          | 0.0%      | 0.0%                        | 0.0%          |           |
| Miscellaneous | 0.0%                                      | 0.0%                        | 0.0%          | 0.0%      | 0.0%                        | 0.0%          |           |
| Natural Gas   | Primary Heat                              | 15.7%                       | 6.7%          | 15.7%     | 7.0%                        | 10.0%         | 7.0%      |
|               | Auxiliary Heat                            | 0.0%                        | 0.0%          | 0.0%      | 0.0%                        | 0.0%          | 0.0%      |
|               | Conv. Gas Water Heat                      | 15.7%                       | 6.7%          | 15.7%     | 7.0%                        | 10.0%         | 7.0%      |
|               | Solar Water Heat w/Gas Backup             | 15.7%                       | 6.7%          | 15.7%     | 7.0%                        | 10.0%         | 7.0%      |
|               | Dryer                                     | 0.0%                        | 0.0%          | 0.0%      | 0.0%                        | 0.0%          | 0.0%      |
|               | Range/Oven                                | 0.0%                        | 0.0%          | 0.0%      | 0.0%                        | 0.0%          | 0.0%      |
|               | Pool Heat                                 | 0.0%                        | 0.0%          | 0.0%      | 0.0%                        | 0.0%          | 0.0%      |
|               | Spa Heat                                  | 0.0%                        | 0.0%          | 0.0%      | 0.0%                        | 0.0%          | 0.0%      |
|               | Miscellaneous                             | 0.0%                        | 0.0%          | 0.0%      | 0.0%                        | 0.0%          | 0.0%      |

The same approach was used to quantify GHGs emission reduction from exceeding Title 24 energy efficiency standards by 1%. The 1% reduction was applied to only energy use intensities for Title 24 regulated end use categories. For the CEUS data, the reduction was not applied to any portion of interior lighting. The reduced energy use intensities were added to the unadjusted energy use intensities for non-Title 24 regulated end use categories to obtain the total energy use intensities for exceeding Title 24 energy efficiency standards by 1% for each building category. These were then compared to the baseline line energy intensities for the overall percentage reduction as follows:

$$\text{Percentage Reduction} = 1 - \frac{\sum [T24_{2001} \times (1 - R_{2001-2005}) \times (1 - R_{2005-2008}) \times 99\%] + \sum \text{NT24}}{\text{Baseline}}$$

Where:

- Baseline = Total baseline energy intensities of building category
- T24<sub>2001</sub> = Energy intensities of Title 24 regulated end use from RASS or CEUS
- R<sub>2001-2005</sub> = Reduction from 2001 to 2005
- R<sub>2005-2008</sub> = Reduction from 2005 to 2008
- NT24 = Non-Title 24 regulated end use energy intensities

### *Installing Energy Efficient Appliances*

The same baseline line energy use intensities from the Exceeding Title 24 Energy Efficiency Standards mitigation were used for this mitigation strategy. For all appliances except ceiling fan, the reductions as presented in the ENERGY STAR 2008 annual report were applied to the energy use intensities of the corresponding energy end use categories. All other end use categories were kept unadjusted. The percentage reductions were calculated as follows:

$$\text{Percentage Reduction} = 1 - \frac{\text{Appliance Intensity} \times (1 - \text{ESR}) + \sum \text{Other End Use}}{\text{Baseline}}$$

Where:

- Baseline = Total baseline energy intensities of building category
- Appliance Intensity = 2008 baseline energy intensity of appliance in consideration
- ESR = Reduction from ENERGY STAR appliance
- Other End Use = 2008 baseline energy intensity of all other end uses

RASS does not specify a ceiling fan end-use; rather, electricity use from ceiling fans is accounted for in the “Miscellaneous” category which includes interior lighting, attic fans, and other miscellaneous plug-in loads. Since the electricity usage of ceiling fans alone is not

## Appendix D

specified, a value from the National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL) Building America Research Benchmark Definition (BARBD)<sup>5</sup> was used. BARBD reported that the average energy use per ceiling fan is 84.1 kWh per year. In this mitigation measure, it was assumed that each multi-family, single-family, and townhome residence has one ceiling fan. Therefore, the 50% reduction from ENERGY STAR for ceiling fan was applied to 84.1 kWh of the electricity attributed to the Miscellaneous RASS category. In other words, 42.05 kWh was subtracted from the electricity end use intensities of the “Miscellaneous RASS” category in evaluating the GHGs emission reduction from installing energy efficient ceiling fans.

The total energy use intensities with reduction from each appliance in consideration were then compared to the baseline line energy intensities for the overall percentage reduction as follows:

$$\text{Percentage Reduction} = 1 - \frac{(\text{Misc} - 42.05) + \sum \text{Other End Use}}{\text{Baseline}}$$

Where:

Baseline = Total baseline energy intensities of building category

Misc = 2008 energy intensity in Miscellaneous category for electricity

Other End Use = 2008 baseline energy intensity of all other end uses

---

<sup>5</sup> NREL. 2010. Building America Research Benchmark Definition. Available online at: <http://www.nrel.gov/docs/fy10osti/47246.pdf>

## Appendix E

### Carbon, Water and CO<sub>2</sub> Sequestration Intensity Factors

Table E-1: Carbon Intensity

| Utility                                 | CO <sub>2</sub> intensity (lb/MWh) <sup>1</sup> |          |          |          |          |          |          |          | Suggested Value <sup>2</sup> |
|---|---|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|------------------------------|
|   | 2000  | 2001     | 2002     | 2003     | 2004     | 2005     | 2006     | 2007     |                              |
| Anaheim Public Utilities                |   |          |          |          |          | 1,399.80 | 1,416.74 | 1,543.28 | 1,416.74                     |
| Austin Energy                           |   |          |          |          |          | 1,127.37 | 1,077.97 | 1,117.37 | 1,077.97                     |
| City and County of San Francisco        |   |          |          |          |          | 76.28    |          |          | 76.28                        |
| City of Palo Alto Public Utilities      |   |          |          |          |          | 320.94   | 39.02    | 426.82   | 39.02                        |
| Glendale Water & Power                  |   |          |          |          |          | 1,065.00 |          |          | 1,065.00                     |
| Los Angeles Department of Water & Power | 1,407.44  | 1,403.39 | 1,348.48 | 1,360.07 | 1,360.60 | 1,303.58 | 1,238.52 | 1,227.89 | 1,238.52                     |
| Pacific Gas & Electric Company          |   |          |          |          | 566.2    | 489.16   | 455.81   | 635.67   | 455.81                       |
| PacifiCorp                              |   |          |          |          | 1,811.00 | 1,812.22 | 1,747.30 | 1,775.28 | 1,747.30                     |
| Pasadena Water & Power                  |   |          |          |          |          | 1,409.65 | 1,664.14 |          | 1,664.14                     |
| Platte River Power Authority            |   |          |          |          |          | 1,970.93 | 1,955.66 | 1,847.88 | 1,955.66                     |
| Riverside Public Utilities              |   |          |          |          |          | 1,333.45 | 1,346.15 | 1,325.65 | 1,346.15                     |
| Roseville Electric                      |   |          |          |          |          |          | 565.52   | 793.8    | 565.52                       |
| Sacramento Municipal Utility District   |   |          |          |          | 769      | 616.07   | 555.26   | 714.31   | 555.26                       |
| Salt River Project                      |   |          |          |          |          |          | 1,546.28 | 1,469.90 | 1,546.28                     |
| San Diego Gas & Electric                |   |          |          |          | 613.75   | 546.46   | 780.79   | 806.27   | 780.79                       |
| Seattle City Light                      |   |          |          |          |          |          |          | 17.77    | 17.77                        |
| Sierra Pacific Resources                |   |          |          |          |          |          |          | 1,442.78 | 1,442.78                     |
| Southern California Edison              |   |          |          |          | 678.88   | 665.72   | 641.26   | 630.89   | 641.26                       |
| Turlock Irrigation District             |   |          |          |          |          |          | 682.48   | 807      | 682.48                       |

## Notes:

1. Based on Table G6 of Local Government Operation Protocol version 1.1
2. The suggested values are based on 2006. If no 2006 value was available, 2005 was used followed by 2007.

**Table E-2: Water Intensity**

|                             | Indoor Water Uses   |                     | Outdoor Water Uses  |                     |
|-----------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
|                             | Northern California | Southern California | Northern California | Southern California |
|                             | kWh/MG              |                     |                     |                     |
| Water Supply and Conveyance | 2,117               | 9,727               | 2,117               | 9,727               |
| Water Treatment             | 111                 | 111                 | 111                 | 111                 |
| Water Distribution          | 1,272               | 1,272               | 1,272               | 1,272               |
| Wastewater Treatment        | 1,911               | 1,911               | 0                   | 0                   |
| Regional Total              | 5,411               | 13,022              | 3,500               | 11,111              |

Note: Based on Table ES-1 from CEC. 2006. Refining Estimates of Water-Related Energy Use in California, CEC-500-2006-118.

**Table E-3: Default CO<sub>2</sub> Sequestration Accumulation**

| Land Use    | Sub-Category | Default annual CO <sub>2</sub> accumulation per acre <sup>1</sup> (tonnes CO <sub>2</sub> /year) |
|-------------|--------------|--|
| Forest Land | Scrub        | 14.3   |
|             | Trees        |  |
| Cropland    |              | 111  |
| Grassland   | --           | 6.2  |
| Wetlands    | --           | 4.31   |

Note: Based on Tables 4.3, 4.7 and 6.4 from IPCC. 2006. Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories (IPCC Guidelines). Available online at <http://www.ipcc-nggip.iges.or.jp/public/2006gl/vol4.htm>