# T-25. Extend Transit Network Coverage or Hours



### **GHG** Mitigation Potential



Up to 4.6% of GHG emissions from vehicle travel in the plan/community

Co-Benefits (icon key on pg. 34)











# Climate Resilience

Increasing transit network coverage or hours improves the reliability of the transportation network and allows redundancy to exist even if an extreme event disrupts part of the system. They could also incentivize more people to use transit, resulting in less traffic and better allowing emergency responders to access a hazard site during an extreme weather event.

# **Health and Equity Considerations**

This measure increases access to social, educational, and employment opportunities. Expansion of transit networks need to ensure equitable access by all communities to the transit system.

### **Measure Description**

This measure will expand the local transit network by either adding or modifying existing transit service or extending the operation hours to enhance the service near the project site. Starting services earlier in the morning and/or extending services to late-night hours can accommodate the commuting times of alternative-shift workers. This will encourage the use of transit and therefore reduce VMT and associated GHG emissions.

### **Subsector**

**Transit** 

### **Locational Context**

Urban, suburban

### Scale of Application

Plan/Community

### Implementation Requirements

There are two primary means of expanding the transit network: by increasing the frequency of service, thereby reducing average wait times and increasing convenience, or by extending service to cover new areas and times.

#### **Cost Considerations**

Infrastructure costs for extending the physical network coverage of a transit system can be significant. Costs to expand track-dependent transit, such as light rail and passenger rail, are high and can require resource- and time-intensive advanced planning. Costs to expand vehicle-dependent transit, such as busses, are likewise high but may be limited to procurement of additional vehicles. Any expansion of transit, including just service hours, would increase staffing and potentially maintenance costs. A portion of these costs may be offset by increased transit usage and associated income. Commuters who may more easily be able to travel without a car may also observe cost savings from reduce vehicle usage or ownership.

# **Expanded Mitigation Options**

This measure is focused on providing additional transit network coverage, with no changes to transit frequency. This measure can be paired with Measure T-26, Increase Transit Service Frequency, which is focused on increasing transit service frequency, for increased reductions.





#### **GHG** Reduction Formula

$$A = -1 \times \frac{C - B}{B} \times D \times E \times F \times G$$

#### **GHG** Calculation Variables

ID	Variable	Value	Unit	Source
Output				
Α	Percent reduction in GHG emissions from plan/community VMT	0–4.6	%	calculated
User Inputs				
В	Total transit service miles or service hours in plan/community before expansion	[]	miles	user input
С	Total transit service miles or service hours in plan/community after expansion	[]	miles	user input
D	Transit mode share in plan/community	Table T-3.1	%	user input
Constants, Assumptions, and Available Defaults				
E	Elasticity of transit demand with respect to service miles or service hours	0.7	unitless	Handy et al. 2013
F	Statewide mode shift factor	57.8	%	FHWA 2017
G	Ratio of vehicle trip reduction to VMT	1	unitless	assumption

#### Further explanation of key variables:

- (A) This formula does not reflect any increase in transit vehicle travel and emissions, which can at least partially offset the reduction in GHG emissions from passenger vehicle travel. Inclusion of this component in the percent GHG reduction formula would require inputs that would not be available to most users.
- (B and C) Transit service miles are defined as the total service mileage. Service hours represent the hours of operation. Either metric can be used in the GHG reduction formula so long as both B and C use the same metric.
- (D) The transit mode share for the six most populated CBSAs in California are provided in Table T-3.1 in Appendix C (FHWA 2017). If the project study area is not within the listed CBSAs or the user is able to provide a project-specific value, the user should replace these regional defaults in the GHG reduction formula. It is likely for areas outside of the area covered by the listed CBSAs to have transit mode shares lower than the values provided in the table. Ideally, the user will calculate existing transit mode share for work trips or all trips at a scale no larger than a census tract. Potential data sources include the U.S. Census, California Household Travel Survey (preferred), or local survey efforts. Care should be taken to not present the reported commute mode share as retrieved from the ACS, unless the land use is office or employment based and the ACS tables are based on work location (rather than home location).
- (E) A policy brief summarizing the results of transit service strategies concluded that a 0.7 percent increase in transit ridership occurs for every 1 percent increase in service miles or hours (Handy et al. 2013).



- (F) Mode shift factor is an adjustment to reflect the reduction in vehicle trips associated with a reduction in person trips, since some vehicles carry more than one person. It is calculated as (1/average vehicle occupancy).
- (G) The adjustment factor from vehicle trips to VMT is 1. This assumes that all vehicle trips will average out to typical trip length ("assumes all trip lengths are equal"). Thus, it can be assumed that a percentage reduction in vehicle trips will equal the same percentage reduction in VMT.

# GHG Calculation Caps or Maximums

Measure Maximum

(A<sub>max</sub>) The GHG reduction from expanding the transit network is capped at 4.6 percent, which is based on the following assumptions:

- $\left(\frac{C-B}{B} \le 100\%\right)$  The transit network increase is capped at a doubling in size, or 100 percent (twice as many revenue miles are provided, for a 100 percent increase).
- (D) The CBSA is San Francisco-Oakland-Hayward, which has a default transit mode share for all trips of 11.38 percent.

This maximum scenario is presented in the below example quantification.

Subsector Maximum

( $\sum A_{\text{max}_{\text{T-25 through T-29, T-46}}} \le 15\%$ ) This measure is in the Transit subsector. This subcategory includes Measures T-25 through T-29 and T-46. The VMT reduction from the combined implementation of all measures within this subsector is capped at 15 percent.

# **Example GHG Reduction Quantification**

The user reduces VMT by extending an existing transit route or lengthening the service hours. In this example, the project in a neighborhood of the San Francisco-Oakland-Hayward CBSA and would increase transit coverage in the area from 20 miles (B) to 40 miles (C). If the existing transit mode share in the study area is 11.38 percent (D), the user would reduce GHG emissions from VMT by 4.6 percent.

$$A = -1 \times \frac{\text{(40 miles - 20 miles)}}{\text{20 miles}} \times 11.38\% \times 0.7 \times 57.8\% \times 1 = -4.6\%$$

### Quantified Co-Benefits



Improved Local Air Quality

The percent reduction in GHG emissions (A) would be the same as the percent reduction in NO<sub>X</sub>, CO, NO<sub>2</sub>, SO<sub>2</sub>, and PM. Reductions in ROG emissions can be calculated by multiplying the percent reduction in GHG emissions (A) by an adjustment factor of 87 percent. See Adjusting VMT Reductions to Emission Reductions above for further discussion.





# **Energy and Fuel Savings**

The percent reduction in vehicle fuel consumption would be the same as the percent reduction in GHG emissions (A).



### **VMT Reductions**

The percent reduction in VMT would be the same as the percent reduction in GHG emissions (A).

#### **Sources**

- Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). 2017. National Household Travel Survey–2017 Table Designer. Average Vehicle Occupancy by HHSTFIPS. Available: https://nhts.ornl.gov/. Accessed: January 2021.
- Handy, S., K. Lovejoy, M. Boarnet, and S. Spears. 2013. Impacts of Transit Service Strategies on Passenger Vehicle Use and Greenhouse Gas Emissions. October. Available: https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/sites/default/files/2020-06/Impacts\_of\_Transit\_Service\_Strategies\_on\_Passenger\_Vehicle\_Use\_and\_Greenhouse\_Gas\_Emissions\_Policy\_Brief.pdf. Accessed: January 2021.