

# T-3. Provide Transit-Oriented Development



## GHG Mitigation Potential



Up to 31.0% of GHG emissions from project VMT in study area

## Co-Benefits (icon key on pg. 34)



## Climate Resilience

Providing TOD puts a large number of people close to reliable public transportation, diversifying their transportation options during an extreme weather event.

## Health and Equity Considerations

TOD may increase housing prices, leading to gentrification and displacement. Please refer to the *Accountability and Anti-Displacement and Housing* section in Chapter 5, *Measures for Advancing Health and Equity*, for potential strategies to minimize disruption to existing residents. TOD coupled with affordable housing options can help to support equity by helping to lower transportation costs for residents and increase active mobility.

## Measure Description

This measure would reduce project VMT in the study area relative to the same project sited in a non-transit-oriented development (TOD) location. TOD refers to projects built in compact, walkable areas that have easy access to public transit, ideally in a location with a mix of uses, including housing, retail offices, and community facilities. Project site residents, employees, and visitors would have easy access to high-quality public transit, thereby encouraging transit ridership and reducing the number of single-occupancy vehicle trips and associated GHG emissions.

## Subsector

Land Use

## Locational Context

Urban and suburban. Rural only if adjacent to commuter rail station with convenient rail service to a major employment center.

## Scale of Application

Project/Site

## Implementation Requirements

To qualify as a TOD, the development must be a residential or office project that is within a 10-minute walk (0.5 mile) of a high frequency transit station (either rail, or bus rapid transit with headways less than 15 minutes). Ideally, the distance should be no more than 0.25 to 0.3 of a mile but could be up to 0.5 mile if the walking route to station can be accessed by pedestrian-friendly routes. Users should confirm “unmitigated” or “baseline” VMT does not already account for reductions from transit proximity.

## Cost Considerations

TOD reduces car use and car ownership rates, providing cost savings to residents. It can also increase property values and public transit use rates, providing additional revenue to municipalities, as well as open new markets for business development. Increased transit use will likely necessitate increased spending on maintaining and improving public transit systems, the costs of which may be high.

## Expanded Mitigation Options

When building TOD, a best practice is to incorporate bike and pedestrian access into the larger network to increase the likelihood of transit use.





## GHG Reduction Formula

$$A = \frac{(B \times C)}{-D}$$

## GHG Calculation Variables

ID	Variable	Value	Unit	Source
<b>Output</b>				
A	Percent reduction in GHG emissions from project VMT in study area	6.9–31.0	%	calculated
<b>User Inputs</b>				
	None			
<b>Constants, Assumptions, and Available Defaults</b>				
B	Transit mode share in surrounding city	Table T-3.1	%	FHWA 2017a
C	Ratio of transit mode share for TOD area with measure compared to existing transit mode share in surrounding city	4.9	unitless	Lund et al. 2004
D	Auto mode share in surrounding city	Table T-3.1	%	FHWA 2017b

Further explanation of key variables:

- (B and D) – Ideally, the user will calculate transit and auto mode share for a Project/Site at a scale no larger than a census tract. Ideally, variables B and D will reflect travel behavior in locations that are *not* already within 0.5 mile of a high-quality transit stop and may instead substitute data from nearby tracts further from transit if such locations exist. Potential data sources include the U.S. Census, California Household Travel Survey (preferred), or local survey efforts. If the user is not able to provide a project-specific value using one of these data sources, they have the option to input the mode share for one of the six most populated core-based statistical areas (CBSAs) in California, as presented in Table T-3.1 in Appendix C, *Emission Factors and Data Tables*. Transit mode share is likely to be smaller for areas not covered by the listed CBSAs, which represent the most transit-accessible areas of the state. Conversely, auto mode share is likely to be larger.
- (C) – A study of people living in TODs in California found that, on average, transit shares for TOD residents exceed the surrounding city by a factor of 4.9 (Lund et al. 2004).

## GHG Calculation Caps or Maximums

### Measure Maximum

$(B \times C)_{\max}$  The transit mode share in the project study area with the measure is capped at 27 percent. This is based on the weighted average transit commute mode share of five surveyed sites in California where residents lived within 3 miles of rail stations (Lund et al. 2004). As transit mode share is typically higher for commute trips compared to all trips, 27 percent represents a reasonable upper bound for expected transit mode share in a TOD



area. Projects in the CBSAs of San Francisco-Oakland-Hayward and San Jose-Sunnyvale-Santa Clara would have their transit mode share capped at 27 percent in the formula.

$(A_{\max})$  For projects that use default CBSA data from Table T-3.1 in Appendix C, the maximum percent reduction in GHG emissions (A) is 31.0 percent. This is based on a project in the CBSA of San Francisco-Oakland-Hayward with a transit mode share that reaches the cap  $((B \times C)_{\max})$ . This maximum scenario is presented in the below example quantification.

### Subsector Maximum

$(\sum A_{\max T-1 \text{ through } T-4} \leq 65\%)$  This measure is in the Land Use subsector. This subcategory includes Measures T-1 through T-4. The VMT reduction from the combined implementation of all measures within this subsector is capped at 65 percent.

## Example GHG Reduction Quantification

The user reduces VMT by locating their project in a TOD location. Project site residents, employees, and visitors would have easy access to high-quality public transit, thereby encouraging transit use and reducing single occupancy vehicle travel. In this example, the project is within the San Jose-Sunnyvale-Santa Clara CBSA with an existing transit mode share (B) of 6.69 percent. Applying a 4.9 ratio of transit mode share for TOD area with the measure compared to existing transit mode share in the surrounding city yields 33 percent, which exceeds the 27 percent cap  $((B \times C)_{\max})$ . Therefore, 27 percent is used to define  $(B \times C)$ . The existing vehicle mode share is 86.96 percent (D). The user would reduce GHG emissions from project study area VMT (as compared to the same project in a non-TOD location) by 31 percent.

$$A = \frac{27\%}{-86.96\%} = -31\%$$

## 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. 2017a. *National Household Travel Survey–2017 Table Designer. Travel Day PMT by TRPTRANS by HH\_CBSA*. Available: <https://nhts.ornl.gov/>. Accessed: January 2021.
- Federal Highway Administration. 2017b. *National Household Travel Survey – 2017 Table Designer. Average Vehicle Occupancy by HHSTFIPS*. Available: <https://nhts.ornl.gov/>. Accessed: January 2021.
- Lund, H., R. Cervero, and R. Wilson. 2004. *Travel Characteristics of Transit-Oriented Development in California*. January. Available: <https://community-wealth.org/sites/clone.community-wealth.org/files/downloads/report-lund-cerv-wil.pdf>. Accessed: January 2021.