

Framework for enhanced mobile source GHG analysis in MEPA reviews

Draft – June 10, 2022

Prepared by the Metropolitan Area Planning Council

Tim Reardon, Eric Bourassa

Existing Regulations/Guidance

MEPA GHG Policy (2010)

- Addresses all types of GHG emissions (building, process, mobile source)
- References Mesoscale air quality analysis
- Calculated as net trips X vmt per trip x emissions factors
- VMT/GHG emissions enumerated separately for customer, employee, resident, truck, fleet trips
- Uses MOBILE 6.2 emissions factors
- Requires proponents to create a baseline (“build without mitigation”) scenario and compare to preferred alternative and other alternatives that include mitigation measures not pursued
- Proponent to estimate impacts of mitigation using COMMUTER model, Work Trips Reduction Model, CMAQ worksheets, or other tools (not prescribed)
- Mitigation reported as reduction from baseline (build without mitigation) scenario, in percentage terms and tons CO₂/year (“% better” approach)
- Requires proponents to “mitigate impacts to the maximum extent feasible”

Guidelines for Performing Mesoscale Analysis of Indirect Sources (1991)

- Focused on mobile source emissions that contribute to ozone formation (“non-methane hydrocarbons”)
- Thresholds: office and nonresidential projects >3,000 ADT to >10,000 ADT
- Analysis required if >10% increase in VMT on any local roadways “due to project”; or if project affects any intersection with current or potential LOS of D or worse
- Analysis area radius as small as 1,000 feet or as large as 10 miles
- Trips must be assigned to analysis area roadway network; emissions calculated at link level (ADT x link length x emissions factor)
- References MOBILE 4.1 emissions factors
- Results evaluated as “build” scenario compared to “no build” scenario; mitigation required if “build” case shows an increase in emissions over “no build” (“no net increase” approach)
- “All reasonable and feasible hydrocarbon reduction mitigation measures should be presented”

Challenges with existing frameworks

- Predicated on achieving incremental improvement over non-mitigated or no-build scenarios
- No standard protocol; hard to compare emissions associated with different projects
- Use of background growth rates on local roadways may mask impact of new development (esp. mesoscale analysis)
- Results don’t indicate whether project and associated mitigation are “good enough” to help meet CECP reduction targets and statutory GHG reduction goals.

Considerations for a new mobile source GHG framework

- Conversion to electric fleet fueled by renewable energy is primary CECP policy strategy for mobile source GHG reduction. However, transition to 100% EV fleet and to 100% renewable

electricity sources will take decades, especially if existing ICE vehicles stay on the road for many years. Therefore, GHG emissions per mile driven will decline with the introduction of EVs, but will do so slowly.

- Meanwhile, the amount of driving in Massachusetts continues to increase rapidly and is expected to do so in the future. Absent any major changes in land use or pricing policies, [MAPC has projected](#) that VMT for personal vehicles in the region may increase by more than 21% between 2010 and 2030, consistent with observed trends since 2010. In such a future, vehicle fuel efficiency would need to improve by at least 18% (equivalent to a fleet-wide average of 29 miles per gallon) before any net reductions in GHG are achieved. Efforts to slow or reverse the growth in VMT are essential to achieving rapid reductions in transportation-related GHG emissions.
- There are many other environmental, health, and economic reasons to address growth in VMT through the environmental permitting process: more driving requires maintenance and expansion of carbon-intensive auto infrastructure and associated heat islands from additional impervious pavement; auto-dominated landscapes diminish pedestrian safety and discourage active transportation; autos (including EVs) produce other forms of pollution, such as particulate matter from tires that can degrade air and water quality; and auto congestion is a major quality of life and economic issue in Massachusetts.
- Fortunately, broad scale changes in land use patterns can have a substantial effect on forecast growth of VMT. This is because people who live and work in transportation-efficient locations and developments tend to drive less and for shorter distances than people living and working in outlying areas. While ‘smart growth’ developments will inevitably produce some new VMT and GHG emissions, the *per capita* VMT and emissions will be less than would be expected for similar developments in less advantageous locations. As a result, comparable numbers of new homes and jobs will produce relatively less GHG emissions.
- A MEPA analysis that is focused on per-capita or per-worker VMT and GHG can help to determine if a project is helping to slow or reverse the growth of VMT, or if it is contributing to increasing rates of GHG emissions.
- For example, the average Massachusetts household drives 49 miles per day (as of 2014) and emits 0.022 tons of CO₂ equivalents in the process. Developments where future residents are likely to drive more than that are making it harder to achieve GHG reduction goals, and should be required to evaluate additional measures for minimizing impact.
- In California, a 2013 law updated the way transportation impacts are measured through the CEQA process. As described in the [guidelines for the new process](#), “to achieve the State’s long-term climate goals, California needs to reduce per capita VMT. This can occur under CEQA through VMT mitigation. Half of California’s GHG emissions come from the transportation sector therefore, reducing VMT is an effective climate strategy, which can also result in co-benefits.” As a result of this change, the CEQA process does not consider increases in auto delay or degradation of auto level of service (LOS) to be environmental impacts in and of themselves.

Conceptual framework for updated VMT/GHG analysis

Phase 1 (2022?)

1. Establish robust and practical methods for estimating project-induced VMT and GHG emissions, accounting for location, mitigation measures, and other characteristics.
2. Require project proponents to account for and report projected VMT and GHG emissions in aggregate and on a per-capita basis (or per-worker/per-delivery/etc.)

Phase 2 (future years)

3. Informed by project-based analysis and goals of future CECPs, set targets for declining per-capita VMT, including targets for new development.
4. Require proponents to estimate per-capita VMT with all proposed mitigation. Developments above per-capita targets could be required to provide additional mitigation or offsets. Review procedures could be streamlined for developments meeting or exceeding targets.

Phase 1: Estimation Tools and Reporting Requirements

- Will require new tools for standardized estimation of VMT/GHG and impacts of mitigation
- Many existing data resources and forecasting tools in Massachusetts
 - Massachusetts Vehicle Census (miles driven per passenger vehicle)
 - Statewide Travel Demand Model (CTPS)
 - Enhanced Multimodal Accessibility tool (MAPC)
 - VisionEval (FHWA, MAPC)
 - MOBILE 6.2 and MOVES (EPA)
- Models should account for
 - Project type and location
 - Resident demographics
 - Parking availability and cost
 - Project-specific trip production and distribution patterns
 - Current and anticipated transit service and nonmotorized facilities
 - Vehicle fleet mix
 - Traffic delay and congestion (and corresponding emission impacts)
 - Carbon intensity of electrical grid energy
 - Tiered analysis for projects at different scales

Next Steps

- Convene technical experts and consultants to inventory existing methods and tools
- Research protocols and tools used in other states
- Develop proposal for estimation and reporting
- Develop and publish detailed protocols and tools