APPENDIX B

CAPCOA CEQA AND CLIMATE CHANGE – EVALUATING AND ADDRESSING GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS FROM PROJECTS SUBJECT TO THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT, JANUARY 2008, APPENDIX B – MITIGATION MEASURE SUMMARY (PORTION)



Appendix B

Mitigation Measure Summary

Table 16 Mitigation Measure Summary									
Mitigation Measure	Applicable Project/Source Type ¹	Effective		Feasible	(Yes/No)	Secondary Effects (Yes/No)	Agency/Organization/Other6	Description/Comments	
		Emissions Reduction/Score ²	Cost (Yes/No) ³	Technical⁴	Logistical ⁵				
Transportation	Fransportation								
Bicycle/Pedestria	n/Transit Meas	ures							
MM T-1: Bike Parking	LD (C, M), I, SP, TP, AQP, RR, P/Mobile	1%-5%/High: CCAP presents combined % reductions for a range of mitigation measures (Dierkers et al. 2007). SMAQMD allocates combined reductions among individual measures (e.g., 2.5%	Yes: Lockers (\$1,200- \$2,950, \$700/bike on average), Racks (\$70- \$2,000, \$70/bike on average).	Yes (Caltrans 2005, Dierkers et al. 2007, VTPI 2007)	Yes (Caltrans 2005, Dierkers et al. 2007, VTPI 2007)	Adverse: No Beneficial: CAPs, TACs	Caltrans, Portland Bicycle Master Plan (City of Portland 1998), CCAP Transportation Emissions Guidebook (Dierkers et al. 2007), SMAQMD Recommended Guidance for Land Use Emission Reductions (SMAQMD	Nonresidential projects provide plentiful short- and long-term bicycle parking facilities to meet peak season maximum demand (e.g., one bike rack space per 20 vehicle/employee parking spaces.	
MM T-2: End of Trip Facilities	LD (C, M), I, SP, TP, AQP, RR, P/Mobile	reduction for all bicycle-related measures and one- quarter of 2.5% for each individual measure) (TIAX 2005, EDAW 2006, SMAQMD 2007). VTPI presents % reductions for showers - and combined	Yes	Yes (Caltrans 2005, Dierkers et al. 2007, VTPI 2007)	Yes (Caltrans 2005, Dierkers et al. 2007, VTPI 2007)	Adverse: No Beneficial: CAPs, TACs	2007), VTPI, CA air quality management and control districts, and cities/counties.	Nonresidential projects provide "end-of-trip" facilities including showers, lockers, and changing space (e.g., four clothes lockers and one shower provided for every 80 employee parking spaces, separate facilities for each gender for projects with 160 or more employee parking spaces).	
MM T-3: Bike- Parking at Multi-	LD (R, M), SP, AQP, RR,	measures in the TDM encyclopedia (VTPI	Yes: Lockers (\$1,200-	Yes (Caltrans 2005,	Yes (Caltrans	Adverse: No Beneficial:	-	Long-term bicycle parking is provided at apartment	

Table 16 Mitigation Measure Summary									
Mitigation Measure	Applicable Project/Source Type ¹	Effectiv	e	Feasible (Yes/No)		Secondary Effects (Yes/No)	Agency/Organization/Other6	Description/Comments	
		Emissions Reduction/Score ²	Cost (Yes/No) ³	Technical ⁴	Logistical ⁵				
Unit Residential	P/Mobile	2007). JSA bases estimates on CCAP information (JSA 2004).	\$2,950, \$700/bike on average), Racks (\$70- \$2,000, \$70/bike on average).	Dierkers et al. 2007, VTPI 2007)	2005, Dierkers et al. 2007, VTPI 2007)	CAPs, TACs		complexes or condominiums without garages (e.g., one long- term bicycle parking space for each unit without a garage). Long-term facilities shall consist of one of the following: a bicycle locker, a locked room with standard racks and access limited to bicyclists only, or a standard rack in a location that is staffed and/or monitored by video surveillance 24 hours per day.	
MM T-4: Proximity to Bike Path/Bike Lanes	LD (R, C, M), I, SP, TP, AQP, RR, P/Mobile		Yes	Yes (Caltrans 2005, Dierkers et al. 2007, VTPI 2007)	Yes (Caltrans 2005, Dierkers et al. 2007, VTPI 2007)	Adverse: No Beneficial: CAPs, TACs		Entire project is located within one-half mile of an existing/planned Class I or Class II bike lane and project design includes a comparable network that connects the project uses to the existing offsite facility. Project design includes a designated bicycle route connecting all units, on- site bicycle parking facilities, offsite bicycle facilities, site entrances, and primary building entrances to existing Class I or Class II bike lane(s) within one- half mile. Bicycle route connects to all streets contiguous with project site. Bicycle route has minimum conflicts with automobile parking and circulation	

Table 16 Mitigation Measure Summary										
Mitigation Measure	Applicable Project/Source Type ¹	Effectiv	re	Feasible	(Yes/No)	Secondary Effects (Yes/No)	Agency/Organization/Other	Description/Comments		
	_	Emissions Reduction/Score ²	Cost (Yes/No) ³	Technical ⁴	Logistical ⁵					
								facilities. All streets internal to the project wider than 75 feet have Class II bicycle lanes on both sides.		

Table 16 Mitigation Measure Summary									
Mitigation Measure	Applicable Project/Source Type ¹	cable Effective /Source pe ¹		Feasible (Yes/No)		Secondary Effects (Yes/No)	Agency/Organization/Other6	Description/Comments	
		Emissions Reduction/Score ²	Cost (Yes/No) ³	Technical⁴	Logistical ⁵				
MM T-5: Pedestrian Network	LD (R, C, M), I, SP, TP, AQP, RR, P/Mobile	1%-10%/High: CCAP presents combined % reductions for a range of mitigation measures (Dierkers et al. 2007). SMAQMD allocates 1% for each individual measure (TIAX 2005, EDAW 2006, SMAQMD 2007).	Yes	Yes (Dierkers et al. 2007, VTPI 2007)	Yes (Dierkers et al. 2007, VTPI 2007)	Adverse: No Beneficial: CAPs, TACs	CCAP Transportation Emissions Guidebook (Dierkers et al. 2007), SMAQMD Recommended Guidance for Land Use Emission Reductions (SMAQMD 2007), VTPI, CA air quality management and control districts, and cities/counties.	The project provides a pedestrian access network that internally links all uses and connects to all existing/planned external streets and pedestrian facilities contiguous with the project site. Project design includes a designated pedestrian route interconnecting all internal uses, site entrances, primary building entrances, public facilities, and adjacent uses to existing external pedestrian facilities and streets. Route has minimal conflict with parking and automobile circulation facilities. Streets (with the exception of alleys) within the project have sidewalks on both sides. All sidewalks internal and adjacent to project site are minimum of five feet wide. All sidewalks feature vertical curbs. Pedestrian facilities and improvements such as grade separation, wider sidewalks, and traffic calming are implemented wherever feasible to minimize pedestrian barriers. All site entrances provide pedestrian access.	
MM T-6: Pedestrian	LD (R, C, M), I, SP, TP,		Yes	Yes (Dierkers et al. 2007,	Yes (Dierkers et	Adverse: No Beneficial:		Site design and building placement minimize barriers to	

	Table 16 Mitigation Measure Summary									
Mitigation Measure	Applicable Project/Source Type ¹	Effective		Feasible	Feasible (Yes/No)		Agency/Organization/Other6	Description/Comments		
		Emissions Reduction/Score ²	Cost (Yes/No) ³	Technical ⁴	Logistical ⁵					
Barriers Minimized	AQP, RR, P/Mobile			VTPI 2007)	al. 2007, VTPI 2007)	CAPs, TACs		pedestrian access and interconnectivity. Physical barriers such as walls, berms, landscaping, and slopes between residential and nonresidential uses that impede bicycle or pedestrian circulation are eliminated.		
MM T-7: Bus Shelter for Existing/Planned Transit Service	LD (R, C, M), I, SP, TP, AQP, RR, P/Mobile	1%-2%/High: CCAP presents these % reductions (Dierkers et al., 2007). SMAQMD assigns from .25%-1%, depending on headway frequency (TIAX 2005, EDAW 2006, SMAQMD 2007).	Yes: \$15,000- \$70,000.	Yes (Dierkers et al. 2007, VTPI 2007)	Yes (Dierkers et al. 2007, VTPI 2007)	Adverse: No Beneficial: CAPs, TACs	CCAP Transportation Emissions Guidebook (Dierkers et al. 2007), SMAQMD Recommended Guidance for Land Use Emission Reductions (SMAQMD 2007), VTPI, City of Calgary (City of Calgary 2004), CA air quality management and control districts, and cities/counties.	Bus or streetcar service provides headways of one hour or less for stops within one-quarter mile; project provides safe and convenient bicycle/pedestrian access to transit stop(s) and provides essential transit stop improvements (i.e., shelters, route information, benches, and lighting).		

Table 16 Mitigation Measure Summary									
Mitigation Measure	Applicable Project/Source Type ¹	Effective	3	Feasible	Feasible (Yes/No)		Agency/Organization/Other6	Description/Comments	
		Emissions Reduction/Score ²	Cost (Yes/No) ³	Technical ⁴	Logistical ⁵				
MM T-8: Traffic Calming	LD (R, C, M), I, SP, TP, AQP, RR, P/Mobile	1%-10%/High: CCAP presents combined % reductions for a range of mitigation measures (Dierkers et al. 2007). SMAQMD allocates .25%-1.0% for each individual measure depending on percent of intersections and streets with improvements (TIAX 2005, EDAW 2006, SMAQMD 2007).	Yes	Yes (Dierkers et al. 2007, VTPI 2007)	Yes (Dierkers et al. 2007, VTPI 2007)	Adverse: No Beneficial: CAPs, TACs	CCAP Transportation Emissions Guidebook (Dierkers et al. 2007), SMAQMD Recommended Guidance for Land Use Emission Reductions (SMAQMD 2007), VTPI, CA air quality management and control districts, and cities/counties.	Project design includes pedestrian/bicycle safety and traffic calming measures in excess of jurisdiction requirements. Roadways are designed to reduce motor vehicle speeds and encourage pedestrian and bicycle trips by featuring traffic calming features. All sidewalks internal and adjacent to project site are minimum of five feet wide. All sidewalks feature vertical curbs. Roadways that converge internally within the project are routed in such a way as to avoid "skewed intersections;" which are intersections that meet at acute, rather than right, angles. Intersections internal and adjacent to the project feature one or more of the following pedestrian safety/traffic calming design techniques: marked crosswalks, count-down signal timers, curb extensions, speed tables, raised crosswalks, raised intersections, median islands, tight corner radii, and roundabouts or mini-circles. Streets internal and adjacent to the project feature pedestrian safety/traffic calming measures such as on-street parking, planter strips with street trees,	

Table 16 Mitigation Measure Summary									
Mitigation Measure	tion Applicable Effective ure Project/Source Type ¹		Feasible	(Yes/No)	Secondary Effects (Yes/No)	Secondary Agency/Organization/Other ⁶ Description Effects (Yes/No)			
		Emissions Reduction/Score ²	Cost (Yes/No) ³	Technical ⁴	Logistical ⁵				
								and chicanes/chokers (variations in road width to discourage high-speed travel).	
Parking Measure	S								
MM T-9: Paid Parking (Parking Cash Out)	LD (C, M), I, SP, TP, AQP, RR, P/Mobile	1%-30%/High: CCAP presents a range of 15%-30% reduction for parking programs (Dierkers et al. 2007). SMAQMD presents a range of 1.0%-7.2%, depending on cost/day and distance to transit (TIAX 2005, EDAW 2006, SMAQMD 2007). Shoupe presents a 21% reduction [\$5/day for commuters to downtown LA, with elasticity of -0.18 (e.g., if price increases 10%, then solo driving goes down by 1.8% more)] (Shoupe 2005). Urban Transit Institute	Yes: Vary by location and project size.	Yes (Dierkers et al. 2007, VTPI 2007)	Yes (Dierkers et al. 2007, VTPI 2007)	Adverse: No Beneficial: CAPs, TACs	CCAP Transportation Emissions Guidebook (Dierkers et al. 2007), SMAQMD Recommended Guidance for Land Use Emission Reductions (SMAQMD 2007), VTPI, CA air quality management and control districts, and cities/counties.	Project provides employee and/or customer paid parking system. Project must have a permanent and enforceable method of maintaining user fees for all parking facilities. The facility may not provide customer or employee validations. Daily charge for parking must be equal to or greater than the cost of a transit day/monthly pass plus 20%.	

Table 16 Mitigation Measure Summary									
Mitigation Measure	Applicable Project/Source Type ¹	Effective		Feasible (Yes/No)		Secondary Effects (Yes/No)	Agency/Organization/Other6	Description/Comments	
		Emissions Reduction/Score ²	Cost (Yes/No) ³	Technical ⁴	Logistical ⁵				
		presents a range of 1%-10% reduction in trips to central city sites, and 2%-4% in suburban sites (VTPI 2007).							
MM T-10: Minimum Parking	LD (R, C, M), I, SP, TP, AQP, RR, P/Mobile	1%-30%/High: CCAP presents a range of 15%-30% reduction for parking programs (Dierkers et al. 2007). SMAQMD presents a maximum of 6% (Nelson/Nygaard Consulting Associates, 2005, TIAX 2005, EDAW 2006).	Yes	Yes (Dierkers et al. 2007, VTPI 2007)	Yes (Dierkers et al. 2007, VTPI 2007), Note that in certain areas of the state, the minimum parking required by code is greater than the peak period parking demand for most land uses. Simply meeting minimum code requirements in these areas would not result in an emissions reduction.	Adverse: No Beneficial: CAPs, TACs	CCAP Transportation Emissions Guidebook (Dierkers et al. 2007), SMAQMD Recommended Guidance for Land Use Emission Reductions (SMAQMD 2007), VTPI, Governor's Office of Smart Growth (Annapolis, Maryland) (Zimbler), CA air quality management and control districts, and cities/counties.	Provide minimum amount of parking required. Once land uses are determined, the trip reduction factor associated with this measure can be determined by utilizing the ITE parking generation publication. The reduction in trips can be computed as shown below by the ratio of the difference of minimum parking required by code and ITE peak parking demand to ITE peak parking demand for the land uses multiplied by 50%. Percent Trip Reduction = 50 * [(min parking required by code – ITE peak parking demand)/ (ITE peak parking demand)]	

	Table 16 Mitigation Measure Summary									
Mitigation Measure	gation Applicable Effective asure Project/Source Type ¹		<u>;</u>	Feasible	(Yes/No)	Secondary Effects (Yes/No)	Agency/Organization/Other6	Description/Comments		
		Emissions Reduction/Score ²	Cost (Yes/No) ³	Technical⁴	Logistical ⁵					
MM T-11: Parking Reduction Beyond Code/Shared Parking	LD (R, C, M), I, SP, TP, AQP, RR, P/Mobile	1%-30%/High: CCAP presents a range of 15%-30% reduction for parking programs (Dierkers et al. 2007). SMAQMD presents a maximum of 12% (Nelson/Nygaard, 2005, TIAX 2005, EDAW 2006).	Yes	Yes (Dierkers et al. 2007, VTPI 2007)	Yes (Dierkers et al. 2007, VTPI 2007)	Adverse: No Beneficial: CAPs, TACs		Provide parking reduction less than code. This measure can be readily implemented through a shared parking strategy, wherein parking is utilized jointly among different land uses, buildings, and facilities in an area that experience peak parking needs at different times of day and day of the week.		
MM T-12: Pedestrian Pathway Through Parking	LD (R, C, M), I, SP, TP, AQP, RR, P/Mobile	1%-4%/Moderate: CCAP presents combined % reductions for a range of mitigation measures (Dierkers et al. 2007). SMAQMD allocates 0.5% reduction for this measure (TIAX 2005, EDAW 2006, SMAQMD 2007).	Yes	Yes (Dierkers et al. 2007, VTPI 2007)	Yes (Dierkers et al. 2007, VTPI 2007)	Adverse: No Beneficial: CAPs, TACs	_	Provide a parking lot design that includes clearly marked and shaded pedestrian pathways between transit facilities and building entrances.		

Table 16 Mitigation Measure Summary									
Mitigation Measure	Applicable Project/Source Type ¹	Effective		Feasible	Feasible (Yes/No)		Agency/Organization/Other6	Description/Comments	
		Emissions Reduction/Score ²	Cost (Yes/No) ³	Technical ⁴	Logistical ⁵				
MM T-13: Off - Street Parking	LD (R, C, M), I, SP, TP, AQP, RR, P/Mobile	1%-4%/Moderate: CCAP presents combined % reductions for a range of mitigation measures (Dierkers et al. 2007). SMAQMD allocates a range of 0.1%-1.5% for this measure (TIAX 2005, EDAW 2006, SMAQMD 2007).	Yes	Yes (Dierkers et al. 2007, VTPI 2007)	Yes (Dierkers et al. 2007, VTPI 2007)	Adverse: No Beneficial: CAPs, TACs		Parking facilities are not adjacent to street frontage.	
MM T-14: Parking Area Tree Cover	LD (R, C, M), I, SP, TP, AQP, RR, P/Mobile	Annual net CO ₂ reduction of 3.1 kg/m ² canopy cover/Moderate (McPherson 2001).	Yes: \$19 per new tree for CA, cost varies for maintenance, removal and replacement (McPherson 2001).	Yes	Yes	Adverse: VOCs Beneficial: CAPs, TACs	AG, State of CA Department of Justice (Goldberg 2007) and cities/counties (e.g., parking lot ordinances in Sacramento, Davis, and Los Angeles, CA).	Provide parking lot areas with 50% tree cover within 10 years of construction, in particular low emitting, low maintenance, native drought resistant trees. Reduces urban heat island effect and requirement for air conditioning, effective when combined with other measures (e.g., electrical maintenance equipment and reflective paving material).	
MM T-15: Valet Bicycle Parking	LD (C, M), SP, AQP, TP, RR, P/Mobile	NA/Low	Yes	Yes	Yes: Raley Field (Sacramento, CA)	Adverse: No Beneficial: CAPs, TACs	Raley Field (Sacramento, CA).	Provide spaces for the operation of valet bicycle parking at community event "centers" such as amphitheaters, theaters, and stadiums.	
MM T-16: Garage Bicycle Storage	LD (R, M), SP, AQP, TP, RR, P/Mobile	NA/Low	Yes: Less than \$200/multiple bike rack.	Yes	Yes	Adverse: No Beneficial: CAPs, TACs	City of Fairview, OR	Provide storage space in one-car garages for bicycles and bicycle trailers.	

Table 16 Mitigation Measure Summary									
Mitigation Measure	Applicable Project/Source Type ¹	Effective		Feasible (Yes/No) Secor Effe (Yes		Secondary Effects (Yes/No)	Agency/Organization/Other6	Description/Comments	
		Emissions Reduction/Score ²	Cost (Yes/No) ³	Technical ⁴	Logistical ⁵				
MM T-17: Preferential Parking for EVs/CNG Vehicles	LD (C, M), I, SP, TP, AQP, RR, P/Mobile	NA/Low	Yes	Yes	Yes	Adverse: No Beneficial: CAPs, TACs	USGBC, CA air quality management and control districts and cities/counties (e.g., BAAQMD).	Provide preferential parking space locations for EVs/CNG vehicles.	
MM T-18: Reduced/No Parking Fee for EVs/CNG Vehicles	LD (C, M), I, SP, TP, AQP, RR, P/Mobile	NA/Low	Yes	Yes	Yes	Adverse: No Beneficial: CAPs, TACs	Hotels (e.g., Argonaut in San Francisco, CA)	Provide a reduced/no parking fee for EVs/CNG vehicles.	

	Table 16 Mitigation Measure Summary									
Mitigation Measure	Applicable Project/Source Type ¹	Effective		Feasible (Yes/No)		Secondary Effects (Yes/No)	Agency/Organization/Other6	Description/Comments		
		Emissions Reduction/Score ²	Cost (Yes/No) ³	Technical⁴	Logistical ⁵					
Miscellaneous Measure										
MM T-19: TMA Membership	LD (R, C, M), I, SP, TP, AQP, RR, P/Mobile	1%-28%/High: CCAP presents a range of 3%-25% for TDMs with complementary transit and land use measures (Dierkers et al. 2007). VTPI presents a range of 6%-7% in the TDM encyclopedia (VTPI 2007). URBEMIS offers a 2%-10% range in reductions for a TDM that has 5 elements that are pedestrian and transit friendly and 1%-5% for 3 elements. SMAQMD presents a reduction of 5% (TIAX 2005, EDAW 2006, SMAQMD 2007).	Yes	Yes (Dierkers et al. 2007, VTPI 2007)	Yes (Dierkers et al. 2007, VTPI 2007)	Adverse: No Beneficial: CAPs, TACs	CA air quality management and control districts and cities/counties (e.g., SMAQMD).	Include permanent TMA membership and funding requirement. Funding to be provided by Community Facilities District or County Service Area or other nonrevocable funding mechanism. TDMs have been shown to reduce employee vehicle trips up to 28% with the largest reductions achieved through parking pricing and transit passes. The impact depends on the travel alternatives.		
MM T-20: ULEV	LD (R, C, M), I, SP, TP, AQP, RR, P/Mobile	NA/Low	Yes: Higher than corresponding gasoline models.	Yes	Yes: Fueling stations might not be readily available depending on location. More than 900 E85 fueling	Adverse: No Beneficial: CAPs, TACs	DGS, CA air quality management and control districts and cities/counties (e.g., SMAQMD).	Use of and/or provide ULEV that are 50% cleaner than average new model cars (e.g., natural gas, ethanol, electric).		

Table 16 Mitigation Measure Summary										
Mitigation Measure	Applicable Project/Source Type ¹	Effective		Feasible	e (Yes/No)	Secondary Effects (Yes/No)	Agency/Organization/Other6	Description/Comments		
		Emissions Reduction/Score ²	Cost (Yes/No) ³	Technical ⁴	Logistical ⁵					
					stations in the U.S., 5 in CA. Vehicles available in select regions only					
MM T-21: Flex Fuel Vehicles	LD (R, C, M), I, SP, TP, AQP, RR, P/Mobile	5466.97 lb GHG/year/Low (DOE Fuel Economy)	Yes: E85 costs less than gasoline per gallon, but results in lower fuel economy.	Yes	Yes: More than 900 E85 fueling stations in the U.S., 5 in CA. Vehicles available in select regions only	Adverse: Yes Issues with the energy intensive ethanol production process (e.g., wastewater treatment requirements). Beneficial: CAPs, TACs	DGS, CA air quality management and control districts and cities/counties (e.g., SJVAPCD).	Use of and/or provide vehicles that utilize gasoline/ethanol blends (e.g., E85).		
Design	Design									
Commercial & R	Commercial & Residential Building Design Measures									
MM D-1: Office/Mixed Use Density	LD (C, M), SP, TP, AQP, RR, P/Mobile	0.05%-2%/Moderate: This range is from SMAQMD, depending	Yes	Yes (VTPI 2007)	Yes (VTPI 2007)	Adverse: No Beneficial: CAPs, TACs	CA air quality management and control districts and cities/counties	Project provides high density office or mixed-use proximate to transit. Project must provide		

Table 16 Mitigation Measure Summary									
Mitigation Measure	Applicable Project/Source Type ¹	Effective		Feasible	Feasible (Yes/No)		Agency/Organization/Other6	Description/Comments	
		Emissions Reduction/Score ²	Cost (Yes/No) ³	Technical ⁴	Logistical ⁵				
		on FAR and headway frequencies (Nelson/Nygaard Consulting Associates 2005, EDAW 2006, SMAQMD 2007).					(e.g., SMAQMD).	safe and convenient pedestrian and bicycle access to all transit stops within one-quarter mile.	
MM D-2: Orientation to Existing/Planned Transit, Bikeway, or Pedestrian Corridor	LD (R, C, M), I, SP, TP, AQP, RR, P/Mobile	0.4%-1%/Moderate: CCAP attributes a 0.5% reduction per 1% improvement in transit frequency (Dierkers et al. 2007). SMAQMD presents a range of 0.25%-5% (JSA 2005, EDAW 2006, SMAQMD 2007).	Yes	Yes (Dierkers et al. 2007)	Yes (Dierkers et al. 2007)	Adverse: No Beneficial: CAPs, TACs	CA air quality management and control districts and cities/counties (e.g., SMAQMD).	Project is oriented towards existing transit, bicycle, or pedestrian corridor. Setback distance between project and existing or planned adjacent uses is minimized or nonexistent. Setback distance between different buildings on project site is minimized. Setbacks between project buildings and planned or existing sidewalks are minimized. Buildings are oriented towards existing or planned street frontage. Primary entrances to buildings are located along planned or existing public street frontage. Project provides bicycle access to any planned bicycle corridor(s). Project provides pedestrian access to any planned pedestrian corridor(s).	
MM D-3: Services Operational	LD (R, C, M), I, SP, TP, AQP, RR, P/Mobile	0.5%-5%/Moderate	Yes	Yes	Yes	Adverse: No Beneficial: CAPs, TACs	CA air quality management and control districts and cities/counties (e.g., SMAQMD).	Project provides on-site shops and services for employees.	

Table 16 Mitigation Measure Summary									
Mitigation Measure	Applicable Project/Source Type ¹	Effective		Feasible	(Yes/No)	Secondary Effects (Yes/No)	Agency/Organization/Other6	Description/Comments	
		Emissions Reduction/Score ²	Cost (Yes/No) ³	Technical ^₄	Logistical ⁵				
MM D-4: Residential Density (Employ Sufficient Density for New Residential Development to Support the Use of Public Transit)	LD (R, M), SP, TP, AQP, RR, P/Mobile	1%-40%/High: #7, EPA presents a range of 32%-40% (EPA 2006). SMAQMD presents a range of 1%-12% depending on density and headway frequencies (Nelson/Nygaard Consulting Associates 2005, JSA 2005, EDAW 2006, SMAQMD 2007). Nelson/Nygaard presents a trip reduction formula: Trip Reduction = 0.6*(1- (19749*((4.814+ households per residential acre)/(4.814+7.14))^- 06.39)/25914).	Yes	Yes (VTPI 2007, Holtzclaw 2007)	Yes (VTPI 2007, Holtzclaw 2007)	Adverse: No Beneficial: CAPs, TACs	CA air quality management and control districts and cities/counties (e.g., SMAQMD).	Project provides high-density residential development. Transit facilities must be within one- quarter mile of project border. Project provides safe and convenient bicycle/pedestrian access to all transit stop(s) within one-quarter mile of project border.	
MM D-5: Street Grid	LD (R, C, M), I, SP, TP, AQP, RR,	1%/Moderate: SMAQMD presents this % reduction (JSA	Yes	Yes (Dierkers et al. 2007, VTPI 2007)	Yes (Dierkers et al. 2007,	Adverse: No Beneficial: CAPs, TACs	CA air quality management and control districts and cities/counties	Multiple and direct street routing (grid style). This measure only applies to projects	

Table 16 Mitigation Measure Summary									
Mitigation Measure	Applicable Project/Source Type ¹	e Effective rce		Feasible	(Yes/No)	Secondary Effects (Yes/No)	Agency/Organization/Other6	Description/Comments	
		Emissions Reduction/Score ²	Cost (Yes/No) ³	Technical ⁴	Logistical ⁵				
	P/Mobile	2005, EDAW 2006, SMAQMD 2007).			VTPI 2007)		(e.g., SMAQMD).	with an internal CF >/= 0.80, and average of one-quarter mile or less between external connections along perimeter of project. [CF= # of intersections / (# of cul-de-sacs + intersections)]. Cul-de-sacs with bicycle/pedestrian through access may be considered "complete intersections" when calculating the project's internal connectivity factor. External connections are bike/pedestrian pathways and access points, or streets with safe and convenient bicycle and pedestrian access that connect the project to adjacent streets, sidewalks, and uses. If project site is adjacent to undeveloped land; streets, pathways, access points, and right-of-ways that provide for future access to adjacent uses may count for up to 50% of the external connections. Block perimeter (the sum of the measurement of the length of all block sides) is limited to no more than 1,350 feet. Streets internal to the project should connect to streets external to the project whenever possible.	

	Table 16 Mitigation Measure Summary									
Mitigation Measure	Applicable Project/Source Type ¹	Effective		Feasible	(Yes/No)	Secondary Effects (Yes/No)	Agency/Organization/Other6	Description/Comments		
		Emissions Reduction/Score ²	Cost (Yes/No) ³	Technical ⁴	Logistical ⁵					
MM D-6: NEV Access	LD (R, C, M), SP, TP, AQP, RR, P/Mobile	0.5%-1.5%/Low: SMAQMD presents this % reduction (EDAW 2006, SMAQMD 2007).	Yes	Yes (Litman 1999, Sperling 1994)	Yes (Litman 1999, Sperling 1994)	Adverse: No Beneficial: CAPs, TACs	CA air quality management and control districts and cities/counties (e.g., SMAQMD).	Make physical development consistent with requirements for neighborhood electric vehicles. Current studies show that for most trips, NEVs do not replace gas-fueled vehicles as the primary vehicle.		
MM D-7: Affordable Housing Component	LD (R, M), SP, TP, AQP, RR, P/Mobile	0.4%-6%/Moderate: SMAQMD presents this % reduction (Nelson/Nygaard Consulting Associates 2005, EDAW 2006, SMAQMD 2007).	Yes	Yes	Yes	Adverse: No Beneficial: CAPs, TACs	CA air quality management and control districts and cities/counties (e.g., SMAQMD).	Residential development projects of five or more dwelling units provide a deed- restricted low-income housing component on-site (or as defined in the code). Developers who pay into In-Lieu Fee Programs are not considered eligible to receive credit for this measure. The award of emission reduction credit shall be based only on the proportion of affordable housing developed on-site because in-lieu programs simply induce a net increase in development. Percentage reduction shall be calculated according to the following formula:		

Table 16 Mitigation Measure Summary										
Mitigation Measure	Applicable Project/Source Type ¹	Effectiv	e	Feasible	e (Yes/No)	Secondary Effects (Yes/No)	Agency/Organization/Other6	Description/Comments		
		Emissions Reduction/Score ²	Cost (Yes/No) ³	Technical ⁴	Logistical ^₅					
								% reduction = % units deed- restricted below market rate housing * 0.04		
MM D-8: Recharging Area	LD (R, M), SP, TP, AQP, RR, P/Mobile	NA/Low	Yes	Yes	Yes	Adverse: No Beneficial: CAPs, TACs		Provide residential buildings with a "utility" room or space for recharging batteries, whether for use in a car, electric lawnmower, other electric landscaping equipment, or even batteries for small items such as flashlights.		
Mixed-Use Develo	opment Measur	es								
MM D-9: Urban Mixed-Use	LD (M), SP, TP, AQP, RR, P/Mobile	3%-9%/Moderate: SMAQMD presents this % reduction (TIAX 2005, EDAW 2006, SMAQMD 2007).	Yes	Yes (EPA 2006)	Yes (EPA 2006)	Adverse: No Beneficial: CAPs, TACs	CA air quality management and control districts and cities/counties (e.g., SMAQMD).	Development of projects 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.		
MM D-10: Suburban Mixed- Use	LD (R, C, M), I, SP, TP, AQP, RR, P/Mobile	3%/Moderate: SMAQMD presents this % reduction (TIAX 2005, EDAW 2006, SMAQMD 2007).	Yes	Yes (EPA 2006)	Yes (EPA 2006)	Adverse: No Beneficial: CAPs, TACs	CA air quality management and control districts and cities/counties (e.g., SMAQMD).	Have at least three of the following on site and/or offsite within one-quarter mile: Residential Development, Retail Development, Park, Open Space, or Office.		
MM D-11: Other Mixed-Use	LD (R, M), SP, TP, AQP, RR, P/Mobile	1%/Moderate: SMAQMD presents this % reduction (TIAX 2005, EDAW	Yes	Yes (EPA 2006)	Yes (EPA 2006)	Adverse: No Beneficial: CAPs, TACs	CA air quality management and control districts and cities/counties (e.g., SMAQMD).	All residential units are within one-quarter mile of parks, schools or other civic uses.		

	Table 16 Mitigation Measure Summary										
Mitigation Measure	Applicable Project/Source Type ¹	Effective		Feasible (Yes/No)		Secondary Effects (Yes/No)	Agency/Organization/Other	Description/Comments			
		Emissions Reduction/Score ²	Cost (Yes/No) ³	Technical⁴	Logistical ⁵						
		2006, SMAQMD 2007).									
MM D-12: Infill Development	LD (R, C, M), I, SP, TP, AQP, RR, P/Mobile	3%-30%/High: Infill development reduces vehicle trips and VMT by 3% and 20%, respectively (Fehr & Peers 2007). CCAP identifies a site level VMT reduction range of 20%-30% (Dierkers et al. 2007).	Yes	Yes (Dierkers et al. 2007)	Yes (Dierkers et al. 2007)	Adverse: No Beneficial: CAPs, TACs	CA air quality management and control districts and cities/counties (e.g., SMAQMD).	Project site is on a vacant infill site, redevelopment area, or brownfield or greyfield lot that is highly accessible to regional destinations, where the destinations rating of the development site (measured as the weighted average travel time to all other regional destinations) is improved by 100% when compared to an alternate greenfield site.			
Miscellaneous M	easures										
MM D-13: Electric Lawnmower	LD (R, M), SP, AQP, RR, P/Area	1%/Low: SMAQMD presents this % reduction (EDAW 2006, SMAQMD 2007).	Yes	Yes	Yes	Adverse: No Beneficial: CAPs, TACs	CA air quality management and control districts and cities/counties (e.g., SMAQMD).	Provide a complimentary electric lawnmower to each residential buyer.			

	Table 16 Mitigation Measure Summary									
Mitigation Measure	Applicable Project/Source Type ¹	Effective		Feasible	e (Yes/No)	Secondary Effects (Yes/No)	Agency/Organization/Other6	Description/Comments		
		Emissions Reduction/Score ²	Cost (Yes/No) ³	Technical ⁴	Logistical ⁵					
MM D-14: Enhanced Recycling/Waste Reduction, Reuse, Composting	LD (R, C, M), I, SP, AQP, RR, P/Stationary & Area	NA/Low	Yes	Yes	Yes: Association with social awareness.	Adverse: No Beneficial: CAPs, TACs	CIWMB	Provide infrastructure/education that promotes the avoidance of products with excessive packaging, recycle, buying of refills, separating of food and yard waste for composting, and using rechargeable batteries.		
MM D-15: LEED Certification	LD (R, C, M), I, SP, AQP, RR, P/Stationary & Area	NA/Moderate	Yes: Receive tax rebates, incentives (e.g., EDAW San Diego office interior remodel cost \$1,700,000 for 32,500 square feet) (USGBC 2007)	Yes	Yes: More than 700 buildings of different certifications in CA (USGBC 2007).	Adverse: No Beneficial: CAPs, TACs	USGBC, CA air quality management and control districts and cities/counties (e.g., BAAQMD).	LEED promotes a whole- building approach to sustainability by recognizing performance in five key areas of human and environmental health: sustainable site development, water savings, energy efficiency, materials selection, and indoor environmental quality.		
MM D-16: Retro- Commissioning	LD (C, M), I, SP, AQP, RR, P/Stationary & Area	8%-10% reduction in energy usage/Moderate: (Mills et al. 2004)	Yes: Average \$0.28/square feet, varies with building size (Haasl and Sharp 1999).	Yes	Yes: 27 projects underway in CA, 21 more to be completed in 2007, mostly state buildings owned by DGS (DGS 2007).	Adverse: No Beneficial: CAPs, TACs	DGS, CA air quality management and control districts and cities/counties (e.g., BAAQMD).	The process ensures that all building systems perform interactively according to the contract documents, the design intent and the owner's operational needs to optimize energy performance.		
MM D-17 Landscaping	LD (R, C, M), I, SP, AQP, RR,	NA/Low	Yes	Yes	Yes	Adverse: No Beneficial: CAPs, TACs	Alliance for the Chesapeake Bay, EPA Green Landscaping	Project shall use drought resistant native trees, trees with low emissions and high carbon		

	Table 16 Mitigation Measure Summary									
Mitigation Measure	Applicable Project/Source Type ¹	Effective		Feasible (Yes/No)		Secondary Effects (Yes/No)	Agency/Organization/Other6	Description/Comments		
		Emissions Reduction/Score ²	Cost (Yes/No) ³	Technical ^₄	Logistical⁵					
	P/Stationary & Area						Resources	sequestration potential. Evergreen trees on the north and west sides afford the best protection from the setting summer sun and cold winter winds. Additional considerations include the use of deciduous trees on the south side of the house that will admit summer sun; evergreen plantings on the north side will slow cold winter winds; constructing a natural planted channel to funnel summer cooling breezes into the house. Neighborhood CCR's not requiring that front and side yards of single family homes be planted with turf grass. Vegetable gardens, bunch grass, and low-water landscaping shall also be permitted, or even encouraged.		
MM D-18: Local Farmers' Market	LD (M), SP/Mobile, Stationary, &	NA/Low	Yes	Yes	Yes: Associated with social	Adverse: No Beneficial: CAPs, TACs	Cities/counties (e.g., Davis, Sacramento)	Project shall dedicate space in a centralized, accessible location for a weekly farmers' market.		

Table 16 Mitigation Measure Summary									
Mitigation Measure	Applicable Project/Source Type ¹	Effective		Feasible (Yes/No)		Secondary Effects (Yes/No)	Agency/Organization/Other6	Description/Comments	
		Emissions Reduction/Score ²	Cost (Yes/No) ³	Technical ^₄	Logistical ^₅				
	Area				choice and public awareness.				
MM D-19: Community Gardens	LD (M), SP/Mobile, Stationary, & Area	NA/Low	Yes	Yes	Yes: Associated with social choice and public awareness.	Adverse: No Beneficial: CAPs, TACs	Cities/counties (e.g., Davis)	Project shall dedicate space for community gardens.	
Energy Efficien	cy/Building C	component							
MM E-1: High- Efficiency Pumps	LD (R, C, M), SP, AQP, RR, P/Stationary & Area	NA/Low	Yes	Yes	Yes	Adverse: No Beneficial: CAPs, TACs	CA air quality management and control districts and cities/counties (e.g., BAAQMD).	Project shall use high-efficiency pumps.	
MM E-2: Wood Burning Fireplaces/Stoves	LD (R, M), SP, AQP, RR, P/Stationary & Area	NA/Low: EDAW 2006	Yes	Yes	Yes	Adverse: No Beneficial: CAPs, TACs	CA air quality management and control districts and cities/counties (e.g., SMAQMD).	Project does not feature fireplaces or wood burning stoves.	
MM E-3: Natural Gas Stove	LD (R, M), SP, AQP, RR, P/Stationary & Area	NA/Low: EDAW 2006	Yes: Cost of stove—\$350 (gas) and \$360 (electric) same brand, total yearly cost of \$42.17 as opposed to \$56.65 for electric (Saving Electricity 2006).	Yes	Yes	Adverse: No Beneficial: CAPs, TACs	CA air quality management and control districts and cities/counties (e.g., SMAQMD).	Project features only natural gas or electric stoves in residences.	

	Table 16 Mitigation Measure Summary									
Mitigation Measure	Applicable Project/Source Type ¹	Effective		Feasible	Feasible (Yes/No)		Agency/Organization/Other6	Description/Comments		
		Emissions Reduction/Score ²	Cost (Yes/No) ³	Technical ⁴	Logistical ⁵					
MM E-4: Energy Star Roof	LD (R, C, M), I, SP, AQP, RR, P/Stationary & Area	0.5%-1%/Low: SMAQMD presents this % reduction (EDAW 2006, SMAQMD 2007).	Yes	Yes	Yes: 866 Energy Star labeled buildings in California (Energy Star 2007)	Adverse: No Beneficial: CAPs, TACs	CA air quality management and control districts and cities/counties (e.g., SMAQMD).	Project installs Energy Star labeled roof materials.		
MM E-5: On- site Renewable Energy System	LD (R, C, M), I, SP, AQP, RR, P/Stationary & Area	1%-3%/Moderate: SMAQMD presents this % reduction (USGBC 2002 and 2005, EDAW 2006, SMAQMD 2007).	Yes	Yes (USGBC 2002 and 2005)	Yes (USGBC 2002 and 2005)	Adverse: No Beneficial: CAPs, TACs	CA air quality management and control districts and cities/counties (e.g., SMAQMD).	Project provides onsite renewable energy system(s). Nonpolluting and renewable energy potential includes solar, wind, geothermal, low-impact hydro, biomass and bio-gas strategies. When applying these strategies, projects may take advantage of net metering with the local utility.		

	Table 16 Mitigation Measure Summary									
Mitigation Measure	Applicable Project/Source Type ¹	Effective		Feasible (Yes/No)		Secondary Effects (Yes/No)	Agency/Organization/Other6	Description/Comments		
		Emissions Reduction/Score ²	Cost (Yes/No) ³	Technical ⁴	Logistical ^₅					
MM E-6: Exceed Title 24	LD (R, C, M), I, GSP, AQP, RR, P/Stationary & Area	1%/Moderate: SMAQMD presents this % reduction (EDAW 2006, SMAQMD 2007).	Yes	Yes (PG&E 2002, SMUD 2006)	Yes (PG&E 2002, SMUD 2006)	Adverse: No Beneficial: CAPs, TACs	PG&E, SMUD, CA air quality management and control districts and cities/counties (e.g., SMAQMD).	Project exceeds title 24 requirements by 20%.		
MM E-7: Solar Orientation	LD (R, C, M), I, SP, AQP, RR, P/Stationary & Area	0.5%/Low: SMAQMD presents this % reduction (EDAW 2006, SMAQMD 2007).	Yes	Yes	Yes	Adverse: No Beneficial: CAPs, TACs	CA air quality management and control districts and cities/counties (e.g., SMAQMD).	Project orients 75% or more of homes and/or buildings to face either north or south (within 30° of N/S). Building design includes roof overhangs that are sufficient to block the high summer sun, but not the lower winter sun, from penetrating south facing windows. Trees, other landscaping features and other buildings are sited in such a way as to maximize shade in the summer and maximize solar access to walls and windows in the winter.		
MM E-8: Nonroof Surfaces	LD (R, C, M), I, GSP, AQP, RR, P/Stationary & Area	1.0%/Low: SMAQMD presents this % reduction (EDAW 2006, SMAQMD 2007).	Yes	Yes (USGBC 2002 and 2005)	Yes (USGBC 2002 and 2005)	Adverse: No Beneficial: CAPs, TACs	CA air quality management and control districts and cities/counties (e.g., SMAQMD).	Provide shade (within 5 years) and/or use light-colored/high- albedo materials (reflectance of at least 0.3) and/or open grid pavement for at least 30% of the site's nonroof impervious surfaces, including parking lots, walkways, plazas, etc.; OR place a minimum of 50% of parking spaces underground or covered by structured parking; OR use an open-grid pavement system (less than 50% impervious) for a minimum of		

	Table 16 Mitigation Measure Summary												
Mitigation Measure	Applicable Project/Source Type ¹	Effectiv	re	Feasible (Yes/No)		Secondary Effects (Yes/No)	Agency/Organization/Other ⁶	Description/Comments					
		Emissions Reduction/Score ²	Cost (Yes/No) ³	Technical⁴	Logistical ⁵								
								50% of the parking lot area. The mitigation measure reduces heat islands (thermal gradient differences between developed and undeveloped areas to minimize impact on microclimate and human and wildlife habitats. This measure requires the use of patented or copyright protected methodologies created by the ASTM. The SRI is a measure of the constructed surface's ability to reflect solar heat, as shown by a small rise in temperature. It is defined so that a standard black (reflectance 0.05, emittance 0.90) is "0" and a standard white (reflectance 0.80, emittance 0.90) is 100. To calculate SRI for a given material, obtain the reflectance value and emittance value for the material. SRI is calculated according to ASTM E 1980-01. Reflectance is measured					

Table 16 Mitigation Measure Summary												
Mitigation Measure	Applicable Project/Source Type ¹	Effective		Feasible (Yes/No)		Secondary Effects (Yes/No)	Agency/Organization/Other6	Description/Comments				
		Emissions Reduction/Score ²	Cost (Yes/No) ³	Technical ⁴	Logistical ⁵							
								according to ASTM E 903, ASTM E 1918, or ASTM C 1549. Emittance is measured according to ASTM E 408 or ASTM C 1371. Default values for some materials will be available in the LEED-NC v2.2 Reference Guide.				
MM E-9: Low- Energy Cooling	LD (C, M), I, SP, AQP, RR, P/Stationary & Area	1%-10%/Low: EDAW presents this percent reduction range (EDAW 2006).	Yes	Yes (USGBC 2002 and 2005)	Yes (USGBC 2002 and 2005)	Adverse: No Beneficial: CAPs, TACs	CA air quality management and control districts and cities/counties (e.g., SMAQMD).	Project optimizes building's thermal distribution by separating ventilation and thermal conditioning systems.				
MM E-10: Green Roof	LD (R, C, M), I, SP, AQP, RR, P/Stationary & Area	1.0%/Moderate: SMAQMD presents this % reduction (EDAW 2006, SMAQMD 2007).	Yes	Yes (USGBC 2002 and 2005)	Yes (USGBC 2002 and 2005)	Adverse: Increased Water Consumption Beneficial: CAPs, TACs	CA air quality management and control districts and cities/counties (e.g., SMAQMD).	Install a vegetated roof that covers at least 50% of roof area. The reduction assumes that a vegetated roof is installed on a least 50% of the roof area or that a combination high albedo and vegetated roof surface is installed that meets the following standard: (Area of SRI Roof/0.75)+(Area of vegetated roof/0.5) >= Total Roof Area. Water consumption reduction measures shall be considered in the design of the green roof.				
MM E-11: EV Charging Facilities	LD (C, M), SP, AQP, RR, P/Stationary & Area	NA/Low	Yes: \$500- \$5000/ vehicle site (PG&E 1999)	Yes	Yes: 381 facilities in CA (Clean Air Maps 2007).	Adverse: No Beneficial: CAPs, TACs	DOE, EERE, CA air quality management and control districts and cities/counties (e.g., BAAQMD).	Project installs EV charging facilities.				
MM E-12:	LD (R, C, M),	NA/Low: Increasing	Yes: Light	Yes	Yes: Apply	Adverse: No		Project provides light-colored				

Table 16 Mitigation Measure Summary											
Mitigation Measure	Applicable Project/Source Type ¹	Effective		Feasible (Yes/No)		Secondary Effects (Yes/No)	Agency/Organization/Other6	Description/Comments			
		Emissions Reduction/Score ²	Cost (Yes/No) ³	Technical ⁴	Logistical ⁵						
Light-Colored Paving	I, SP, AQP, RR, P/Stationary & Area	the albedo of 1,250 km of pavement by 0.25 would save cooling energy worth \$15M per year.	colored aggregates and white cement are more expensive than gray cement. Certain blended cements are very light in color and may reflect similarly to white cement at an equivalent cost to normal gray cement.		natural sand or gravel colored single surface treatments to asphalt (EOE 2007).	Beneficial: CAPs, TACs		paving (e.g., increased albedo pavement).			
MM E-13: Cool Roofs	LD (R, C, M), I, SP, AQP, RR, P/Stationary & Area	NA/Low	Yes: 0.75– 1.5/square feet coating (EPA 2007a)	Yes	Yes: Over 90% of the roofs in the United States are dark colored	Adverse: No Beneficial: CAPs, TACs	CEC	Project provides cool roofs. Highly reflective, highly emissive roofing materials that stay 50-60°F cooler than a normal roof under a hot summer sun. CA's Cool Savings			

Table 16 Mitigation Measure Summary											
Mitigation Measure	Applicable Project/Source Type ¹	plicable Effective ect/Source Type ¹		Feasible	e (Yes/No)	Secondary Effects (Yes/No)	Agency/Organization/Other6	Description/Comments			
		Emissions Reduction/Score ²	Cost (Yes/No) ³	Technical⁴	Logistical ⁵						
					(EPA 2007a).			Program provided rebates to building owners for installing roofing materials with high solar reflectance and thermal emittance. The highest rebate went to roofs on air conditioned buildings, while buildings with rooftop ducts and other nonresidential buildings were eligible for slightly less. The program aimed to reduce peak summer electricity demand and was administered by the CEC.			
MM E-14: Solar Water Heaters	LD (R, M), SP, AQP, RR, P/Stationary & Area	20%–70% reduction in cooling energy needs/Moderate	Yes: \$1675/20 square feet, requires a 50 gallon tank, annual operating cost of \$176 (DOE 2007).	Yes	Yes: Based on solar orientation, building codes, zoning ordinances.	Adverse: No Beneficial: CAPs, TACs	Europe	Project provides solar water heaters.			
MM E-15: Electric Yard Equipment Compatibility	LD (R, M), SP, AQP, RR, P/Stationary & Area	NA/Low	Yes: \$75– \$250/outlet from existing circuit (Cost Helper 2007).	Yes	Yes	Adverse: No Beneficial: CAPs, TACs		Project provides electrical outlets at building exterior areas.			
MM E-16: Energy Efficient Appliance Standards	LD (R, C, M), SP, AQP, RR, P/Stationary & Area	NA/Low	Yes: Varies for each appliance— higher capital costs, lower operating costs (Energy	Yes	Yes: Major retail stores.	Adverse: No Beneficial: CAPs, TACs		Project uses energy efficient appliances (e.g., Energy Star).			

	Table 16 Mitigation Measure Summary											
Mitigation Measure	Applicable Project/Source Type ¹	Effective	Effective		Feasible (Yes/No)		Agency/Organization/Other	Description/Comments				
		Emissions Reduction/Score ²	Cost (Yes/No) ³	Technical⁴	Logistical ⁵							
			Star 2007).									
MM E-17: Green Building Materials	LD (R, C, M), SP, AQP, RR, P/Stationary & Area	NA/Low: 25-30% more efficient on average.	Yes	Yes: BEES software allows users to balance the environmental and economic performance of building products; developed by NIST (NIST 2007).	Yes	Adverse: No Beneficial: CAPs, TACs		Project uses materials which are resource efficient, recycled, with long life cycles and manufactured in an environmentally friendly way.				
MM E-18: Shading Mechanisms	LD (R, C, M), I, SP, AQP, RR, P/Stationary, & Area	NA/Low: Up to \$450 annual energy savings (Energy Star 2007).	Yes: Higher capital costs, lower operating and maintenance costs (Energy Star 2007).	Yes	Yes: Major retail stores.	Adverse: No Beneficial: CAPs, TACs		Install energy-reducing shading mechanisms for windows, porch, patio and walkway overhangs.				

	Table 16 Mitigation Measure Summary											
Mitigation Measure	Applicable Project/Source Type ¹	Effective		Feasible (Yes/No)		Secondary Effects (Yes/No)	Agency/Organization/Other6	Description/Comments				
		Emissions Reduction/Score ²	Cost (Yes/No) ³	Technical ^₄	Logistical ⁵							
MM E-19: Ceiling/Whole- House Fans	LD (R, C, M), I, SP, AQP, RR, P/Stationary, & Area	NA/Low: 50% more efficient than conventional fans (Energy Star 2007).	Yes: \$45- \$200/fan, installation extra (Lowe's 2007).	Yes	Yes: Major retail stores.	Adverse: No Beneficial: CAPs, TACs		Install energy-reducing ceiling/whole-house fans.				
MM E-20: Programmable Thermostats	LD (R, C, M), I, SP, AQP, RR, P/Stationary, & Area	NA/Low: \$100 annual savings in energy costs (Energy Star 2007).	Yes: \$60/LCD display and 4 settings for typical residential use (Lowe's 2007).	Yes	Yes: Major retail stores.	Adverse: Yes, Mercury Beneficial: CAPs, TACs		Install energy-reducing programmable thermostats that automatically adjust temperature settings.				
MM E-21: Passive Heating and Cooling Systems	LD (R, C, M), I, SP, AQP, RR, P/Stationary, & Area	NA/Low	Yes: \$800 (wall heaters) to \$4,000+ (central systems)	Yes	Yes	Adverse: No Beneficial: CAPs, TACs		Install energy-reducing passive heating and cooling systems (e.g., insulation and ventilation).				
MM E-22: Day Lighting Systems	LD (R, C, M), I, SP, AQP, RR, P/Stationary, & Area	NA/Low	Yes: \$1,300 to \$1,500 depending upon the kind of roof (Barrier 1995), installation extra.	Yes	Yes: Work well only for space near the roof of the building, little benefit in multi- floor buildings.	Adverse: No Beneficial: CAPs, TACs		Install energy-reducing day lighting systems (e.g., skylights, light shelves and interior transom windows).				
MM E-23: Low- Water Use Appliances	LD (R, C, M), I, SP, AQP, RR, P/Stationary, & Area	NA/Low: Avoided water agency cost for using water-efficient kitchen pre-rinse spray valves of \$65.18 per acre-foot.	Yes: Can return their cost through reduction in water consumption,	Yes	Yes	Adverse: No Beneficial: CAPs, TACs		Require the installation of low- water use appliances.				

Table 16 Mitigation Measure Summary											
Mitigation Measure	Applicable Project/Source Type ¹	Effectiv	/e	Feasible	e (Yes/No)	Secondary Effects (Yes/No)	Agency/Organization/Other ⁶	Description/Comments			
		Emissions Reduction/Score ²	Cost (Yes/No) ³	Technical ⁴	Logistical ⁵						
			pumping, and treatment.								
MM E-24: Goods Transport by Rail	LD (C, M), I, SP, AQP, RR, P/Mobile	NA/Moderate	Yes	Yes	Yes	Adverse: No Beneficial: CAPs, TACs	ARB Goods Movement Plan (ARB 2007)	Provide a spur at nonresidential projects to use nearby rail for goods movement.			
Social Awareness/Education											
MM S-1: GHG Emissions Reductions Education	LD (R, C, M), I, SP, TP, AQP, RR, P/Mobile, Stationary, & Mobile	NA/Low	Yes	Yes	Yes: Similar programs currently exist in CA.	Adverse: No Beneficial: CAPs, TACs		Provide local governments, businesses, and residents with guidance/protocols/information on how to reduce GHG emissions (e.g., energy saving, food miles).			
MM S-2: School Curriculum	LD (R, C, M), I, SP, TP, AQP, RR, P/Mobile, Stationary, & Mobile	NA/Low	Yes	Yes	Yes: Similar programs currently exist in CA.	Adverse: No Beneficial: CAPs, TACs		Include how to reduce GHG emissions (e.g., energy saving, food miles) in the school curriculum.			
Construction											
MM C-1: ARB- Certified Diesel Construction Equipment	LD (R, C, M), I, SP, TP, AQP, RR, P/Mobile	NA/Low	Yes: Oxidation Catalysts, \$1,000-	Yes	Yes	Adverse: Yes, NO _x Beneficial: CAPs, TACs	AG, EPA, ARB, and CA air quality management and pollution control districts.	Use ARB-certified diesel construction equipment. Increases CO ₂ emissions when trapped CO and carbon particles			

Table 16 Mitigation Measure Summary											
Mitigation Measure	Applicable Project/Source Type ¹	Effectiv	e	Feasible (Yes/No)		Secondary Effects (Yes/No)	Agency/Organization/Other6	Description/Comments			
	-	Emissions Reduction/Score ²	Cost (Yes/No) ³	Technical ⁴	Logistical ⁵						
			\$2,000. DPF, \$5000- \$10,000; installation extra (EPA 2007b).					are oxidized (Catalyst Products 2007, ETC 2007).			
MM C-2: Alternative Fuel Construction Equipment	LD (R, C, M), I, SP, TP, AQP, RR, P/Mobile	NA/Low	Yes	Yes	Yes	Adverse: Yes, THC, NO _x Beneficial: CO, PM, SO _x	AG, EPA, ARB, and CA air quality management and pollution control districts.	Use alternative fuel types for construction equipment. At the tailpipe biodiesel emits 10% more CO_2 than petroleum diesel. Overall lifecycle emissions of CO_2 from 100% biodiesel are 78% lower than those of petroleum diesel (NREL 1998, EPA 2007b).			
MM C-3: Local Building Materials	LD (R, C, M), I, SP, TP, AQP, RR, P/Mobile	NA/Low	Yes	Yes	Yes: Depends on location of building material manufacture sites.	Adverse: No Beneficial: CAPs, TACs		Use locally made building materials for construction of the project and associated infrastructure.			
MM C-4: Recycle Demolished Construction Material	LD (R, C, M), I, SP, TP, AQP, RR, P/Mobile	NA/Low	Yes	Yes	Yes	Adverse: No Beneficial: CAPs, TACs		Recycle/Reuse demolished construction material. Use locally made building materials for construction of the project and associated infrastructure.			

Table 16 Mitigation Measure Summary											
Mitigation Measure	Applicable Project/Source Type ¹	Effective	•	Feasible	e (Yes/No)	Secondary Effects (Yes/No)	Agency/Organization/Other6	Description/Comments			
		Emissions Reduction/Score ²	Cost (Yes/No) ³	Technical ^₄	Logistical ⁵						
Miscellaneous											
MM M-1: Off- Site Mitigation Fee Program	LD (R, C, M), I, SP, TP, AQP, RR, P/Mobile & Area	NA/Moderate-High: Though there is currently no program in place, the potential for real and quantifiable reductions of GHG emissions could be high if a defensible fee program were designed.	Yes	Yes	No: Program does not exist in CA, but similar programs currently exist (e.g., Carl Moyer Program, SJVAPCD Rule 9510, SMAQMD Off-Site Construction Mitigation Fee Program).	Adverse: No Beneficial: CAPs, TACs		Provide/Pay into an off-site mitigation fee program, which focuses primarily on reducing emissions from existing development and buildings through retro-fit (e.g., increased insulation).			
MM M-2: Offset Purchase	LD (R, C, M), I, SP, TP, AQP, RR, P/Mobile, Stationary, & Area	NA/Low	Yes	Yes	No: ARB has not adopted official program, but similar programs	No		Provide/purchase offsets for additional emissions by acquiring carbon credits or engaging in other market "cap and trade" systems.			

Table 16 Mitigation Measure Summary												
Mitigation Measure	Applicable Project/Source Type ¹	Effectiv	Effective Feasi		e (Yes/No)	Secondary Effects (Yes/No)	Agency/Organization/Other ⁶	Description/Comments				
	-	Emissions Reduction/Score ²	Cost (Yes/No) ³	Technical ⁴	Logistical ^₅							
					currently exist.							
Regional Trans	Regional Transportation Plan Measures											
MM RTP-1: Dedicate High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lanes prior to adding capacity to existing highways.	RTP		Yes	Yes	Yes	Adverse: possible local CO Beneficial: regional CAPs, TACs	Caltrans, local government	Evaluate the trip reduction (and GHG reduction) potential of adding HOV lanes prior to adding standard lanes.				
MM RTP-2: Implement toll/user fee programs prior to adding capacity to existing highways.	RTP		Yes	Yes	Yes	Adverse: possible local CO. Beneficial: regional CAPs, TACs	Caltrans	Evaluate price elasticity and associated trip reduction (and GHG reduction) potential with adding or increasing tolls prior to adding capacity to existing highways.				
highways. Note: ¹ Where LD (R, C, M) =Land Development (Residential, Commercial, Mixed-Use), I=Industrial, GP=General Plan, SP=Specific Plan, TP=Transportation Plans, AQP=Air Quality Plans, RR=Rules/Regulations, and P=Policy. It is important to note that listed project types may not be directly specific to the mitigation measure (e.g., TP, AQP, RR, and P) as such could apply to a variety of source types, especially RR and P. ² This score system entails ratings of high, moderate, and low that refer to the level of the measure to provide a substantive, reasonably certain (e.g., documented emission reductions with proven technologies), and long-term reduction of GHG emissions. ³ Refers to whether the measure would provide a cost-effective reduction of GHG emissions based on available documentation. ⁴ Refers to whether the measure is based on currently, readily available technology based on available documentation.												

[°] Refers to whether the measure could be ⁶ List is not meant to be all inclusive. Source: Data complied by EDAW in 2007