| Primary Sector | Strategy | New or Existing? | $CO_2e$ Reduction Potential[1] (L, M, H) | Timeframe for Implement. (S, M, L) | Costs (L, M, H) | Policy Acceptance (L, M, H) | Current Authority (Y, P, N) | Tech Avail (C, E, F) | Co-Benefits S | R | C | Q | E | M | A | W | B | CA | Related Sectors | Notes |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| T= Transportation<br>B=Built Environment<br>E=Energy<br>L=Land Use | | New = New regional strategy<br><br>Existing = Exists in region; expandable | Low (L) <0.5% reduction<br><br>Medium (M) – 0.5% - 1.5% reduction<br><br>High (H) – 1.5%+ | Short-Term (S): by 2020<br><br>Medium-Term (M): between 2020 and 2040<br><br>Long-Term (L): after 2040 | Low (L): <\$50M<br><br>Medium (M): between \$50M and \$500M<br><br>High (H): \$500M+ | Low (L): May be controversial<br><br>Medium (M): Acceptable by some stakeholders<br><br>High (H): Wide support | Yes (Y): within current authority<br>Partial (P): Action needed is some jurisdictions<br>No (N): New auth. needed | Current (C): Widely available<br><br>Experimental (E): In pilot phase<br><br>Future (F): Not yet launched | Safety | Reliability | Congestion Reduction | Air Quality (Criteria Pollutant | Economic Vitality, Jobs, Equity | Mobility | Accessibility | Current and Future Weather Resilient | Chesapeake Bay/stormwater | Community Amenity | T= Transportation<br><br>B=Built environment<br><br>E=Energy<br><br>L=Land Use | |
| L | L-1: Maximize urban tree canopy | E + N | L-M<br>Adelaide got 0.6 m tons = 0.75% of DC total – they have 1.3 m pop | S-M | L | M-H | Y | C | | | | x | | | | | x | x | B, E | Can impact in various ways: (1) retain/expand existing canopy in unbuilt areas, parks, urban areas; (2) direct more future growth into CMXD areas with smaller LU footprint while preserving undeveloped areas; (3) tree cover reduces building energy needs |
| L | L-2: Increase proportion of new housing and jobs in regional activity centers | E + N | L-H<br>Depends on proportions and how designed, supported by infrastructure | M-L<br>Benefits will grow over time as policy proliferates | L-M<br>Private sector reclaims its development costs; jurisdiction get property tax revenue; more \$ for transit & B/W, less for highways | M<br>Region Forward regional compact says this is accepted policy; less urban jurisdictions will want slower implementation time frame; strongly supports transit vision | P | E<br>Is happening but not at full pace in all places | x | | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | T, B, E | Recommend this strategy be segmented into low, medium and high scenario aspirations in terms of:<br>Percent of total growth by time period;<br>Location in metropolitan, regional and local centers;<br>Level of transit investment/service;<br>Degree of jobs/resid/retail mix;<br>Street network density<br><br>B&E sectors may assume smaller footprint – multi-story/unit construction with greater tree cover |

[1] $CO_2e$ reduction potential estimates are from prior studies, some based on national data, and are not additive. $CO_2e$ reduction potential estimates will be updated for the metropolitan Washington region based on further analysis of selected strategies.

| Primary | Strategy | New or | $CO_2e$ | Timeframe for | Costs | Policy | Current | Tech Avail | Co-Benefits | | | | | | | | | | Related | Notes |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| L | L-3: Improve regional jobs-housing balance | E+N | L-M<br>Primarily impacts commuting | M-L<br>Benefits will grow over time as policy proliferates | M<br>Might need to compete with market in short run; may team with LNYW financing | L<br>May conflict with jurisdictional growth aspirations, willingness | P | E<br>Is happening, but not at full pace in all places | | | x | x | x | x | x | | | x | | This is a more macro-level strategy than L-2: It aims at better overall regional balance in jobs and housing, which (1) suggests that some parts of the region should grow faster/more than others, (2) affordable housing policies would enable more workers to live in the region or in the jurisdiction of their job |
| L | L-4: Maximize walkable design in activity centers | E + N | L-M<br>Significant impacts depend on supportive land use (is there something to walk to?) | M-L<br>Benefits will grow over time as policy proliferates | L-M<br>Fund local streets and NM facilities; can elicit developer contributions | M-H<br>More acceptable and ready in places which are already implementing urban designs | P, N<br>May need to find new ways to fund local street development | E<br>Is happening, but not at full pace in all places | x | | x | x | x | x | x | | x | x | T, B | Assume current (policy) rates of growth in centers, ensure existence of a local street network with appropriate intersection spacing/density to support walking; this may incorporate complete streets concepts and traffic calming |
| L | L-5: Establish adequate retail activity levels and balance in all activity centers | E + N | M-H<br>More than 80% of HH travel is non-work; critical to have better accessibility to shopping, schools, services | M-L<br>Benefits will grow over time as policy proliferates | L<br>May need to incentivize in short term | M<br>Accepted In urbanizing areas, not broadly supported (public, zoning) in suburban areas | P | E<br>Is happening, but not at full pace in all places | | | x | x | x | x | x | | x | x | | Retail density and ratios impact in 2 important ways: (1) alternatives to driving for households satisfying daily activity needs, resulting in shorter trips, more non-motorized trips,(2) reduced need to drive for commuters or visitors to an activity center because all supporting needs are walk accessible once at site |
| L | L-6: Require all new or relocated government employment (federal, state, county) to be in proximity of premium transit | E + N | L-M<br>Depends on volume & proportion of such employment that is in play | M-L | L<br>If higher cost to locate in TOD areas, can be compensate d by lower parking demand | M<br>BRAC is evidence of concern about concentrated location | P | E<br>Is happening, but not at full pace in all places | | | x | x | x | x | x | | x | | | Federal employers mainly seem on-board; bigger sell may be state and local offices, which seem to prefer outlying locations with only auto access |

[1]$CO_2e$ reduction potential estimates are from prior studies, some based on national data, and are not additive. $CO_2e$ reduction potential estimates will be updated for the metropolitan Washington region based on further analysis of selected strategies.