

MEETING SUMMARY - DRAFT
Washington Climate Advisory Team (CAT)
Transportation Technical Work Group (TWG)
Call #4, July 24, 2007, 10:00am – 12:00pm

Attendance:

1. Technical Working Group members: Genesee Adkins; Dick Ford; Paul Parker; KC Golden; Dennis Hession; Christy Baumal (for Jay Larson, Snohomish County); Gary Prince (for Jim Lopez); Steve Marshall; Sue Mauermann; Galen Hon; Mary McCumber; Michael McGinn; Dennis McLerran; Leslie Stanton; Dave Moore; Jim Thomas (for Sister Sharon Park); Megan White; Dan Sinks
2. Center for Climate Strategies (CCS) and Ross & Associates staff: Jeff Ang-Olson; Lisa McNally
3. Washington State Agency (ECY/CTED) Liaison and Attendees: Joyce Phillips; Gail Sandlin; Brent Rude; Marsh Taylor

Background documents:

(All posted at http://www.ecy.wa.gov/climatechange/cat_twg_trans.htm)

1. Powerpoint presentation (including agenda) for meeting
2. Draft Mitigation Options Description and Design
3. Greenhouse Gas Inventory and Reference Case Projections (July 2007 Draft)
4. Contribution of recent actions to Washington State GHG mitigation (July 20 Draft)

Discussion items and key issues:

1. CCS reviewed the Agenda for the call.
2. CCS conducted roll call.
3. CCS asked the TWG if there were any comments on or requests for changes in the Meeting #3 draft summary notes posted to the TWG web page. No comments or changes were requested from TWG members. The final Meeting #3 summary notes will be posted to the website.
4. CCS provided a description of the upcoming August 7 CAT meeting in Seattle. The main action item for that meeting is to approve the selection of priority options suggested by all five technical working groups. Additionally, the CAT will review the description and design text, and will consider approving those that are ready, as time permits. The CAT will review the revised GHG Inventory and Forecast. The next CAT meeting is in October, at which time the CAT will review any remaining description and design text

and begin reviewing the quantification of costs and benefits. The final CAT meeting is in December.

- a. A question arose regarding how all of the separate options/strategies will get integrated in the final report. CCS explained that the final report will compile the text for each of the individual options and can also include overview discussion to help address over-lapping quantification, costs and emissions issues to make options mesh more seamlessly.
5. CCS reviewed the revisions to the draft GHG Emission Inventory & Forecast.
 - a. Revising historic motor gas consumption data, 1996-2004. Data now from Department of Licensing Fuel Tax Receipts data rather than U.S. DOE SED data.
 - b. Updating marine vessel inventory of emissions. Data now incorporates Puget Sound Maritime Air Forum inventory.
 6. CCS discussed the initial assessment of the contribution of recent actions to achieve emission targets in the Executive Order. The assessment memo is available on the Ecology website, under the Additional Documents heading of the Transportation TWG page. In the EO, it was assumed that 60% of emission reduction needed in 2020 would be achieved through recent actions, such as the Pavley standards. However, it has been estimated that recent actions only contribute to 51% of emission reductions. This is primarily because the inventory is larger than what was assumed when the EO was written. The memo will be reviewed by the CAT and will be discussed further during the next TWG meeting.

CCS discussed the possibility of adding California's Zero Electric Vehicle (ZEV) standard to the TWG's priority mitigation options. There is growing concern that the Pavley standards may be delayed, and if so this would partially make up the shortfall in GHG reductions. WA did not originally adopt the ZEV standard when it adopted the Pavley standard. The ZEV is a component of the California vehicle emission standards. ZEV is a technology forcing regulation that requires large vehicle manufacturers to produce zero emitting vehicles as well as "partial ZEVs". The expected ZEV technology is either battery electric or fuel cell vehicles. The standards are phased to allow technology development and have been periodically adjusted to provide manufacturers with needed time and flexibility.

The ZEV standards would be a relatively easy measure to implement as a partial fall-back strategy. The TWG agreed to add this option as a 12th priority option, and it will now go to CAT for approval as one of the priority options. A TWG member suggested that this option also include some language about WA possibly updating/revising its standards if California standards change in the future.

7. CCS highlighted the need for current option Design sections to identify numeric targets (goals) to the extent possible.
8. Members of the TWG questioned whether establishing serious targets was feasible given the constraints of limited funding. Further, TWG members asked to what extent they should base the policy goals on anticipated costs for achieving emission reduction results. CCS mentioned that the policy option text should discuss new funding sources that might appropriate for a given option. The intent is to quantify the emission reductions and cost

of each option to the extent possible. The issue of funding and identifying new funding sources for implementing the options will need to be brought up with the CAT.

- a. The TWG agreed to form a sub-group to address the issue of new funding sources. KC Golden volunteered to be part of the “funding” sub-group, as well as Gary Prince, Dennis McLerran, Michael McGinn, Genesee Adkins, Galen Hon, and Paul Parker. This group will begin developing a description of the issue and identification of funding sources. It was left undecided as to whether new funding sources would be added as a new mitigation strategy, or if this recommendation would come from the TWG in some other form. The identification of new funding sources is not a mitigation option by itself, but a foundational issue that cuts across multiple options. The TWG will discuss at the next meeting whether the document be included as an additional mitigation option, or included as a separate, over-arching discussion.
9. CCS moved to the main agenda item: review of the draft mitigation option Description and Design sections for the 11 priority options.
- a. **Option 1. Transit, Ridesharing, and Commuter Choice Programs.** For this option, CCS suggested that the design include numeric goals. For example, a goal for transit could be an increase in transit mode share or ridership by 2020. Similarly, for rideshare, a numeric target could be carpooling mode share or increase in ridesharing trips for different metro areas. For the Commuter Choice programs numeric target, a numeric goal could related to the number of employers offering commuter benefit packages, showing an increase from today’s numbers. These goals might be different for metropolitan vs. non-metropolitan areas of the state.

It was noted that rail transit should be mentioned in the Design section, since it mentions bus rapid transit. Also, the first sentence of the Description should be revised to include ridesharing, not just transit.

- b. **Option 2. State, Regional, and Local VMT and GHG Reduction Goals and Standards.** CCS noted that this strategy should include the VMT and/or GHG reduction goals and standards, rather than just suggest that goals be developed. Such numeric targets will be needed to quantify the benefits of this option. For this option, the numeric targets could increase or decrease depending on the extent that other options reduce emissions; so finalization of the numeric targets might be done late in the process. In future versions of this option, a table will be added that illustrates how much GHG reduction would be achieved for a given VMT standard.

For consideration when revising the description for this option, a point was raised that the VMT standard could be established per household, rather than per capita. It was also suggested that VMT reduction goals could be established for government agencies in the state, or possibly businesses. It was noted that as currently worded, the option suggests that only RTPOs would set the standards, not the state. The revised text will clarify that the state would also set standards. Finally, it was noted that there are many different options for reducing travel demand, and for effective VMT reduction, options need to be implemented as a

package. A stand-alone option will not be effective. CCS explained that the benefits of this option will overlap with others that reduce VMT; that overlap will be accounted for when the GHG benefits are quantified.

- c. **Option 3. Transportation Pricing.** CCS suggests adding a numeric target if possible. This option overlaps with option 9, system management, which could also involve pricing. CCS noted that option 9 deals primarily with GHG benefits related to reduced delay and congestion, while option 3 focuses more on using pricing as a demand management tool (to reduce trips and VMT). Overlap could exist between the two options, but when it comes to quantifying benefits for option 3, there needs to be a focus on travel reduction benefits.

Several TWG members suggested that this option should be revised so that it encompasses not only near-term road pricing at the corridor level, but also full system-wide dynamic pricing at the metropolitan level. The TWG agreed with this revision.

CCS offered several suggestions for how numeric targets could be defined: setting targets for vehicle owners offered or using pay-as-you-drive insurance; increasing parking pricing/surcharges; and expanding parking cash out and identifying percent of employers partaking in the program.

- d. **Option 4. Promote Compact and TOD.** CCS noted that it is difficult to quantify emission benefits for this option; one approach would be to look at MPO modeling of alternative land use scenarios. Modeling results can help with determining appropriate VMT reduction goals given the context of an area. A TWG member raised the point that limiting urban growth area expansions could defeat the goal of reducing VMT. For example, as urban areas grow in density, there may be reasons to extend urban boundaries in order to accommodate additional community assets so that people are not forced to commute long distances to access those assets. The design also needs to consider the impact of limiting the conversion and development in rural areas. Another point was raised that when urban growth areas are defined, there tends to be a decrease in affordable housing; this issue needs to be further discussed in this option.

Jim Thomas and Dennis Hession would like to be added to the sub-group working on this option.

- e. **Option 5. Quantify GHG Emissions from Transportation Projects.** CCS noted that the option design goals should consider what needs to happen by what date, and which agency needs to adopt rules for amendments. It was suggested that this option might best be achieved through a revision to SEPA. A point was raised that some transportation projects might actually reduce net GHGs, such as a new highway that provided short cut to where people were driving or a new rail transit line. It was agreed that this option should be revised to consider both positive and negative impacts.

Another TWG member requested that this option include some definition of which projects would be subject to the quantification requirement – a threshold. Small projects presumably would not be subject to the requirement.

- f. Option 6. Improvements to Freight Railroads and Intercity Passenger Railroads.** The volunteer work group noted that this option as currently written is light on intercity passenger rail. Information for developing numeric goals and also for quantifying this option can come from the freight and regional rail study that the Port of Tacoma completed, and from the Washington State Rail Capacity & System Needs Study. CCS noted that the design for this option should include some target for passenger rail ridership or mode share, as well as identification of corridors. For freight, the design goals should consider the increase in freight movement on rail or a shift from truck to rail in certain corridors.
- g. Option 7. Diesel Engine Emission Reductions and Fuel Efficiency Improvements.** This option includes recent revisions by WA DOT. The Design section has lots of detail because there are so many different emission source types covered. CCS noted that numeric goals for this option could identify the number of truck stops to be electrified throughout the state or market penetration of APUs or other idle reduction devices. Or targets could be defined for the amount of idling to be reduced if this option were to become a regulatory approach.
- h. Option 8. Local Transportation Financing Tools and Bike/Ped Infrastructure Improvements.** It was noted that this option includes a whole set of strategies to improve pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure. It overlaps with Option 4, Promote Compact and TOD. It was noted that it is difficult to induce biking/walking mode shifts and it is often a question of funding to properly measure the shift. A TWG member suggested that the GMA be updated to require quantification of bike/ped mode share or usage. CCS suggested that goals be applicable to different regions, smaller areas, etc. and provide a numeric target for mode share.
- i. Option 9. Transportation System Management.** There are a lot of different elements to this strategy. As a management approach, the question was raised about lowering speed limits on highways/freeways to 55 mph, the speed at which most vehicles get the highest efficiency. It was suggested that accidents are also reduced at lower speeds, thereby enhancing overall efficiency of the system. In terms of targets, the extent of reduction in delay or idling needs to be considered through the adoption of system management strategies (often as a package of options). CCS suggested adding numeric goals related to reduction in congestion or delay in 2020.
- j. Option 10. Incentives to Promote Low-GHG Vehicle Technologies.** The option description includes a statement about total GHG emissions from vehicles. These data were taken from a study reproduced in the Washington Post. The point was raised that the design needs to have transparency, and the assumptions need to be made clear when coming up with targets. CCS suggested that the design should include a target number of hybrids (accounting for different hybrid technologies) to operate in a region by a certain year. It was also noted that the number of miles driven by these vehicles may be higher (because they cost less to operate), and this should be taken into account. It was suggested that the title of this option be changed in order to differentiate it from option 11 since option 10 is specifically talking about hybrid-electric vehicles.

- k. Option 11. Low Carbon Fuel Standard.** CCS briefly reviewed this option. There were no TWG comments.

Next steps:

1. By noon Friday, TWG members will send to CCS any necessary revisions to the policy option Description and Design sections. These should include placeholder language for numeric goals.
2. CCS will compile the revisions and send the document back to the TWG late Friday. TWG members can comment on the full revised text by COB Monday. On Tuesday, the policy options document will be posted for the upcoming CAT.
3. After the Aug 7 CAT meeting, the TWG sub-groups will finalize Description and Design text, including numerical goals wherever possible.
4. The next TWG meeting is scheduled for Thursday, August 16, 10-12pm. At this meeting, the TWG will review and discuss the revised Design sections and discuss quantification approaches.