

MEETING SUMMARY - DRAFT
Washington Climate Advisory Team (CAT)
Transportation Technical Work Group (TWG)
Call #7, October 18, 2007, 10:00am – 12:00pm

Attendance:

1. Technical Working Group members: Genesee Adkins; Dick Ford; Paul Parker; Lloyd Brewer (for Dennis Hession); Teresa Jones; Gary Prince; Steve Marshall; Galen Hon (for Sue Mauerman); Mary McCumber; Leslie Stanton (for Dennis McLerran); Dave Moore; Jim Thomas (for Sister Sharon Park); Katy Taylor (replacing Megan White); Jemae Hoffman
2. Center for Climate Strategies (CCS) staff: Jeff Ang-Olson; Lisa McNally
3. Washington State Agency (ECY/CTED) Liaison and Attendees: Spencer Reader, ECY (for 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 Document

Discussion items and key issues:

1. CCS reviewed the meeting Agenda.
2. CCS conducted roll call.
3. CCS asked the TWG if there were any comments on or requests for changes in the draft summary notes from TWG Meeting #6. There were no comments or requests for changes.
4. CCS provided a report on the October 4 CAT meeting. In summary, the CAT affirmed the direction of the TWG with respect to the two mitigation options they reviewed (T-10 and T-11) and affirmed the overall direction in which the TWG is moving.
 - a. Regarding the T-10 (PHEV) draft, the CAT provided comments on the assumptions being made about the source of grid power that would be used to charge hybrid electric vehicles. The CAT directed the TWG to cross-walk their energy source assumptions with those being discussed by the energy supply group for consistency.
 - b. Regarding the T-11 (LCFS) draft, the CAT supports this policy, but there were questions about the timing of implementation, as the CAT is concerned that low-carbon fuel sources (e.g., cellulosic ethanol) may not be commercially available to

meet the standards in the short-term (may need slower phase in and steeper ramp-up to meet standards in 2020).

- c. The CAT also offered comments and suggestions to the TWG on several other options. Regarding T-12 (ZEV standard), a CAT member suggested that this option also include removing any state restrictions that prevent automakers from switching to low-GHG refrigerants (such as HFC 152a).
 - d. A TWG member requested that her frustration be registered about the impossibility of accessing the last CAT meeting by phone or web cast. She requested that the State ensure that those facilities work for the next CAT meeting. Ecology reported that every effort will be made to ensure that access (both via phone and web cast) will be available for the next CAT meeting.
5. CCS reviewed the meeting schedule for the upcoming TWG and CAT meetings.
 6. CCS moved into reviewing draft mitigation options and providing updates on changes and additions made by the volunteer groups since the last TWG meeting.
 - a. **T-0: New Transportation Funding Mechanism.** The volunteer group lead for this option provided an update on the status of the description and design text. She highlighted that this option recommends that existing revenue streams be examined to assure their best and maximum use, and also that priority should be given to developing additional and flexible long-term funding mechanisms. TWG members agreed that this option is not intended to suggest reprogramming transportation funds that have been allocated; this option is more focused on developing funding sources over the long-term. A TWG member suggested that an analysis be conducted to determine the potential revenue impacts of different revenue tools, suggesting that the joint transportation commission do a study for what could be recommended for 2009 legislative action. A TWG member suggested adding more specificity on the local option taxes, and to consider the LIFT option used in Bellingham. It was noted that local option gas taxes are currently allowed but no one is using them. It was suggested that “fuel efficiency/carbon emission tax” be moved to the User Fee group. It was suggested that a street utility tax be added to the revenue tools list. *The lead for this group will go through the description again and revise the language, also emphasizing that the suggestion for obligating funds is for future funds that have not yet been committed. [Mayor Hession will be added to the sub-group distribution list to receive the next draft of this option.]*
 - b. **T-1: Transit, Ridesharing, and Commuter Choice Programs.** CCS reported that the subgroup developed 8 specific sub-policies and goals for this policy option. The subgroup lead summarized how policies could impact VMT and explained how these impacts were quantified. In developing these sub-policies, the subgroup met with WSDOT, Transportation Choices, and staff from King County. CCS took a first cut at quantifying the goals, but the VMT estimates still need to be refined, and will still need to take into account the possible double counting of benefits. The TWG discussed the need to distinguish between large urban systems versus more rural environments when quantifying impacts,

particularly when considering transit efficiency in smaller areas. It was suggested that light rail transit be added to the first bullet under Transit – Capital.

Jemae Hoffman requested to be added to the subgroup. She has good stats on non-commute data from Seattle’s “One Less Car” study. She can contribute data and wants to learn more about transit reductions methodologies used in this option.

Gary Prince will take the lead in revising the goals text and scrutinizing the calculations (CCS can send Gary the Excel file of calculations to modify the numbers.) CCS also requested that the subgroup develop the Implementation Mechanisms for each of these 8 sub-policies. These mechanisms should define what needs to happen next in order for goals to be reached and who needs to act to get each of these done. Implementation Mechanisms should flow out of the goals.

- c. **Option 2: State, Regional, and Local VMT and GHG Reduction Goals and Standards.** CCS summarized the focus of this option. The subgroup still needs to identify a VMT reduction target in time for review at the November 15 CAT meeting. This option is a higher level framework for VMT reductions being achieved under the other options. CCS has temporarily plugged in a 15% statewide per capita VMT reduction from the 2020 baseline, which results in roughly a reduction of 6.1 million metric tons of CO₂. CCS noted that this value is close to the aggregate reduction resulting from implementing T-1, plus the more conservative level of reductions from implementing T-4, plus T-8. Thus, 15% may be an appropriate per capita reduction target for 2020 that captures the other VMT reduction options (although the inclusion of T-3 contributes significant additional VMT reduction). In terms of quantification, the TWG agreed that the per capita VMT reduction goal for 2020 should be roughly commensurate with the level of VMT reduction achieved by the other options.

The T-2 subgroup will still need to determine a percent reduction for the 2035 and 2050 target dates; these are more difficult to estimate since a GHG forecast does not yet exist for those years. A TWG member asked if it would make sense to explicitly state in this option that for 2035 and 2050, instead of determining a target reduction, to instead note that these targets will be defined to keep with the Governor’s goal when a GHG forecast is produced. The TWG agreed with this suggestion. The TWG also agreed that this option will be implemented primarily at the RTPO level, although some policy options do strive to reduce rural VMT. *The T-2 subgroup lead will complete text revisions to this effect and will send it around to the group again.* A TWG member requested that the source of reductions be cross-identified with the other proposed options so that the TWG can see where the numbers comprising the aggregate reduction are coming from.

CCS asked the TWG if it makes sense to state the goals in terms of a statewide per capita VMT number, or to state the goals as a percent reduction per capita VMT for RTPOs. A TWG member suggested doing both; that is, a statewide plan focus on reducing VMT per capita across the state, as well as meeting VMT goals within particular parts of the state. This should create a type of “hybrid” accountability at the state and regional levels.

Another TWG member asked about the source of the VMT baseline that is being used as a starting point CCS responded that they came from WSDOT (Brian Lagerberg). *It was suggested that the current baseline is not appropriate and WSDOT will provide more appropriate figures.* A TWG member made the point that there is not a one-to-one relationship between VMT reduction and GHG reduction. For example, a shift to transit could reduce auto GHGs but increase bus GHGs – this needs to be addressed in the quantification. Another TWG member requested that the option also make clearer that in promoting reductions in per capita VMT, that this does not necessarily mean a ban on driving, but rather, promotes the goal of reducing the amount of miles driven, and encouraging different modes of travel, such as transit. *The subgroup lead noted that she will make revisions to the text to add “per capita” after “VMT” and removing “GHG” from the title, and specify that the RTPOs required to achieve goals are urban RTPOs.*

- d. **Option 3: Transportation Pricing.** A TWG member provided an update on changes to the parking management portion of the option. These were questions as to whether the parking surcharge being proposed here is indeed high enough to change behavior, as well as whether the overall parking management being promoted is an effective strategy. Their research found no economic models that provide the “magic” surcharge rate that would change behavior.

A TWG member recommended that CCS compare its methodology used to determine employee cash out impacts with work done by Mathew Kitchen at WSDOT. Another TWG member requested that an addition be made to include an exemption for transit vehicles in tolling lanes to facilitate efficient flow in the system. It was suggested that in considering the impacts of tolling, the experience of cordon pricing systems in London and Singapore be considered.

CCS requested the TWG to review the assumption of market penetration for mileage-based insurance. Genesee Adkins said she will send her information on potential market penetration for King County’s pilot program for mileage based insurance. WSDOT will also review the tolling portion of the text and associated numbers and report back to CCS.

- e. **Option 4: Promote Compact and Transit-Oriented Development.** The volunteer lead summarized a recent meeting where members of the sub-group, Dr. Larry Frank, CCS, and modelers from PSRC came together to discuss the impacts of land use on travel patterns. Dr. Frank is a major leader in developing case studies based on land use impacts on VMT. The subgroup lead noted that the high-end range of a 50% reduction in urban area VMT for 2050 reflects a major paradigm shift and the subgroup acknowledges that it is pushing the envelope with this target.

A TWG member requested that in the Implementation Mechanisms under the heading Promote affordable housing opportunities, the word “retail” be dropped.

The sub-group lead noted that there are several text edits that did not yet get translated between the subgroup and CCS, but revisions will be made and available for review at the next TWG meeting.

- f. **Option 5: Quantifying GHG Emissions from Transportation Emissions.** CCS reported that this option will be discussed in more detail at the next meeting.
- g. **Option 6: Improvements to Freight Railroads and Intercity Passenger Railroads.** CCS reported that much progress has been made on this option. This option will be discussed in more detail at the next meeting.
- h. **Option 7: Diesel Engine Emission Reductions and Fuel Efficiency Improvements.** CCS reported that the subgroup has quantified most benefits of this option; however, the section related to hybrid-electric freight handling equipment has not yet been quantified.
- i. **Option 8: Local Transportation Financing and Bicycle and Pedestrian Infrastructure Improvements.** CCS reported that preliminary quantification of GHG reductions and costs has been completed.
- j. **Option 9: Transportation System Management.** CCS reported that minor text changes have been made by WSDOT. The subgroup is confronting challenges on how to best quantify benefits, however. CCS reported that this may be an option for which GHG reduction numbers cannot be determined. CCS may need to contact WSDOT for assistance in quantifying the benefits and costs for this option.
- k. **Option 10: Actions to Accelerate and Integrate Plug-In Hybrid Electric Vehicle Use.** CCS reported that T-10 was preliminary reviewed by the CAT and small revisions have been made.
- l. **Option 11: Low Carbon Fuel Standard.** CCS reported that T-11 was preliminary reviewed by the CAT and small revisions have been made.
- m. **Option 12: Zero Emission Vehicle (ZEV) Standard.** CCS reported that Ecology commissioned consultants to conduct a benefits study of ZEV standards and that this quick analysis could be applied to this option. The study determined that the benefits are small, however, because ZEV targets only a small proportion of vehicles. Another component will be added to this option at the request of a CAT member related to removing state barriers to use of alternative low-GHG air conditioning refrigerants in vehicles.

Next steps:

1. The TWG scheduled an extra meeting on Wednesday, October 31 from 2:00 – 4:00. This is an “extra” meeting that the group agreed to hold in order to allow more time to review the options. The TWG will pick up reviewing TLU-5. CCS requested that any TWG members modifying mitigation option text should show additional edits to the options document using track changes in the current (October 18) mitigation options document.
2. The next CAT meeting is November 15-16 when a review will occur of all of the draft mitigation options. Therefore, a draft of all option descriptions, designs, and implementation mechanisms, as well as quantification of preliminary GHG reduction and cost effectiveness will need to be completed by then.