

MEETING SUMMARY - DRAFT
Washington Climate Advisory Team (CAT)
Transportation Technical Work Group (T TWG)
Call #8, October 31, 2007, 2:00pm – 4:00pm

Attendance:

1. Technical Working Group members: Genesee Adkins; Dennis Antonellis; Dick Ford; KC Golden; Dennis Hession; Jay Larson; Gary Prince; Steve Marshall; Sue Mauerman; Mary McCumber; Michael McGinn; Leslie Stanton (for Dennis McLerran); Dave Moore; Jim Thomas (for Sister Sharon Park); Galen Hon (for Larry Paulson); 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: None

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 T TWG if there were any comments on or requests for changes in the draft summary notes from TWG Meeting #7. There were no comments or requests for changes.
4. CCS reviewed the meeting schedule for the upcoming TWG and CAT meetings.
5. CCS moved into reviewing draft mitigation options and providing updates on changes and additions made by the volunteer groups over the last month. (Options 0 through 4 were discussed at the October 18, 2007 meeting.)
 - a. **Option 5: Quantifying GHG Emissions from Transportation Emissions.** The sub-group lead reported on changes made over the last month. During this time, members of the TWG requested that the policy discussion reference case studies. The policy description now includes supporting literature that helps to strengthen the policy recommendation. The lead also reported that the sub-group has captured a lot of input on describing the current limitations in modeling and considerations for improving predictions, and this is reflected in the updated

option. The sub-group relied on input from Larry Blaine (lead modeler at PSRC), Larry Frank and others to expand the discussion on modeling. A TWG member commented that it is important to show the trade-off in emissions between proposed projects (e.g., light rail) and that “full” impacts (e.g., those associated with construction) be evaluated. Another TWG member requested that the modeling of impacts also be responsive to congestion and roadway pricing. A TWG member requested that congestion pricing be added to first bullet under policy design.

- b. **Option 6: Improvements to Freight Railroads and Intercity Passenger Railroads.** The sub-group lead reported on the most recent effort to gather input from WSDOT’s policy and rail staff and others to further develop this option. The option looks at existing plans for both freight and passenger rail, and at the potential GHG reductions resulting from the switch to rail from on-road travel modes. The TWG discussed capturing light rail impacts under this option. Instead, the TWG agreed that light rail is covered under option T-1. The TWG also discussed locomotive idle reduction strategies, including the potential reductions associated with the automatic shut-down and start-up device. It is this technology that is being assumed to reduce locomotive emissions under this option. One TWG member suggested that incentives (e.g., federal or state tax credits to retrofit or buy new equipment) should be made available to facilitate uptake of new technologies. A TWG member discussed ZTR Smartstart technology and offered to provide input on the quantifications section of this option. CCS noted that it will quantify the impacts of expanding Amtrak’s intercity passenger rail service.
- c. **Option 7: Diesel Engine Emission Reductions and Fuel Efficiency Improvements.** CCS reported that changes to quantification have been highlighted in the latest draft, including fuel and GHG reduction estimates. CCS still needs to complete cost estimates, as the CAT expects to review those at their next meeting. A TWG member commented on engine retrofits, and underscored the issue that many owner-operated vehicles are purchased second-hand, and it is questionable whether such owners have the capacity to invest further in their equipment to incorporate idle reduction technology. In quantifying benefits, CCS assumed greater benefits accrued by long-haul trucks since they idle more. The TWG also discussed the emission reductions from off-road diesel construction equipment. CCS will work with WSDOT to look into current emissions from this sector and consider potential reductions for analysis.
- d. **Option 8: Local Transportation Financing and Bicycle and Pedestrian Infrastructure Improvements.** CCS reported that the goal for this option is to increase the bicycle/pedestrian mode share for all trips in urban areas to 15% by 2020. CCS reviewed the quantification methodology which was based on a previous study for the Bay Area Air Quality Management District reviewing the cost-effectiveness of bicycle/pedestrian projects. A TWG member brought up Portland’s Complete Streets study, and suggested looking at cost and mode shift data based on household travel surveys. It was suggested to add this example to the implementation mechanisms to build the case for this recommend strategy. A TWG member volunteered to look into the mode shift data and cost-effectiveness

of comparable studies to add to this option. The TWG also discussed stretching the 2020 mode goal since Seattle already has a high rate of bike/ped use and the TWG's objective is to try to go above and beyond the status quo. However, it was decided to keep the current goal of 15% since the proposed goals for urban growth areas is statewide (where the status quo for other urban areas is significantly lower than Seattle's bicycle/pedestrian mode share).

- e. **Option 9: Transportation System Management.** The sub-group lead (WSDOT) summarized two major changes to this option. The biggest change refers to the speed limit strategy being removed, based on State Traffic Engineer conclusions that this would not be a feasible option. Second, WSDOT made the performance measures more positive-oriented, focusing on the benefits resulting from efficiency and reliability instead of measuring delay. CCS noted that it is difficult to quantify system management benefits, as studies often report benefits in terms of delay reduction, which is not the same as fuel reduction. Fuel consumption can increase or decrease depending on speed. CCS said that the future benefits accruing from incremental increases in efficiency over time can be difficult to determine when considering that Washington already has an effective transportation system in place. CCS therefore recommends leaving GHG benefits un-quantified at this time. A TWG member suggested including ranges on pricing estimates. A TWG member volunteered to look into the prospect of quantifying fuel savings, although CCS noted that it may not be possible to quantify the benefits by the next CAT meeting. WSDOT agreed to identify those strategies that can be likely quantified.
- f. **Option 10: Actions to Accelerate and Integrate Plug-In Hybrid Electric Vehicle Use.** CCS reported that the CAT was preliminarily happy with the approach of this option. The implementation mechanisms still need to be completed, and the steps for achieving the option goals still need to be identified. CCS will quantify costs. A TWG member offered to provide CCS with a few suggestions for implementation mechanisms. Another TWG member suggested that CCS consider how the use of PHEVs can be promoted through existing park-and-ride lot infrastructure (e.g., providing sufficient plug-in stations). A CAT member suggested adding a demonstration grant program promoted by CTED to the implementation mechanisms, which CCS will do.
- g. **Option 11: Low Carbon Fuel Standard.** CCS reviewed this option and the responses made to the CAT's comments from the previous CAT meeting. The CAT requested that consideration be given to the likelihood that cellulosic ethanol may not be commercially available in large quantities until 2015 or later. CCS reviewed a graph on page 71 of the current document which demonstrates how to reach targets without cellulosic ethanol before 2015. CCS also reviewed a new table that breaks out the associated incremental benefits of biofuels use in relation to the requirements of recent legislative actions through 2020. A TWG member volunteered to provide price projections for biofuels.
- h. **Option 12: Zero Emission Vehicle (ZEV) Standard.** CCS reported that this option now includes low-GHG air conditioning refrigerants as an alternative to the current refrigerant (which is a potent GHG when air conditioning systems

leak). CCS obtained data on the relative GHG effects on these refrigerants and conducted benefits calculations. The associated benefits are fairly small, but not insignificant. For the ZEV standard, CCS pulled data from an analysis conducted by Cambridge Systematics, Inc. (for Dept of Ecology) using Washington's vehicle fleet, new vehicle sales, and emission factors. CCS asked the sub-group to further develop the implementation mechanisms both for the ZEV standard and for low-GHG refrigerants.

- i. Option 2: State, Regional, and Local VMT and GHG Reduction Goals and Standards.** The sub-group lead provided an update on the recent changes to this option. The policy description includes two modes of action. Option A recommends that the state establish a schedule of targets for reducing statewide per capita VMT and work with local governments and regional planning organizations to achieve those targets. Option B would establish per capita VMT reduction targets for each of the urban RTPOs. The TWG agreed that Option A might provide a bit more flexibility, since it provides the opportunity to acknowledge the disparities among different regions of the state. Additionally, Option A could better support collaboration between state agencies and local government to identify appropriate tools across diverse regions. A TWG member asked how the state will set the standard or goals and how those reduction targets will be distributed regionally. Another TWG member asked about accountability, and who will be tracking the agencies or offices to determine whether goals are being achieved. The sub-group lead volunteered to provide edits to this option and respond to TWG questions, specifically moving forward with Option A, and will also suggest goal targets (percent reduction per capita VMT) for 2035 and 2050. CCS will suggest numeric reduction targets for 2020.

Next steps:

1. The next CAT meeting is November 15-16 (in Olympia) when CAT members will review all the draft mitigation options.
2. The next TWG meeting is scheduled for Monday, November 19 from 2:00 – 4:30. This will be the last formal TWG meeting. The agenda will be to finalize the text and quantification of policy options and address remaining gaps in the policy option text. For this meeting, the TWG will discuss the CAT's comments from the Nov. 15-16 meeting, and will discuss how to address those comments and any remaining issues.
3. The CAT will meet again on December 4-5 to approve the options in final draft form.