

**MEETING SUMMARY - DRAFT**  
**Washington Climate Advisory Team (CAT)**  
**Transportation Technical Work Group**  
Call #5, August 16, 2007, 10:00am – 12:00pm

**Attendance:**

1. Technical Working Group members: Genesee Adkins; Dick Ford; Paul Parker; Jessica Coven (for KC Golden); Dennis Hession; Teresa Jones; Jay Larson; Steve Marshall; Sue Mauermann; Galen Hon; Mary McCumber; Tim Gould (for Michael McGinn); Leslie Stanton (for Dennis McLerran); Dave Moore; Jim Thomas (for Sister Sharon Park); Carol Lee Roalkvam (for 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: Gail Sandlin (for Marsh Taylor); Julie Anderson

**Background documents:**

(All posted at [http://www.ecy.wa.gov/climatechange/cat\\_twg\\_trans.htm](http://www.ecy.wa.gov/climatechange/cat_twg_trans.htm) )

1. Powerpoint presentation (including agenda) for meeting
2. Draft Mitigation Options Description and Design

**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 Meeting #4. It was requested that the name of a TWG alternate attendee be added to the notes. The final summary notes will now be posted to the website.
4. CCS provided a report on the August 7 CAT meeting in Seattle. Overall, the CAT did not raise any major concerns about the mitigation options that the TWG has so far developed. Meeting materials can be found on the CAT website: [http://www.ecy.wa.gov/climatechange/cat\\_overview.htm](http://www.ecy.wa.gov/climatechange/cat_overview.htm). The following issues were discussed during the meeting:
  - a. First, there was discussion about the Preparation/Adaptation Working Groups (PAWGs) in which members are working to identify strategies that integrate climate impacts into future decision-making. There are five areas of focus (agriculture; forestry resources; human health; water resources & quality; and, coastal & infrastructure). PAWGs do not report to the CAT, but to ECY and CTED.

- b. Second, there was some discussion on how the TWGs will be dealing with economic analysis when summarizing recommended policy options. The CAT clarified that the TWGs' approach involves a cost-effectiveness analysis, not a cost-benefit analysis of quantifying the costs associated with climate change and weighting those against the costs of taking action. That is, the evaluation of impacts should be based on state-wide societal costs, as opposed to quantifying impacts on particular actors (e.g., state agency, etc.). The CAT also discussed the need to identify or better define clean energy sector jobs. However, this may be less of an issue for the Transportation TWG.
  - c. Third, the CAT is planning to add several more meetings to its schedule. Originally, only two more CAT meetings were planned (early October and early December). The CAT would like gather more public input on individual options. As a result, they are planning additional CAT meetings. An interim meeting will be held, via telephone, in September. The purpose of this meeting will be to review and affirm the direction of TWGs in respect to reviewing any remaining mitigation options not taken up at the August 7 CAT meeting. A November meeting is also being proposed. Quantification of options should be completed in a near-final draft of mitigation options by September. A January CAT meeting is also being proposed.
5. CCS reviewed the assessment of recent actions and their potential to reduce Washington emissions. The Executive Order states that GHGs must be reduced to 1990 levels by 2020. The E.O. assumed approximately 60% of these emissions reductions are estimated to result from policies that have already been adopted, and role of the TWGs was to suggest additional policy options to reduce the remaining 40% of emissions. However, the CCS assessment suggests that the recent actions will achieve only about 50% of the necessary reduction in 2020, and the TWGs will need to produce the remaining 50%. There is a memo on the CAT website that describes this analysis on how recent actions affect potential emissions reductions. See <http://www.ecy.wa.gov/climatechange/CATdocs/80707RecentActionsMemo.pdf>
6. CCS moved into reviewing and further developing draft mitigation options. Discussion centered specifically on T-1, T-3, T-4, T-9, and T-10, since these five option descriptions have not yet been reviewed by the CAT in final form. TWG members commented on the draft text for these five options in preparation for submission to the CAT for their review during the September phone meeting.
  - a. **T-1: Transit, Ridesharing, and Commuter Choice Programs.** A table was added under the mitigation option design to quantify the goals of increasing market or mode share for transit use and ridesharing. Goals should be quantified separately for Metro areas and other regional areas of the state. It was suggested that the final mitigation options document include definitions for terms such as "activity centers." Given that there is overlap in strategies, it was asked if option descriptions should make reference to other action strategies and mitigation options in the same document. It was suggested that reference be made to other programs that are already in place, as well as to other options in the TWG strategy list. This can be done at the bottom of the mitigation option description. A point was raised about exploring new revenue sources to support this effort, citing as an

example Google's corporate transit service that picks up employees at park-and-ride lots. The King County Metro dollar matching program was also cited as a possible means for supporting revenue generation for this option. Points regarding revenue generation can be added to T-0, New Funding Mechanisms.

- b. **T-3: Transportation Pricing.** Several specific comments were provided for this option, including the need to clarify language to include dynamic and fixed tolling, as well as shortening the target date for a long-term goal of achieving dynamic pricing on highway systems throughout Puget Sound. It was agreed that 2015 is a better target date than 2020. TWG members noted the need to develop analytical tools that can be used to compare the effectiveness of various pricing options. Another suggestion was made to clarify how pricing funds can be used to pay for alternative transportation facilities and services (e.g., transit) to improve the operability of the corridor or surrounding region, once the facility is paid for. It was noted that the U.S. DOT just awarded King County a \$138.7 million grant to help reduce traffic congestion in the Seattle area, which will likely require tolling on the 520 bridge.
- c. **T-4: Promote Compact and Transit Oriented-Development.** The Design text for this option has been in discussion among the volunteer team. The TWG agreed on compromise language for the first bullet under the Design section. It was noted that the description still needs to include a statement about the GMA recognizing differences between small and large urban areas and how the Act applies to these areas accordingly. It was also noted that a description of compact development should be included in the description. The implementation mechanism section of this option should address impacts of different levels of density. It was noted that several TWG members have recently met with PSRC to discuss options for quantifying the GHG benefits of compact and transit-oriented development.
- d. **T-9: Transportation System Management.** The updated text identifies performance measures to determine progress towards achieving goals. The volunteer group will establish values for these numeric goals over the coming weeks. WSDOT is the lead on this. Currently, the text discusses how GHG emissions can be quantified through a qualitative description to help others understand the types of benefits that can be achieved by this mitigation option. The investment levels are currently categorized on a high-medium-low scale. It was noted that this option overlaps with T-3, Transportation Pricing. The challenge will be to determine actual benefits and feasibility of reductions by 2020. The volunteer team drafting this option will aim to take into account regional variation of urban and rural areas to help support decision-making that make sense given the location of system management projects (e.g., rural, urban, etc.).
- e. **T-10. Actions to Accelerate and Integrate Plug-In Hybrid Electric Vehicle Use.** This updated option raised a question about the extent of research on park-and-ride capacity to help prioritize investment in plug-in infrastructure for PHEVs. Pilot projects may be underway to gather data and help determine whether plug-in infrastructure could be an effective use of funds. It was suggested

that these points be addressed in the implementation mechanism section of the policy descriptions.

7. CCS reiterated that the five options discussed today should be finalized by volunteer teams in the next two weeks. These will be sent to the CAT for review at the early September meeting for their affirmation that the TWG is indeed moving in the right direction.
8. CCS discussed the goal of **T-0: New Funding Mechanisms**. This is a “foundation” option acting as an overarching issue that discusses strategies for funding many of the other priority mitigation options. Therefore, this option will not necessarily include the same sections as the other 12 options. There was a discussion about the whether the TWG should suggest a revision to the state’s 18<sup>th</sup> Amendment. It was suggested that, in addition to addressing funding sources, this option should address criteria for prioritizing funding. Several additional TWG members expressed interest in joining the volunteer team to work on this option. The full volunteer team now includes: KC Golden, Jim Lopez, Dennis McLerran, Michael McGinn, Genesee Adkins, Sue Mauermann, Dick Ford, Jay Larson, and Megan White. Genesee Adkins volunteered to do initial drafting of text to be sent around to volunteer group in the next two weeks.
9. CCS discussed the development of numeric goals for all mitigation options. Based on these goals, CCS will quantify the benefits associated with the strategies, with assistance from the TWG. CCS reviewed each of the options, requesting suggestions for sources to contact for data.
  - a. T-1. To gather data for developing baseline trips and mode share for ridesharing at MPO level, the TWG suggested talking with PSRC (Charlie Howard). The TWG also suggested talking with WSDOT’s Commute Trip Reductions Office. The Spokane, TriCities, Vancouver offices would be another good data source. Also contact MPO directors (Glen Miles; Mark Kushner; Dean Lookingbill) for these three metro areas. The WA State Transit Association can provide a statewide transit overview to get information about transit agencies and their mode splits in eastern Washington. There was a suggestion that in addition to mode shift goals, this option might also need to suggest goals for levels of transit service. Charlie Howard has done this for PSRC.
  - b. T-2. This is a top-down mechanism. This option works in parallel with other options which are bottom-up. This option would set per capita VMT standards which would be achieved by other options, thereby achieving emission goals. CCS proposes that real numbers not yet be included in this option. Instead, a table will be developed showing proposed percent reductions in per capita VMT. This option is meant to track and set some performance standards for reducing per capita VMT. It was suggested that this option include an explicit statement of how VMT relates to GHG emissions.
  - c. T-3. It was suggested at the August 7 CAT meeting to include cordon pricing in this option. The TWG considers cordon pricing for more dense urban regions only, whereas this option should encompass region-wide pricing in parts of the state. This option will consider tolling impacts at the major urban areas, regional and sub-regional areas.

- d. T-4. CCS requested additional ideas for how to quantify impacts of this option. It was noted that it is difficult to model how changes in land use affect travel behavior. The models used by PSRC are some of the best in the country, but probably not sufficient to quantify this option. Rather, estimating GHG impacts will probably need to rely on case studies. The lead volunteer member for this option is working to summarize key case studies from the Northwest that demonstrate how development patterns result in different travel patterns, and to provide suggestions for what needs to be done over the long term to affect emission reductions.
  - e. Option 6. Volunteers for this option will take the lead on quantifying impacts of this option, but CCS will be involved to provide support.
  - f. Option 7. Volunteers for this option will take the lead on quantifying impacts of this option, but CCS will be involved to provide support.
  - g. Option 8. The volunteers for this option will develop targets for increasing bike mode share. To develop targets, the team may need to look at PSRC's regional modeling to determine the current mode share for biking and walking and how it can be increased in the future. A concern was raised that this option does not consider local transportation financing tools, but has instead morphed into a bike/pedestrian infrastructure discussion. It was suggested that there is a need for additional investment in local infrastructure. CCS responded that the general issue of new revenue for local transportation infrastructure and services will be addressed under T-0 (Funding Mechanisms).
  - h. Option 10. CCS will work with volunteer team to quantify emission benefits of this option.
  - i. Option 11. CCS will talk with Bob Saunders and work with volunteer team to determine emission benefits.
10. CCS discussed next steps for developing the text for implementation mechanisms for each of the priority options. Draft text should be completed for the October CAT meeting. TWG volunteers will take initiative to develop first cut at language for implementation options. This section should discuss issues such as: whether the strategy requires new programs, new policies, actions by state, local, and/or regional agencies, and what has to happen by when to achieve goals in the design.

**Next steps:**

1. The next TWG meeting is scheduled for Thursday, September 20, 10-12pm. The next CAT meeting will take place on September 7, via teleconference.
2. The next TWG meeting will discuss numeric goals and any impact quantification of the 12 options, and review the draft text of implementation mechanisms. CCS will circulate an updated version of the mitigation options document to the TWG for review one week before the September 20 TWG meeting. The final date for providing CCS (Jeff Ang-Olson) inputs for the updated version is Friday, September 14.