



[www.akclimatechange.us](http://www.akclimatechange.us)

## Transportation and Land Use Technical Working Group

### Summary List of Pending Priority Policy Options

Option No.	Draft Policy Option	GHG Reductions (MMtCO <sub>2</sub> e)				Net Present Value 2008–2025 (Million \$)	Cost-Effectiveness (\$/tCO <sub>2</sub> e)	Level of Support	
		2015	2020	2025	Total 2008–2025				
TLU-1	Transit, Ridesharing, and Commuter Choice Programs	0.002	0.003	0.005	0.046	29.9	651	Pending	
TLU-2	Heavy-Duty Vehicle Idling Regulations and/or Alternatives	0.004	0.009	0.009	0.095	24.3	255	Pending	
TLU-3	Transportation System Management	0.006	0.006	0.006	0.092	-10.8	-117	Pending	
TLU-4	Promote Efficient Development Patterns (Smart Growth)	0.019	0.043	0.066	0.501	Net Savings	NQ	Pending	
TLU-5	Promotion of Alternative Fuel Vehicles	0.026 - 0.084	0.054 - 0.173	0.09 - 0.288	0.669 - 2.139	207.3 - 350.4	135 - 524	Pending	
TLU-6	VMT and GHG Reduction Goals in Planning	0.019	0.043	0.066	0.501	NQ	NQ	Pending	
TLU-7	On-Road Heavy-Duty Vehicle Efficiency Improvements	a. SmartWay	0.050	0.075	0.084	0.930	-52.3	-56	Pending
		b. Phase Out	0.025	0.012	0.000	0.198	2.1	11	
		c. Public Fleets	0.016	0.033	0.037	0.364	NQ	NQ	
TLU-8	Marine Vessel Efficiency Improvements	0.012	0.022	0.032	0.269	20.4	76	Pending	
TLU-9	Aviation Emission Reductions	NQ	NQ	NQ	NQ	NQ	NQ	Pending	
TLU-10	Alternative Fuels R&D	NQ	NQ	NQ	NQ	NQ	NQ	Pending	
	<b>Sector Total Before Adjusting for Overlaps</b>	0.21	0.36	0.50	4.44	296	67		
	<b>Sector Total After Adjusting for Overlaps</b>	0.19	0.31	0.42	3.85	296*	77*		
	<b>Reductions From Recent Actions (CAFE stds)</b>	0.23	0.53	0.73	6.00	NQ	NQ		
	<b>Sector Total Plus Recent Actions</b>	0.41	0.84	1.15	9.84	NQ	NQ		

\*Does not include any cost for policies T-4, T-6, or T-7c, but does include emission reductions for those policies.

## T-1. Transit, Ridesharing, and Commuter Choice Programs

### Policy Description

The state would provide the leadership and resources necessary to help expand Alaska's public transit and ridesharing system. To alter Alaskan driving habits to reduce GHG emissions, issues of convenience, choice, and finance must be major elements in expanded transit and ridesharing operation. Public education will be paramount to success.

In order to reduce GHG emissions though expanding transit opportunities, commuters need to be provided with progressive incentives to change behavior. Intense, long term education must be undertaken to demonstrate the financial savings for transit users. Current successful van routes from Wasilla into Anchorage appear to offer cost savings to the users. The overall system connections, from parking lot to rail to bus routes, must meet citizen demands to get from home to workplace and lead to a public awareness of system functionality. Piecemeal programs will fade away with the lack of public buy in.

The majority of GHG reduction with increased transit and ridesharing service is expected to be achieved in the state's larger population areas.

If funding is not allocated to initiate the larger programs, then beginning with individual large employers incorporating financial incentives may be the best method to show success.

### Policy Design

This option would:

- Develop park-and-ride systems that are coupled to increased urban transit schedules. Estimates of new infrastructure will be needed in cold areas to keep car engines heated.
- Develop outlying collector routes with buses or vans to high employment destinations, i.e., university campuses, oil industry offices, and state offices. A daytime shuttle or van offer to provide for personal lunch time trips has been demonstrated in the private work place.
- Provide funding support to expand the current transit systems operations to increase the frequency of in-town schedules.
- Develop rail tie-in along existing track. DMU cars from Wasilla to Anchorage and North Pole - UAF Campus through Fairbanks would be leased on an initial winter basis. Funding would be provided to invest in these cars and a program operator, a possible statewide or regional transit authority.
- ADOT&PF will help achieve an expansion of transit services in Alaska communities including coordinated transit solutions, and seek additional funds to support this expansion.

**Goals:**

- Double transit ridership in Alaska by 2025, compared to 2007 levels.
- Double vanpooling in Alaska by 2025, compared to 2007 levels.
- Increase carpool mode share in Alaska by 2025.
- Support the development of a Regional Transportation Authority in Anchorage and Fairbanks to integrate all alternatives into one coordinated regional system. This system would eventually include rail, bus transit, paratransit, and ferries where appropriate.

**Timing:** See above.

**Parties Involved:** Local transit authorities, Alaska Railroad, local and state government, Alaska DOT

**Implementation Mechanisms**

The State of Alaska should develop legislation that provides transit funding that augments current FTA grants and/or pass through funds in combination with local government operational funding. A state funding source could be an incentive for small local governments to consider implementing limited transit operations in central core areas.

To the extent that commuter van ride sharing is operated primarily by rider subscription, this approach may offer a fractional reduction in GHG emissions in less densely populated locales associated with urban work environments.

**Related Policies/Programs in Place****Transit in Anchorage**

Since 2002, People Mover ridership in Anchorage has exceeded estimations. Service enhancements through route restructuring and increases in operations, combined with high fuel prices, have attracted more commuters resulting in 2008 ridership being the highest in People Mover's history. Future plans to improve service frequency to a bus every ½ hour from 6 a.m. to 6 p.m., as well as increased peak hour frequency on seven routes in corridors that have the highest ridership.

While the trend in Anchorage is matching the success of transit systems in the lower 48, Anchorage riders are more responsive to service increases. The industry standard for new service is that a 10% increase in service will result in a 7% increase in riders. Changes made since 2002 have increased service 18% with a corresponding 28% increase in riders indicating a strong latent demand for public transportation.

Anchorage's Long Range Transportation Plan addresses high frequency, high performance express bus service on the Glenn Highway corridor to pick-up 5-7 percent of the peak-period commuters.

Currently the transit fixed route fleet has 55 buses. People Mover's long range goals double the size of the fleet. In the short term, approximately \$7 million is needed to replace the aging fleet, and another 20-25 buses are needed to meet the goals of the increased frequency on key corridors. The increased transit availability and ridership has a direct benefit to reducing GHG and managing congestion by reducing the number of overall vehicles on the road.

## Transit and Intelligent Transportation Systems in Anchorage

Anchorage's People Mover system has implemented a number of Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) in the past five years. Scheduling and dispatching systems, bus schedule information via a 24-hour telephone system, and most significantly, TransitRealTime provides the actual time a bus will arrive at a bus stop via the internet and by signs at major bus stops. This technology is being implemented to enhance the reliability, predictability and attractiveness of transit services for existing and potential bus riders.

## Ridesharing in Anchorage

Ridesharing is a program that provides car/van pool matching services for residents in Anchorage and its commute area. Its primary objective is to encourage and support alternatives to Single Occupant Vehicle (SOV)-driver commuting by coordinating with employers, disseminating information and sponsoring vanpool services and providing rideshare matching services.

The existing significant need in addressing ridesharing is the commuting traffic between the Mat-Su and Anchorage. Currently, 700 residents travel in 49 vanpools between Mat-Su and Anchorage and in 3 vanpools between Anchorage and Girdwood. Park and ride lots are full and the waiting list to enroll in the vanpool program is over 700 residents strong. The lack of vans that are used in the rideshare program is the largest obstacle. Anchorage and the Mat-Su are working to solve this need hopefully with some financial support for the legislature in the coming sessions.

## Statewide Actions

The recently approved (September 2008) Governor's Coordinated Transportation Task Force (Administrative Order #243), is an important step in advocacy for transit improvements.

## Types(s) of GHG Reductions

Primarily CO<sub>2</sub>. Small reductions in N<sub>2</sub>O and CH<sub>4</sub>.

## Estimated GHG Reductions and Net Costs or Cost Savings

Option No.	Draft Policy Option	GHG Reductions (MMtCO <sub>2</sub> e)				Net Present Value 2008–2025 (Million \$)	Cost-Effectiveness (\$/tCO <sub>2</sub> e)
		2015	2020	2025	Total 2008–2025		
TLU-1	Transit, Ridesharing, and Commuter Choice Programs	0.002	0.003	0.005	0.046	29.9	651

## Data Sources:

- Transit and Vanpool Ridership and Passenger Miles Traveled in Anchorage and Fairbanks: National Transit Database, 2007.
- Transit and Vanpool Fuel Use: National Transit Database, 2007.

- Transit Operating Costs: National Transit Database, 2007.
- Mode Shift Factor for Transit Systems in Small Urban Areas: American Public Transportation Association Draft Climate Change Guidance (August 2008)
- Fuel Prices from Annual Energy Outlook, 2009 Early Release.

### Quantification Methods:

- Passenger miles traveled (PMT) in transit and vanpool vehicles was assumed to double, along with ridership, by 2025
- PMT was multiplied by the mode shift factor from APTA guidance to determine the number of vehicle miles traveled (VMT) displaced by bus, rail, and demand response ridership. For vanpool ridership, we consider PMT to replace VMT on a 1:1 basis. This assumption is consistent with the methodology that the City of Anchorage uses to calculate the VMT displacement of its vanpool program. Vanpools target the commuter population, whose main alternative mode tends to be driving alone (single occupancy vehicle).
- The increase in VMT displaced in each year was multiplied by standard emissions factors to arrive at GHG reductions.
- An increase in buses and vans in service was calculated assuming that average passenger load factors would increase by 50% by 2025. This is equivalent to a 2.7% annual improvement in load factors. We assume that the average route miles traveled per vehicle will not change. Therefore 33% more vehicles will be required in order to double transit ridership.
- We calculated transit vehicle emissions using data on diesel and gasoline consumption reported by transit agencies to the National Transit Database. We assume that by 2025, 25% of the bus fleet will be diesel-electric hybrid vehicles, with 30% better fuel economy than conventional diesel buses (based on experience of King County, WA Metro). We assume that other new vehicles purchased will use the same fuel types and achieve the same mileage as current vehicles.
- For policy cost, we calculated the following components:
  - Capital Cost Increase: We calculated the cost of new vehicles based on current vehicle prices. An average 35 ft. bus costs about \$350,000 ([based on experience of Fairbanks North Star Borough](#)). An average van costs about \$40,000 ([City of Anchorage](#)). We assume that other capital costs, including facilities, stations, systems, guideways, and replacement costs for existing vehicles, are unaffected by the policy.
  - Operating Cost Increase: [We assume that operating costs for each mode will increase by 33% to 2020, proportional to the increase in transit service.](#)
  - User Cost Savings: Users of transit save money on vehicle expenses for every mile they do not drive their cars. Users save on gas, depreciation of vehicle value, and maintenance expenses. Fuel costs are calculated from the Annual Energy Outlook. Depreciation and maintenance costs are drawn from [www.commutesolutions.org](http://www.commutesolutions.org).

**Key Assumptions:** Ridership increase begins in 2010 and rises steadily to 2025. Vehicle passenger loads increase by 50% to 2025.

### **Key Uncertainties**

The appropriate mode shift factor for the proposed transit and vanpool expansions may be higher than estimated in APTA guidance. The guidance estimates that only one third of transit trips would have been made in a unique vehicle trip if no transit were available. Commute trips on transit are more likely to replace a single-occupancy vehicle (SOV) trip than non-commute trips.

### **Additional Benefits and Costs**

Transit expansion in urban areas can facilitate more compact development patterns and help reduce roadway congestion. Both of these benefits produce additional reductions in GHG emissions.

### **Feasibility Issues**

*TBD – [as needed and approved by the TWGs]*

### **Status of Group Approval**

*TBD – [until CCMAG moves to final agreement]*

### **Level of Group Support**

*TBD – [until CCMAG moves to final agreement]*

### **Barriers to Consensus**

*TBD – [undetermined until final vote by the CCMAG]*

## T-2. Heavy-duty Vehicle Idling Regulations and/or Alternatives

### Policy Description

Alaska will focus on reducing idling times for diesel and gasoline heavy-duty vehicles, buses, and other vehicles through a combination of statewide anti-idling regulations and by promoting and expanding the use of technologies that reduce heavy-duty vehicle idling. These technologies include vehicle equipment modifications such as auxiliary power units, direct fired heaters, and automatic engine shut down/startup system controls. Other effective means of idle reduction come through the use of Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) technology such as electronic weigh station bypass systems. These systems allow safe and legal vehicles to pass a weigh station, at highway speed, without stopping for inspection. This bypass eliminates the need for a heavy duty vehicle to idle its engine for a period from as few as 10 minutes to as many as 60-90 minutes.

Recognizing Alaska's severe arctic and sub-arctic winter conditions, accommodations must be made for below zero winter temperatures. Auxiliary power units, for example, can ameliorate the effects of idling but idling cannot be entirely prohibited such as when extreme weather conditions warrant.

Alaska will encourage the adoption of statewide statutes or regulations and local ordinances to promote idle reduction for all vehicles. All vehicle owners, public and private will be subject to these regulations and to the penalties prescribed in the statute or regulations.

### Policy Design

Alaska will develop and implement a statewide regulation banning extended idling by heavy-duty vehicles given accommodations for below zero arctic and sub arctic winter conditions. As with all regulations, they must be enforceable with a reasonable expectation of penalty for non-compliance. Alaska will also provide local governmental units with model language for adoption as local anti-idling ordinances.

Alaska will encourage and promote reduced idling through programs aimed at increasing voluntary adoption of idling reduction technologies. Components of such an effort should include collaborative outreach and education timed with the implementation and enforcement of a statewide anti-idling regulation and seeking funding for pilot projects and demonstrations as well as funds available through any federal or other programs to evaluate the effectiveness of various idle reduction technologies.

Alaska may also provide additional incentives to fleet or individual heavy truck owners to purchase and install idle reduction technologies on their vehicles. These incentives may come in the form of full grants, matching grants, tax credits and low or no interest loans.

Alaska may also provide incentives to assist the private fleets to convert some of their vehicles to hybrid operation. Such engine technology is or soon will become available in the marketplace.

**Goals:**

- Alaska DOT&PF will lead by example with the installation of idle reduction technology and/or idle reduction policies/procedures for its fleet of heavy duty vehicles. This goal will be phased to accomplish installation of these technologies or adoption of policies; 20% will be so equipped by 2012 with the remaining 80% equipped by 2020, with exception for vehicles used only seasonally.
- Local governments and school districts will install idle reduction for their fleets at a rate similar or slightly lagging the state DOT&PF.
- Commercial and private fleets will be encouraged through regulation and through incentives to meet the same timetables.
- The Alaska DEC will be the lead agency to adopt and enforce the statute or regulations on both public and private vehicle owners.
- Accomplishment of these goals should result in significant reductions in both green house gas emissions and should also show significant fuel savings.

**Timing:**

- Target date for the development and implementation of anti idling regulations for state and local governments is the end of 2011. Legislation can be introduced in the 2010 session of the Alaska Legislature to establish the statutory authority to require that regulations and local ordinances be adopted to implement these requirements.
- Target date for partial and full implementation of idle reduction technologies by all parties is 20% by 2012 and the remaining 80% by 2020, with exception for vehicles used only seasonally.

**Parties Involved:** Alaska Departments of Commerce and Community Development, Transportation and Public Facilities, Environmental Conservation, Revenue, local governments, school districts, commercial and private truck fleets, tour bus operators, trucking associations, unions, shippers, Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPO) including FMATS and AMATS.

**Implementation Mechanisms**

Alaska DEC will adopt idling regulations for private and public agency vehicles by the end of 2011. Legislation can be introduced in the 2010 session of the Alaska Legislature to establish the statutory authority for these regulations. Include concise language in the regulation so that the agency with enforcement responsibilities is clearly delineated and has full authority to enforce the ordinance. The language should also include any exemptions to the idling policy, which can be easily observed. In developing the idling regulation, the U.S. EPA's recent Model State Idling Law should be reviewed for potential language.

Alaska DEC will develop a program to provide incentives for idle reduction technologies by the end of 2010. Funding can come from both state and federal sources.

For vehicles owned by Alaska DOT&PF, the department will install idle reduction technologies and/or promote idle reduction through internal policies and training.

The state will also provide information and education to targeted audiences. Trucking companies should be encouraged to do their own proctoring. Outreach materials should emphasize the fuel savings benefits, reductions in toxic emissions, and reduced engine wear associated with reducing idling. Provide information to fleet carriers, shippers, retailers, bus companies, school districts, and others involved in the diesel fleet industry indicating the economic benefits, as well as the environmental benefits, of applying idle reduction technologies. Identify best practices within the industry and recognize companies with these best practices in place within Alaska to encourage companies to select these carriers for their shipments.

**Related Policies/Programs in Place**

U.S. EPA-approved idling reduction devices are excluded from the 12% federal excise tax (FET) under Section 206 of the Energy Improvement and Extension Act of 2008 (EIEA) (PL 110-343). EPA has published a complete list of idling reduction devices that are eligible for the retail excise tax exemption. The types of idling reduction devices include fuel operated heaters, battery air conditioning systems, auxiliary power units/generator sets, thermal storage systems, and shore connection systems. The complete list of EPA approved idling reduction devices can be found at: [www.epa.gov/smartway/transport/what-smartway/idling-reduction-fet.htm](http://www.epa.gov/smartway/transport/what-smartway/idling-reduction-fet.htm)

**Types(s) of GHG Reductions**

Primarily CO<sub>2</sub>. Small reductions in N<sub>2</sub>O and CH<sub>4</sub>.

**Estimated GHG Reductions and Net Costs or Cost Savings**

Option No.	Draft Policy Option	GHG Reductions (MMtCO <sub>2</sub> e)				Net Present Value 2008–2025 (Million \$)	Cost-Effectiveness (\$/tCO <sub>2</sub> e)
		2015	2020	2025	Total 2008–2025		
T-2	Heavy-duty Vehicle Idling Regulations and/or Alternatives	0.004	0.009	0.009	0.095	24.3	255

**Data Sources:**

- Vehicle Populations for State and Local Government and Private and Commercial Vehicles: FHWA, Highway Statistics 2006 (Tables MV-7 and MV-9)
- Alaska Population Forecasts: Alaska Economic Trends, October 2007
- Fuel Prices: Energy Information Administration, Annual Energy Outlook Early Release 2009, Table 12

**Quantification Methods:**

- Highway Statistics provides limited data on heavy duty truck populations in Alaska. Based on this data, we estimate the population of private and state and local government-owned combination trucks (truck tractors) and buses in Alaska (2,584 buses and 4,323

truck tractors in 2007). Data from the state DMV suggests there are private 9,994 trucks over 12,000 lbs gross vehicle weight registered in the state (a portion of which are combination trucks). Thus, we assume 5,671 heavy-duty single-unit trucks (9,994 minus 4,323).

- Population of heavy duty trucks in future years was estimated to increase proportional to the population of the state until 2025.
- Hours of idling reduced was calculated from assumed total hours of idling, target penetration rates, and assumed policy effectiveness. Fuel savings and emission reductions were calculated based on hours of idling reduced.
- Cost was calculated based on the installation costs of anti-idling technologies and the fuel cost savings incurred by anti-idling measures. To estimate costs, we assumed the following:
  - Installation of PonyPack APU on new combination trucks, at a cost of \$10,000 each.
  - Fuel use in PonyPack is 0.2 gallons per hour, compared to average rate of 0.75 gallons per hour for the truck engine
  - For other heavy-duty vehicle types (buses and single unit trucks), no equipment installation required. Idle reduction achieved through training, education, and regulation.

### **Key Assumptions:**

- Buses and heavy duty trucks idle an average of 312 hours per year each. (Assumption from Puget Sound Clean Air Agency and Washington State Department of Ecology. Consistent with estimates from California Air Resources Board.)
- There is no substantial overnight idling of long-haul vehicles in Alaska
- 25% of idling is discretionary idling that can be reduced by vehicles installing anti-idling technologies or complying with new regulations. Discretionary idling includes idling during vehicle loading and unloading, idling at rest stops, and extended idling at station stops (for transit vehicles). The remaining 75% of idling is non-discretionary, which includes vehicles stopped in traffic, operating power equipment, emergency situations, and when the engine is needed to keep the vehicle warm.
- 20% of vehicles will be compliant by 2012. 100% of vehicles will be compliant by 2020. Reductions begin in 2011.

### **Key Uncertainties**

*TBD – [as needed and approved by the TWGs]*

### **Additional Benefits and Costs**

Reducing idling by heavy-duty vehicles and locomotives would reduce particulate matter emissions. Many scientific studies have linked breathing PM to a series of significant health problems, including aggravated asthma, difficult breathing, chronic bronchitis, heart attacks, and

premature death. Diesel particulate matter is of specific concern because it is likely to be carcinogenic to humans when inhaled.

### **Feasibility Issues**

*TBD – [as needed and approved by the TWGs]*

### **Status of Group Approval**

*TBD – [until CCMAG moves to final agreement]*

### **Level of Group Support**

*TBD – [until CCMAG moves to final agreement]*

### **Barriers to Consensus**

*TBD – [undetermined until final vote by the CCMAG]*

### T-3. Transportation System Management

#### Policy Description

The State of Alaska would seek to reduce GHG emissions from the transportation sector through improvements to transportation system management. These efforts would focus on the improvement, management, and operation of the transportation infrastructure, with a focus on the roads and highway systems.

#### Policy Design

- Roundabouts can reduce traffic queuing and delay, thus saving fuel and reducing GHG emissions; they also have safety benefits. ADOT&PF will encourage the installation of roundabouts.
- To improve fuel economy and reduce GHG emissions per mile traveled, the state will reduce maximum speed limits on state highways to 60 MPH, or lower where appropriate. Additional benefits are reduced traffic injuries and fatalities.
- ADOT&PF will continue its commitment to providing a multimodal transportation system by continuing to invest in transit, bike and pedestrian facilities. ADOT&PF spends an average of roughly \$5 million annually on these facilities and expects this level of commitment to continue or increase.
- All urban areas (i.e., >5,000 population) will continue to include consideration of bike and pedestrian facilities in their urban transportation plans.
- ADOT&PF in partnership with urban communities will work to improve traffic signal synchronization on all state managed routes (mostly arterials) in urban areas (i.e., >5,000 population) by 2012. Signal synchronization reduces start/stop traffic on arterial routes as the lights are timed to continuously move traffic forward at the target pace. This strategy also helps reduce traffic queuing thus saving fuel and reducing GHG emissions.
- ADOT&PF will complete conversion of all traffic lights to LED bulbs by 2010 and will work with cities to convert roadway luminary lighting under city jurisdiction. LED bulbs significantly conserve energy thereby indirectly reducing GHG emissions.
- All urban transportation plans will be updated by 2012 with an emphasis on operations and safety. The operations elements in urban transportation plans will improve traffic flow, reduce conflict points and can result in turn lanes, reconfiguration of intersections or access control. In metropolitan areas, the transportation plans will meet air quality conformity requirements for criteria pollutants.
- Congestion management plans for all high traffic volume construction projects will be considered by ADOT&PF. These plans implement strategies to keep traffic flowing through construction zones, thus reducing fuel use and reducing GHG emissions.

- Access management will continue to be pursued consistent with state of Alaska statutes and ADOT&PF policies. Access management is intended to reduce the number of street and driveway access points to major roads and highways, in order to reduce conflict points. It has a proven capacity and safety benefit. The appropriate goal is to continue and strengthen access management within the state.
- Install traffic management technologies and provide public information of travel conditions on high volume commuter routes, especially those lacking practical bypasses. ADOT&PF along with partner communities will complete by 2010 a comprehensive ITS Plan for the Glenn Highway corridor between Anchorage and the Mat-Su valley.
- Improve the manner in which incidents and accidents on high volume routes are processed. Require drivers involved in crashes to pull away from travel lanes. Implementation will require educational signs, and possibly a statutory change requiring moving vehicles to the side of a road in non-injury accidents. Accelerate accident scene processing following the Washington state model (faster accident scene clean-up, faster documentation of scene evidence, while not compromising investigation of facts); this may require some trial deployment and testing of the new approach in the courts.

**Goals:** See above.

**Timing:** See above.

**Parties Involved:** ADOT&PF, FMATS and AMATS, local governments

### Implementation Mechanisms

**Roundabouts.** ADOT&PF, FMATS and AMATS should evaluate potential intersection locations for roundabout installation. ADOT&PF will report on its roundabout evaluation criteria and list all locations evaluated annually for potential roundabout installation, to be no less than 5 intersections/locations annually. ADOT&PF will encourage the installation of roundabouts when the installation is based on sound engineering principles. ADOT&PF will work cooperatively with local governments seeking information on the principles of roundabout installation. ADOT&PF will assist the cities and boroughs in their analysis of roundabout suitability for intersections under their jurisdiction. ADOT&PF will consider roundabout treatment at planned right angle intersections for new construction and upgrades and when completing routine safety reviews. ADOT&PF has previously adopted roundabouts in the 2007 Strategic Highway Safety Plan as a preferred solution, where practicable, for safety reasons.

**ITS Plan.** Routes such as the Glenn Highway between Anchorage and the Mat-Su valley experience considerable traffic during peak conditions. Due to a lack of alternative routes, incidents such as accidents and spilled loads can tie up traffic for hours. ADOT&PF along with partner communities will strive to complete by 2010 a comprehensive ITS Plan for the corridor that would evaluate and prioritize:

- Installation of speed and congestion sensors
- Installation of internet accessible cameras
- Use these technologies to monitor conditions, respond to incidents and inform the public of incidents and congestion

- Use all available means of communication, including radio, email/text message, Variable Message Signs, Highway Advisory Radio and internet media.
- Deploy (perhaps on a trial basis) courtesy patrols which can respond to breakdowns, out of fuel, flat tire, accident scenes.
- Capture better data on incidents so that progress can be evaluated (e.g., benefit-cost)

**Related Policies/Programs in Place**

**LED Lights.** To improve energy efficiency of traffic signal and roadway lighting, several efforts are underway in Anchorage. The Municipality has already installed LED lights in all of its traffic signals to reduce energy costs. It’s estimated that energy cost for traffic signals alone is about a 30% savings. In addition, the Municipality is reviewing all outdoor lighting, which includes over 16,000 streetlights as well as pedestrian lighting, parking garage lighting, and trail lighting. Streetlights currently utilize a 150W to 400W High Pressure Sodium (HPS) fixture, which operate approximately 4,400 hours per year at an annual energy cost of \$2.2 Million. It’s also possible to reduce the load or wattage of the street lights and /or provide dimming devices for greater energy and cost savings.

As of December 2008, Anchorage has finalized design criteria for low-speed, residential street lighting and is installing over 4,000 LED fixtures in neighborhoods throughout the city. The Municipality is undergoing testing of LED fixtures for higher speed roadways and hopes to finalize criteria for this application in 2009.

The quality, amount, brightness, glare, and uniformity of lighting are all key elements in the effort for better and lower cost lighting. In addition to cost and energy savings, lighting can also provide a better color of light (white instead of orange or blue), enhanced safety through improved visibility, less light trespass into homes, and less light pollution into the night sky. The effort to minimize operational maintenance cost is a significant benefit. The LED fixtures being installed in Anchorage use 50% of the energy of HPS fixtures, and the lamps last roughly five to seven times as long.

**Transit Improvements.** The recently approved (September 2008) Governor’s Coordinated Transportation Task Force (Administrative Order #243), is an important step in advocacy for transit improvements.

**Types(s) of GHG Reductions**

Primarily CO<sub>2</sub>. Small reductions in N<sub>2</sub>O and CH<sub>4</sub>.

**Estimated GHG Reductions and Net Costs or Cost Savings**

Partial Quantification Only Based on Reduced Speed Limits:

Option No.	Draft Policy Option	GHG Reductions (MMtCO <sub>2</sub> e)				Net Present Value 2008–2025 (Million \$)	Cost-Effectiveness (\$/tCO <sub>2</sub> e)
		2015	2020	2025	Total 2008–2025		
T-3	Transportation System Management	0.006	0.006	0.006	0.092	-10.8	-117

**Data Sources:**

- Speed limits, average vehicle speeds, and daily traffic counts on Alaska state highways from ADOT&PF
- VMT from the Alaska GHG Inventory and Projections.
- Annual VMT by vehicle and facility type from FHWA, “Highway Statistics 2006 (VM-1),” available at: <http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/policy/ohim/hs06/>.
- U.S. EPA, Office of Transportation and Air Quality, SmartWay Transport Partnership, *A Glance at Clean Freight Strategies: Reducing Highway Speed*, EPA420-F-04-007, February 2004, available at: [http://www.epa.gov/smartway/smartway\\_fleets\\_strategies.htm](http://www.epa.gov/smartway/smartway_fleets_strategies.htm).
- Dierkers, Greg, et al., *CCAP Transportation Emissions Guidebook*. Guidebook Emissions Calculator, Center for Clean Air Policy. Available at: [www.ccap.org/guidebook](http://www.ccap.org/guidebook)
- Fuel Prices: Energy Information Administration, Annual Energy Outlook Early Release 2009, Table 12

**Quantification Methods:**

- We calculate VMT for each future year for affected highways using data on VMT by vehicle and facility type from FHWA and projections of VMT for Alaska. VMT on routes currently posted at 65 MPH is assumed to increase proportionally with total statewide VMT.
- We calculate improvements in fuel economy for affected vehicles based on assumptions below.
- We calculate the reduction in CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from the improved fuel economy of targeted vehicles. Cumulative reductions are calculated beginning in 2010.
- We calculate cost savings based on forecast fuel prices and estimated fuel savings. [Education and enforcement costs are calculated based on assumptions below.](#)

**Key Assumptions:**

- Reducing the speed limit from 65 to 60 MPH will cause 25% of vehicles to reduce their speed by 5 MPH.
- Each 1-mph reduction of speed from 70 mph to 55 mph yields a fuel economy increase of 0.1 mpg for heavy-duty diesel trucks (EPA).
- Each 1-mph reduction of speed down to 55 mph yields a 1% reduction in CO<sub>2</sub> emissions per mile (Dierkers et al.).
- [Education and enforcement for reduced speed limits will require four new full time employees at a cost of \\$100,000 per year each.](#)

**Key Uncertainties**

*TBD – [as needed and approved by the TWGs]*

**Additional Benefits and Costs**

Strategies that reduce congestion can have significant economic benefits to the state.

Some strategies that improve highway system efficiency have safety benefits (reduce vehicle crashes).

Strategies that reduce vehicle idling or stop-and-go traffic patterns will reduce emissions of criteria air pollutants (such as particulate matter), resulting in public health benefits.

**Feasibility Issues**

*TBD – [as needed and approved by the TWGs]*

**Status of Group Approval**

*TBD – [until CCMAG moves to final agreement]*

**Level of Group Support**

*TBD – [until CCMAG moves to final agreement]*

**Barriers to Consensus**

*TBD – [undetermined until final vote by the CCMAG]*

## T-4. Promote Efficient Development Patterns (Smart Growth)

### Policy Description

GHG emission reduction through efficient, sustainable (i.e., smart growth) land development patterns will need to be incorporated with reduced VMT, transit improvements, sustained implementation of multi modal links to facilitate biking, walking, and winter trail use in residential and urban areas.

Issues and items to be developed would include:

- State policy issues detailing funding parameters and funders' policies distributing state and fed dollars
- Changes to state laws and regulations
- Local development plans i.e. Anchorage 2020, FNSB Regional Comprehensive Plan
- Local zoning code changes
- Increased urban / residential density factors
- Land "disposal" sales and auctions, including UA and AMHLT
- Subdivision codes and standards to set aside people friendly open spaces, green belt reserves
- Tax credits / incentives to developers
- Must be combined with infrastructure planning – roads and utilities

Public buy-in is a must. There must be strong incentives to have people accept programs.

### Policy Design

This option will focus on promoting land use changes that result in higher densities in developed, urban areas. It will also focus on incorporating retail zones and small limited commercial nodes in residential developments, with a goal of reducing driving needs by facilitating walking or bicycling, and also reducing the length of driving trips. Changes to residential development patterns, including new subdivisions around population centers, will require a full gambit of incentives to produce the desired change. Efforts to promote land use changes should be coordinated with the Alaska Municipal League.

The Department of Education will require school boards in selecting new school sites to favor sites which can be reached by walking and biking for the majority of the population the school will serve. Travel of school children by parent-driven vehicles is widely practiced, and is considered a major component in traffic volumes due peak periods. The benefits of walking and

bike riding to schools include not only reduced vehicular fuel consumption and GHG emissions but also a more physically fit youth population.

**Goals:** By 2020, increase the share of Alaska's annual new residential and commercial construction that occurs within the denser parts of urban areas (compared to a business-as-usual baseline) through re-development, infill, and mixed uses that take advantage of the existing public investment in infrastructure, public services, and facilities. Simulation studies performed in other metropolitan areas have shown that efficient development patterns can reduce VMT in the range of 3% to 20% over a 20-30 year time horizon. Using the lower end of this range, the goal for Alaska should be reduce urban area VMT 3% by 2025.

Note that implementation of this strategy may be affected by new federal regulations on metropolitan transportation planning and GHG reduction.

**Timing:** See above.

**Parties Involved:** State and local governments, developers, transit agencies, Alaska Municipal League, Alaska DOT&PF, MPOs

### Implementation Mechanisms

- The state should require all new elementary schools to be located on sites with good pedestrian and bicycle access.
- The state should require that all state government work centers to be located in the central business district (CBD) or other established core business area of municipalities or, if this is not possible, in a suburban location with good pedestrian and bicycle access.
- Enable and encourage local governments to adopt financial incentives for infill or location efficient development such as fast track permitting, reduction of building permit fees, and reduction of system development or impact fees.
- Where regional or comprehensive land use plans are in place, municipalities should develop land suitable maps for residential and light commercial development, focusing on infill and transit-oriented parcels that can reduce VMT.
- Enable and encourage local governments to modify zoning codes to allow land use mixing, which can reduce the length of trips and encourage walk trips. Also encourage amendments to zoning codes to allow mother-in-law apartments in single family residential zones.
- Establish financial incentives (density bonuses, property tax credits) for developers to construct more multi family dwellings, including senior/retirement units for denser development in urban areas
- Improve urban areas with “arbor actions” and designate green spaces to create pedestrian-friendly streetscapes and improve walkability in downtown areas.
- Establish alternative non-motorized travel incentives to workplaces, similar to the \$20 Federal travel payments to employees.
- Enable and encourage local governments to develop building design guidelines or standards that incorporate energy efficiency, smaller CO2 footprint, and lower dwelling

utility costs. Higher design standards offer higher quality to draw existing populations into denser urban centers.

- Modify State law to allow differential tax rates for energy efficiency and reduced GHG footprint.

### Related Policies/Programs in Place

FMATS and AMATS are working with the University of Fairbanks to improve their travel models to include GHG emissions. The enhanced models may improve the quantification of this policy option in the future.

### Types(s) of GHG Reductions

Primarily CO<sub>2</sub>. Small reductions in N<sub>2</sub>O and CH<sub>4</sub>.

### Estimated GHG Reductions and Net Costs or Cost Savings

Option No.	Draft Policy Option	GHG Reductions (MMtCO <sub>2</sub> e)				Net Present Value 2008–2025 (Million \$)	Cost-Effectiveness (\$/tCO <sub>2</sub> e)
		2015	2020	2025	Total 2008–2025		
T-4	Promote Efficient Development Patterns (Smart Growth)	0.019	0.043	0.066	0.501	Net Savings	NQ

The GHG impacts of this option are identical to option T-6, which has a goal of reducing per capita light duty vehicle GHG emissions in urbanized areas 3% by 2025.

#### Data Sources:

An extensive body of research has demonstrated the ability of smart growth development policies to reduce VMT in urban areas. By creating denser, mixed use developments served by transit, bicycle, and pedestrian infrastructure, smart growth policies reduce the distances that people need to travel to reach their destinations, and reduce the need to travel by car. A number of regional studies throughout the United States have estimated the specific benefits of smart growth to various urban regions. Ewing et al estimate that compact development can reduce VMT per capita by 30% over the sprawling development patterns typical of the last few decades in the United States. (See Ewing et al., *Growing Cooler: the Evidence on Urban Development and Climate Change*, Urban Land Institute, 2008, for more information.)

For a summary of other relevant literature, see:

- U.S. EPA, Our Built and Natural Environments: A Technical Review of the Interactions between Land Use, Transportation, and Environmental Quality, 2001.  
<http://www.epa.gov/dced/built.htm>
- Federal Highway Administration, Toolbox for Regional Policy Analysis,  
<http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/planning/toolbox/index.htm>

## Key Uncertainties

*TBD – [as needed and approved by the TWGs]*

## Additional Benefits and Costs

Land use policies such as the densification of developed land, mixing of compatible land uses and other urban design measures have beneficial “spin-offs” for other strategies. Land use based policies further mode switching policies because these policies help create an environment that is easier served by transit, biking and walking.

Compact development patterns also reduce public expenditure on infrastructure and services. A variety of literature finds that integrated transportation and land use planning produces net savings on the total costs of buildings + land + infrastructure + transportation. While some components may be higher, the preponderance of literature suggests net savings overall (see US EPA, Our Built and Natural Environments: A Technical Review of the Interactions Between Land Use, Transportation, and Environmental Quality, 2001). A National Academy of Sciences / Transportation Research Board review found substantial regional and state-level infrastructure cost savings from more compact development (see Robert Burchell, et al., The Costs of Sprawl—Revisited (TCRP Report 39), Transportation Research Board, Washington, D.C. 1998). An analysis of the New Jersey State Plan found that municipalities, counties, and school districts would save an estimated \$160 million from 2000 to 2020 by pursuing smart growth patterns (see Robert Burchell, et al., The Costs and Benefits of Alternative Growth Patterns: The Impact Assessment of the New Jersey State Plan, Center for Urban Policy Research, Rutgers University, 2000).

## Feasibility Issues

*TBD – [as needed and approved by the TWGs]*

## Status of Group Approval

*TBD – [until CCMAG moves to final agreement]*

## Level of Group Support

*TBD – [until CCMAG moves to final agreement]*

## Barriers to Consensus

*TBD – [undetermined until final vote by the CCMAG]*

## T-5. Promotion of Alternative Fuel Vehicles

### Policy Description

Alternative fuel vehicles (AFVs) offer significant opportunities to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from the light-duty fleet. Alternative fuels include natural gas, propane, bio-diesel, electricity, ethanol, hydrogen, and fuel cells. AFVs include hybrid vehicles that utilize more than one power source to move the vehicle. Because of Alaska's large deposits of natural gas, compressed natural gas (CNG) vehicles may be a particularly viable option for the state. However, questions remain about the feasibility and benefits of CNG vehicles in Alaska.

This mitigation option consists of two parts. The first part is working towards the replacement of existing light-duty vehicle fleets with AFVs. The second part consists of better informing the public of the benefits of purchasing AFVs and providing incentives as well.

Public sector agencies<sup>1</sup> and some private sector firms own large number of vehicles. Converting these fleets to AFVs can result in large reduction of pollutants and greenhouse gases.

The second component of this proposed policy consists of providing information to consumers about benefits of AFVs, such as fuel efficiency benefits, environmental (cleaner air) benefits, cost savings, and technological benefits.

The policy would be implemented through as series of federal and state supported low-cost loans, grants, attractive financing of trade-in, tax incentives, other incentives and subsidies, to promote use of AFVs.

Implementation of this policy would be supported by TLU-10: Alternative Fuels Research and Development.

### Policy Design

#### Goals:

- Increase the use of light-duty AFVs by public sector agencies and private sector firms to 25% of on-road fuel consumption by 2020 and 35% by 2030.
- Increase the use of AFVs by consumers to 10% of on-road fuel consumption by 2020 and 25% by 2030.
- The AFV technologies chosen should produce a minimum 15% lifecycle reduction in GHG emissions per mile compared to conventional fuels.

**Timing:** See above.

#### Parties Involved:

---

<sup>1</sup> Public sector agencies include: federal, state, and local governments; school districts, and utilities.

*Affected:* Government at all levels; other fleets

*Implementers:* Government, military.

### Implementation Mechanisms

State legislation should authorize financing (2% loans) for AFV purchases by 2012.

State legislation should create a rebate program to encourage consumer purchases of AFVs.

State legislation should create incentives for local government to purchase AFVs or convert existing fleet vehicles to alternative fuels. Because local governments cannot benefit from tax incentives, one option is to create a state program that converts tax incentives into a rebate, allowing local governments to purchase AFVs at a lower price.

The state should also encourage conversion of gasoline vehicles to CNG in appropriate situations. The U.S. Congress has encouraged conversion of cars to CNG with tax credits of up to 50% of the auto conversion cost and the CNG home filling station cost. However, while CNG is a much cleaner fuel, the conversion can only be performed by manufacturers certified to perform aftermarket conversions on vehicles to operate on alternative fuels. There do not appear to be any certified manufacturers for conversion in Alaska. One challenge preventing more widespread conversion of standard engines to operate on alternative fuels is the high cost associated with becoming certified to perform the conversion; meeting the requirements of a type certificate can cost up to \$50,000.

### Related Policies/Programs in Place

Under the 2005 federal Energy Policy Act (EPACT), approximately 5% of gasoline sales will be replaced by ethanol nationally by 2012.

FMATS and AMATS are working with the University of Fairbanks to improve their travel models to include GHG emissions. The enhanced models may improve the quantification of this policy option in the future.

### Types(s) of GHG Reductions

Primarily CO<sub>2</sub>. Small reductions in N<sub>2</sub>O and CH<sub>4</sub>.

### Estimated GHG Reductions and Net Costs or Cost Savings

Option No.	Draft Policy Option	GHG Reductions (MMtCO <sub>2</sub> e)				Net Present Value 2008–2025 (Million \$)	Cost-Effectiveness (\$/tCO <sub>2</sub> e)
		2015	2020	2025	Total 2008–2025		
T-5	Promotion of Alternative Fuel Vehicles	0.026 - 0.084	0.054 - 0.173	0.09 - 0.288	0.669 - 2.139	207 - 350	135 - 524

### Data Sources:

- GHG reduction factors from alternative fuels from the GREET model v1.8

- Electricity generation mix in Alaska from EPA's eGRID 2007
- VMT forecasts from the Alaska GHG Inventory and Forecast
- Vehicle fleet data from Highway Statistics 2006 (Table VM-1)
- Fuel price forecasts from Energy Information Administration, Annual Energy Outlook 2009 Early Release, Tables 12 and 13
- Current year fuel prices by state from Energy Information Administration, State Energy Data System, 2008, Tables S5a and S2a

### Quantification Methods:

Three possible scenarios were evaluated for compliance with the AFV goals:

1. 100% of AFV run on compressed natural gas for 100% of mileage
2. 100% of AFV are electric vehicles
3. 100% of AFV are plug-in hybrid electric vehicles (PHEV)

The table below shows lifecycle (well-to-wheels) GHG emissions per mile for automobiles, calculated using GREET v1.8. These figures take into account Alaska's electricity generation mix and proximity to reserves of petroleum and natural gas.

	GHG per mile (g CO <sub>2</sub> e)	Reduction from Gasoline
Gasoline	482	
CNG	410	-15.1%
Electric	250	-48.2%
PHEV	315	-34.6%

These figures assume average driving cycles for light-duty vehicles driven in the United States. Typical driving cycles in Alaska may be different than those in other parts of the country, given the limited urban development and longer distances between settlements in the state. These potential differences may affect the relative reductions in GHG emissions achievable using the various alternative fuel propulsion technologies.

The following proportions were assumed for VMT in light-duty vehicles. These assumptions are based on available data on vehicle populations from Highway Statistics:

- Public vehicles: 1%
- Commercial vehicles: 20%
- Private vehicles: 79%

Penetration rates are assumed to increase smoothly starting in 2011 to reach the stated goals. For each year we calculate VMT affected by the goal. Reduction percentages from GREET are applied to calculate total GHG reductions. Results for each scenario are:

AFV Scenario	Reductions (MMtCO <sub>2</sub> e)		Cumulative Reductions (2008–2025)
	2012	2025	
CNG	0.009	0.082	0.611
Electric	0.029	0.263	1.954
PHEV	0.021	0.189	1.403

We drew information on the cost of alternative vehicle technologies from studies comparing each of the three technologies to conventional vehicles:

- EPRI, *Comparing the Benefits and Impacts of Hybrid Electric Vehicle Options for Compact Sedan and Sport Utility Vehicles*, 2002
- EPRI, *Advanced Batteries for Electric-Drive Vehicles: A Technology and Cost-Effectiveness Assessment for Battery Electric, Power Assist Hybrid Electric, and Plug-in Hybrid Electric Vehicles*, 2003
- Yocobucci, Brent, *Natural Gas Passenger Vehicles: Availability, Cost, and Performance*, 2008

Each of the studies estimates the difference in cost between a conventional vehicle and the alternative vehicle type in three categories: vehicle purchase cost, cost of fuel, and vehicle maintenance cost. (The Yocobucci study did not provide any difference in maintenance costs for CNG vehicles; we therefore assume that maintenance costs for CNG vehicles are comparable to those for conventional vehicles. Anecdotal evidence suggest that CNG vehicles are on average cheaper to maintain than conventional vehicles.). Using these findings we calculate the costs to increase the share of each AFV to the target percentage by 2025. These costs would typically be born by the owners of the AFVs, unless the State of Alaska subsidizes any portion of the vehicle purchase or operating costs.

For CNG vehicles, an additional cost for refueling equipment was included. There is currently very little infrastructure for CNG refueling in Alaska. The Yocobucci study assumed that CNG vehicle owners would need to purchase and install home refueling equipment, at a cost of approximately \$3,900 each. If CNG becomes widely used as a fuel for passenger vehicles in Alaska, we expect that centralized infrastructure will be provided, perhaps at lower cost. Still, infrastructure costs for CNG will almost certainly be higher than those for PHEV or electric vehicles. These vehicle types require little to no new infrastructure, since they can be charged using existing home electrical outlets.

We updated information on fuel costs in each of the studies with the latest energy price forecasts from the Energy Information Administration. To account for generally higher costs of energy in Alaska versus the continental U.S. (with the exception of CNG, which is cheaper in Alaska), we scale national fuel price forecasts by the current differential between average national prices and prices in Alaska.

Information about capital, fuel, and maintenance costs of each vehicle type are provided in the table below. Costs for each vehicle type were drawn from separate studies that use potentially

different methodologies. The reader should take care in comparing costs across vehicle types using this information.

### Additional Cost Compared to Conventional Gasoline Vehicle

Vehicle Type	Capital Costs (\$)	Fuel Costs (cents per mile)	Maintenance Costs (\$ per year)
CNG	9,480	-13.3	--
Electric	4,258	-3.0	-350
PHEV	6,351	-8.2	-94

-- no data available, but anecdotal reports suggest likely cost savings

**Key Assumptions:** see above

### Key Uncertainties

Transportation fuel providers would need to change their production and distribution methods to achieve the goals. Because the policy does not prescribe particular technology pathways, and because technology in this area is changing quickly, there is substantial uncertainty about which fuels and technologies fuel providers will use to meet the standard. The program assumes that providers will use the most cost-effective options to meet the standard, but compliance costs are unknown at this time.

### Additional Benefits and Costs

Most alternative fuels produce lower emissions of particulate matter and other localized pollutants. So this strategy will produce air quality and public health benefits.

### Feasibility Issues

*TBD – [as needed and approved by the TWGs]*

### Status of Group Approval

*TBD – [until CCMAG moves to final agreement]*

### Level of Group Support

*TBD – [until CCMAG moves to final agreement]*

### Barriers to Consensus

*TBD – [undetermined until final vote by the CCMAG]*

## T-6. VMT and GHG Reduction Goals in Planning

### Policy Description

Transportation Planning has historically focused on meeting the user demands for transportation, reacting primarily to changes in population growth, land use and other demands such as freight or resource movements. In many respects, the profession has been reactive or passive to these other considerations. Transportation planning generally evaluates tradeoffs of agency cost, travel time and user costs. The idea of using Planning as a means of reducing both the number of miles driven, and the production of green house gases is the cornerstone of this option. By empowering transportation planners to evaluate alternative proposals on the basis of VMT and/or GHG generation, decision makers can further improve the organization of communities so as to reduce the impacts of transportation on the environment.

It is important that personal mobility be retained as a paramount goal. Such mobility is a hallmark of modern society, for it empowers people to live, work, shop, play and go to school at locations they choose rather than those for which no other alternative exists due to lack of mobility. Historically in the U.S., VMT has risen much faster than population including a 3:1 ratio in Alaska since statehood. Thus any policy that attempts to reduce the per capita VMT and GHG production must be carefully tailored and include follow-up monitoring during implementation, to ensure it does not put a drag on the economy. Moreover, the real goal of this policy should focus on emissions reductions, even if VMT is unfettered. The fact that VMT can occur without emissions, depending upon the means of propulsion, suggests the ultimate goal should be on the form of energy and not the use of vehicles.

Unlike other states, where highway travel is the predominant source of transportation emissions, in Alaska the predominant emissions source is aviation, with highways a distant second. Thus, many Alaska communities are limited in their mobility options, relying solely on aviation and seasonal barge deliveries of freight and fuel. Nearly 30% of the state's population is limited in their mobility options, and any analysis must consider these circumstances. Currently, due to high energy costs, villages are experiencing out-migration to Alaska's cities, where employment is more readily found and the cost of living lower. This will increase per capita VMT within the state, as a cohort of the population is moving into the ranks of drivers.

Transportation planning is one tool to better inform decision makers. Many important decisions affecting vehicle miles traveled are made by various other entities. For example, the decision made in siting a new school may make busing and/or driving by parents the unavoidable option for pupil transport. Yet, seldom is this even considered by school boards when they make decisions for new school locations. When a new school is sited where walking and biking is not safe or practical it results in millions of vehicle trips being necessary over the long life of the school. This is but one example of how TLU-6 can help inform decision makers of the transportation consequences of their decisions.

## Policy Design

### Greenhouse Gases (GHG)

Calculating CO<sub>2</sub> emissions associated with an individual transportation project is not straightforward. The analysis can be quite complicated as most projects form but one piece of a larger network. Transportation planner's models do not generally predict the land use, induced demand, changes in speed and fleet that will occur during the project life nor travel characteristics of the user population. For example, phenomenon such as trip linking or what has happened in modern Alaska, when a large cohort of young people that arrived in the 1970's later age and thus have fewer children at home and follow a different life style, are generally not considered in even today's most sophisticated models.

However, whether adopted by the state, or later mandated under federal law<sup>2</sup>, the requirement to predict the GHG emissions of any given project, including all considered alternatives, is likely to become a requirement soon.

**Goals:** All significant transportation system plans developed at the state and MPO level, and all actions that would change or provide a new mode of transportation or enlarge capacity would be required to have an evaluation of their contribution to GHG emissions. Currently, traffic models to assist in such evaluations exist only at the metropolitan level in Alaska, and thus time may be needed to develop tools for non-metropolitan areas.

**Timing:** The two MPOs (FMATS and AMATS) would work with ADOT&PF to start developing consistent methods to evaluate GHG from transportation system plans, and relevant projects by the end of 2010.

**Parties Involved:** ADOT&PF, FMATS, and AMATS

### Vehicle Miles of Travel (VMT)

**Goals:**

- Support and promote public and private planning and development practices, including smart growth planning (see TLU-4) and infrastructure provisions, including expanded opportunities for non-vehicular travel that reduce the number and/or length of trips made in Alaska.
- By 2015, reduce the per-capita light-duty vehicle miles traveled (VMT) by 1% in communities that offer transit services and 3% by 2025.

**Timing:** See above.

**Parties Involved:** Alaska Department of Transportation and Public Facilities (ADOT&PF), Fairbanks Metropolitan Area Transportation Solutions (FMATS), Anchorage Metropolitan Area Transportation Solutions (AMATS)

---

<sup>2</sup> The Ninth Circuit which includes Alaska recently held that federal agencies must assess climate change impacts in environmental documents prepared under NEPA (9<sup>th</sup> Cir., November 15, 2007).

### Implementation Mechanisms

The two MPOs (FMATS and AMATS) would work with ADOT&PF to develop consistent methods to evaluate GHG from transportation system plans and relevant projects by the end of 2010.

The state legislature would enact a policy that requires per capita reductions in VMT in communities that offer transit services.

### Related Policies/Programs in Place

*TBD – No recent policies or programs have been identified as of yet. The TWG and DEC can work with CCS to identify existing or planned programs that address issues raised in this option.*

### Types(s) of GHG Reductions

Primarily CO<sub>2</sub>. Small reductions in N<sub>2</sub>O and CH<sub>4</sub>.

### Estimated GHG Reductions and Net Costs or Cost Savings

Option No.	Draft Policy Option	GHG Reductions (MMtCO <sub>2</sub> e)				Net Present Value 2008–2025 (Million \$)	Cost-Effectiveness (\$/tCO <sub>2</sub> e)
		2015	2020	2025	Total 2008–2025		
T-6	VMT and GHG Reduction Goals in Planning	0.019	0.043	0.066	0.501	NQ	NQ

The GHG impacts of this option are identical to option T-4, which has a goal of reducing per capita light duty vehicle GHG emissions in urbanized areas 3% by 2025.

#### Data Sources:

- Statewide VMT projections from Alaska GHG Inventory and Forecast
- Population forecasts for Alaska and Alaska urban regions: Alaska Economic Outlook, October 2007

#### Quantification Methods:

- Baseline VMT in the Anchorage/Mat-Su, Fairbanks, and Juneau regions was projected based on assumptions below
- VMT reduction in Anchorage/Mat-Su, Fairbanks, and Juneau was estimated based on stated goals.

#### Key Assumptions:

- VMT per capita in the Anchorage/Mat-Su region, the Fairbanks region, and the Juneau region is assumed equal to statewide VMT per capita.

## Key Uncertainties

The goal of limiting the per-capita use of light duty vehicles by 1%, then 3% by 2015 and 2020 respectively may be considered short of a “stretch goal” by some observers. Further, as written, the goal exempts heavy vehicle VMT, and further exempts communities that lack transit systems. However, the Alaska circumstance is so significantly different, the following factors are put forward to justify this seemingly “soft” goal.

- **Gas Line Construction:** Alaska is facing the construction of one and possibly two major pipelines in the coming decade which will substantially amplify the economy and the number of trips being made, since most of the line’s construction lies beyond the reach of transit, walking or biking. The larger gas line project will be the largest private sector construction project in North America history, and it will have a material impact on VMT.
- **Migration to other modes:** Alaskans rely extensively on aviation as a means of travel, and in some cases, where possible, their travel mode of choice may be changed to highway travel. Since highway travel is often less fuel intensive than is aviation, this is a good outcome for GHG production, even if it results in increased VMT.
- **Not including heavy vehicles trips in the goal:** Much of Alaska’s reliance on freight and construction vehicles (non light-duty) is related to oil and gas industry or other resource production. Including these types of trips in any goal, is not realistic, since there are very limited options for such freight and equipment movements.
- **Historic pattern of VMT growth:** Alaska has seen its VMT measure increase by about 300% as compared to population. This is higher than in the United States where a growth ratio of 2.5 has been observed. Yet nearly 30% of Alaskans cannot drive beyond the confines of their community due to an incomplete road network, and thus the actual ratio might have been higher if more roads were available. In a state larger than Texas, Montana and California combined, long distance travel is sometimes unavoidable, and thus any goal must keep this in mind.
- **Land Use Changes are Slow Moving:** Once developed, land use is relatively fixed, and thus the pattern of vehicle use from these locations is not easily addressed by transportation planners. Examples include the practice of large lot subdivisions within the rapidly growing Mat-Su area, the hillside development in south Anchorage, or residential land development outside the Fairbanks bowl area that requires 20 to 50 mile round trip. Encouraging walking and biking to schools that are miles from their pupils is another example of prior decisions that lock in vehicle use, for many more years into the future.
- **Alternatives May Not Exist:** If a community is too small or too spread out for transit and walking, what choices are there for residents, but to drive as they do today? Many of Alaska’s communities are not likely to see transit systems in the foreseeable future. The van ride sharing options become the primary methods to reduce SOV driving. Thus any VMT reduction goal in such communities is not founded in reality.

## Additional Benefits and Costs

*TBD – [as needed and approved by the TWGs]*

### **Feasibility Issues**

*TBD – [as needed and approved by the TWGs]*

### **Status of Group Approval**

*TBD – [until CCMAG moves to final agreement]*

### **Level of Group Support**

*TBD – [until CCMAG moves to final agreement]*

### **Barriers to Consensus**

*TBD – [undetermined until final vote by the CCMAG]*

## T-7. On-Road Heavy-Duty Vehicle Efficiency Improvements

### Policy Description

The State of Alaska should create new services and add additional support to existing voluntary and incentive-based programs that help public and private on-road heavy-duty diesel powered fleets reduce GHG emissions.

### Policy Design

This policy employs a combination of three primary strategies to achieve GHG emission reductions. The three strategies are:

- a. Develop incentives to encourage public and private on road diesel fleets to participate in the Federal EPA Smart Way® Transport Partnership Program.

**Goal** – Achieve public and private fleet participation in Smart Way of 30% of total trucks in Alaska by 2012 and to 50% by 2020.

- b. Provide incentives to phase out “old” (1988 and older) high GHG emitting on-road heavy-duty diesel engines and replace them with modern lower GHG emitting diesel engines if appropriate. **Vehicles replaced by the program must be permanently scrapped in order to achieve a net emission reduction. They may not be sold into the used truck market.**

**Goal** - Phase out 50% of “old” (1988 and older) high GHG emitting on-road heavy-duty diesel engines by 2015.

- c. Develop incentives for state, borough and municipal government managed vehicle fleets to develop and implement plans to reduce GHG emissions from their public transit, school bus and maintenance vehicles. Examples could include idling reduction strategies, alternatively powered engines; i.e. LNG, NG, electric, hybrid, resource sharing etc.

**Goal** - Achieve a minimum 20% GHG emission reduction from 2008 benchmark by 2020.

**Timing:** Immediate, no need to wait.

**Parties Involved:** Alaska Departments of Environmental Conservation, Transportation and Public Facilities, Municipal and local governments, Alaska Railroad, Alaska Trucking Association, public and private partners, local and statewide businesses, several not-for-profit organizations.

### Implementation Mechanisms

The State will develop a program to offer subsidized low interest loans as an incentive to replace pre-1988 on-road heavy-duty diesel engines and or tractors.

The State will develop a program to offer significant vehicle registration fee discounts for vehicles participating in the Federal Smart Way program.

**Related Policies/Programs in Place**

*TBD – No recent policies or programs have been identified as of yet. The TWG and DEC can work with CCS to identify existing or planned programs that address issues raised in this option.*

**Types(s) of GHG Reductions**

Primarily CO<sub>2</sub>. Small reductions in N<sub>2</sub>O and CH<sub>4</sub>.

**Estimated GHG Reductions and Net Costs or Cost Savings**

Option No.	Draft Policy Option		GHG Reductions (MMtCO <sub>2</sub> e)				Net Present Value 2008–2025 (Million \$)	Cost-Effectiveness (\$/tCO <sub>2</sub> e)
			2015	2020	2025	Total 2008–2025		
T-7	On-Road Heavy-Duty Vehicle Efficiency Improvements	a. SmartWay	0.050	0.075	0.084	0.930	-52.3	-56
		b. Phase Out	0.025	0.012	0.000	0.198	2.1	11
		c. Public Fleets	0.016	0.033	0.037	0.364	NQ	NQ

**Data Sources:**

- Fuel economy impacts of truck efficiency strategies based on U.S. EPA FLEET model
- Vehicle registration data from Alaska Department of Motor Vehicles
- Heavy duty vehicle fuel efficiency from the Vehicle Inventory and Use Survey (VIUS): 1992, 1997, 2002
- Vehicle Populations from Highway Statistics 2006 (Tables MV-7 and MV-9)
- Fuel price forecasts from Energy Information Administration, Annual Energy Outlook 2009 Early Release, Tables 12 and 13

**Quantification Methods:**

*Part a (SmartWay)*

Based on information from the U.S. EPA FLEET model, we estimate that the average vehicle can improve fuel efficiency by 6% by participating in Smart Way. We apply this fuel efficiency improvement to the target population stated in the policy goal, as a share of the entire heavy duty fleet population in Alaska.

To estimate costs, Truck Efficiency Strategies assumed to involve:

- Installation of single-wide tires and wheels on new combination truck, in lieu of dual tires and wheels, at a cost savings of \$1040 per truck

- Installation of trailer side skirts on a combination truck trailer at a cost of \$2400 and installation of NoseCone on single-unit truck at a cost of \$700
- Use of low-friction engine and drive train lubricants at a cost of \$118 per year for combination trucks and \$18 per year for single-unit trucks

#### Part b (Phase Out):

Registration data from Alaska DMV was used to determine the average turnover rate of heavy-duty vehicles. We estimate that under normal conditions, only 14% of the fleet in 2015 will date from 1988 or before. By 2025, only 2% of the fleet will date from 1988 or before. We estimate the impact of reducing the share of 1988 or older vehicles by half, to 7% in 2015 and to 1% in 2025. We assume that average VMT is the same for older and newer heavy duty vehicles. We assume that new vehicles introduced by the program will achieve an average fuel efficiency improvement of 16% (the average efficiency improvement reported by VIUS for short-haul trucks from 1992-2002).

To estimate costs, we assume that the average state subsidy per vehicle will be \$20,000. (This is the average grant amount for new heavy-duty vehicle purchases awarded by the State of California under the Carl Moyer Program, as reported in California Air Resources Board, “The Carl Moyer Program 2006 Status Report.” January 2007). We assume that only vehicles that would not otherwise have been retired will receive the subsidy.

#### Part c (Public Fleets):

Based on data from Highway Statistics, we estimate that 6.7% of heavy duty vehicles in Alaska are owned by government agencies. We assume that, on average, these vehicles travel the same amount of miles annually as private and commercially owned heavy-duty vehicles. We calculate linear emissions reductions to reach the goal of 20% reduction for publicly owned heavy duty vehicles in 2020.

We do not estimate the cost of this measure, since no particular implementation measures are specified by the policy. Costs will vary depending on the specific compliance mechanisms, and could be either positive or negative (cost savings).

**Key Assumptions:** *[TBD, as needed, with TWG & MAG approval]*

### **Key Uncertainties**

*TBD – [as needed and approved by the TWGs]*

### **Additional Benefits and Costs**

This option will reduce diesel particulate matter emissions. Many scientific studies have linked breathing PM to a series of significant health problems, including aggravated asthma, difficult breathing, chronic bronchitis, heart attacks, and premature death. Diesel particulate matter is of specific concern because it is likely to be carcinogenic to humans when inhaled.

### **Feasibility Issues**

*TBD – [as needed and approved by the TWGs]*

### **Status of Group Approval**

*TBD – [until CCMAG moves to final agreement]*

### **Level of Group Support**

*TBD – [until CCMAG moves to final agreement]*

### **Barriers to Consensus**

*TBD – [undetermined until final vote by the CCMAG]*

## T-8. Marine Vessel Efficiency Improvements

### Policy Description

Actions by the State can promote efficiencies and conservation options for commercial fishing, recreational fishing, marine tourism, and other forms of marine transportation.

Because Alaska's commercial fishing economy powers most coastal communities and provides employment levels higher than any other private industry in the state, it is critical to mitigate GHG emissions from the sector as a way to assure continued commercial fishing activities. Registration information available from the State of Alaska through the Commercial Fisheries Entry Commission (CFEC) for 2007 shows that there are 9,695 registered Alaska commercial fishing vessels, including 6,028 diesel and 3,510 gasoline vessels, with 1981 as the average year of construction and a mean horsepower rating of 311. While the vessel registrations range from 2-cycle gasoline powered outboard skiffs to sophisticated factory ships, the larger vessels are more likely to be newer and have operational plans that include engine and hull efficiency improvements. The medium and small vessels that typically operate seasonally are more likely to need government assistance to encourage installation of more fuel efficient engines.

There may also be efficiency gains and resulting GHG reductions available to the commercial fishing fleets relating to season openings, closings, and conduct through regulatory adjustments and coordination with freight transportation systems. GHG reductions may also be possible through development of regulations that minimize travel requirements for all fisheries, commercial, commercial sport, recreational, personal use or subsistence.

Charter vessels (4,097 as of 2004) are generally less than 50 feet and are likely to have similar issues to the small and medium vessels in the commercial fleet; information on the fleet's make-up is not as readily available. Determining the nature of the recreational fleet and issues relating to fuel efficiency is more problematic. Larger vessels such as cruise ships and ferries would typically have sophisticated operational plans that consider fuel efficiency issues with government oversight well established.

### Policy Design

The basic policy recommendation for promoting installation of more fuel efficient engines or hull design is to provide financial incentives such as low-cost loans that would encourage vessel owners to implement changes without unduly compromising industry economics. For the Alaska resident commercial fleet, the state's Department of Commerce, Community and Economic Develop (DOCCED) already has a commercial fishery revolving loan fund that could be further altered to allow for targeting energy efficiency improvements. For the out-of-state residents, options include a Department of Energy loan program or inclusion of fishermen in equipment upgrade programs set up for farmers under the Department of Agriculture. Charter and recreational vessels are currently not eligible under the DOCCED program and need an alternate avenue for financial assistance.

Efficiency improvements relating to conduct of a given commercial, commercial sport (charter), recreational, personal use or subsistence fishery are regulatory in nature and would require action by the Alaska Board of Fisheries (BOF). Currently, there are no BOF criteria specifically relating to efficiency or GHG emissions other than cost considerations. A policy requiring the BOF to consider energy efficiency when setting regulations would not require any funding or subsidy, but would allow the BOF to at least consider GHG emissions.

**Goals:**

- Provide financial incentives to accelerate replacement of marine vessel engines such that, by 2020, no more than 50% will be pre-2000 engines. (EPA's Tier 1 standards for marine engines took effect in 2000).
- Encourage federal and state agencies that regulate commercial fishing to consider GHG emissions when making policy decisions.

**Timing:** See above.

**Parties Involved:** Alaska Department of Commerce, Community and Economic Development (DCCED); Alaska Department of Energy; Alaska Board of Fisheries (BOF); Alaska State Legislature; Alaska Dept of Fish and Game; US Dept. of Energy; US Dept. of Agriculture

**Implementation Mechanisms**

For the Alaska resident commercial fleet, expand the Alaska Department of Commerce, Community and Economic Development (DCCED) commercial fishery revolving loan fund to targeting energy efficiency improvements. This could involve lowering the interest rate for vessel improvements that improve fuel efficiency. (May be unnecessary if current HB 20 is signed.)

For the out-of-state residents, encourage development of a U.S. Department of Energy loan program that could target commercial marine vessels. Also encourage inclusion of fishermen in equipment upgrade programs set up for farmers under the Department of Agriculture.

For charter and recreational vessels, which are currently not eligible under the DCCED program, develop a new state program to encourage energy efficiency improvement.

In order to develop regulations can reduce GHG footprint of fisheries in Alaska; a policy that requires the Board of Fish to consider energy efficiency into account for commercial, commercial sport (charter), recreational, personal use and subsistence fisheries. The Alaska Department of Fish and Game also needs direction to manage fisheries in a way that can accommodate GHG reductions.

**Related Policies/Programs in Place**

*TBD – No recent policies or programs have been identified as of yet. The TWG and DEC can work with CCS to identify existing or planned programs that address issues raised in this option.*

**Types(s) of GHG Reductions**

Primarily CO<sub>2</sub>. Small reductions in N<sub>2</sub>O and CH<sub>4</sub>.

## Estimated GHG Reductions and Net Costs or Cost Savings

Option No.	Draft Policy Option	GHG Reductions (MMtCO <sub>2</sub> e)				Net Present Value 2008–2025 (Million \$)	Cost-Effectiveness (\$/tCO <sub>2</sub> e)
		2015	2020	2025	Total 2008–2025		
T-8	Marine Vessel Efficiency Improvements	0.012	0.022	0.032	0.269	20.4	76

### Data Sources:

- Vessel age distributions from Alaska Commercial Fisheries Entry Commission, Permit Holder Database (2008)
- California Air Resources Board, “The Carl Moyer Program 2006 Status Report.” January 2007
- Fuel price forecasts from Energy Information Administration, Annual Energy Outlook 2009 Early Release, Tables 12 and 13
- Current year fuel prices by state from Energy Information Administration, State Energy Data System (SEDS), 2008, Tables S5a and S2a

### Quantification Methods:

- The quantification method uses vessel age as a proxy for engine age; we are not aware of any data on the actual age of operating marine engines. We calculated the percentage of vessels that are 20 years old or older using data from the Permit Holder Database. Approximately 2/3 of vessels in 2008 are 20+ years old.
- We assume that the age distribution of vessels will remain constant in future years. We calculated the percentage of vessel engines that should be replaced by the incentive each year in order to attain the goal of no more than 50% pre-2000 engines in 2020. [We assume that the program will continue funding engine replacements at a similar rate after 2020.](#) We assume that vessels taking advantage of the incentives have average fuel use and GHG emissions. For engines affected by the turnover incentives, we applied an improvement in fuel economy of 12%, according to assumptions below.
- Emission reductions in each year are calculated as follows:
  - $\text{MtCO}_2\text{e reduced} = \text{total vessels repowered in all previous years} \times 12,500 \text{ gallons diesel per vessel} \times 12\% \times \text{carbon content of diesel fuel}$
- Note that the use of vessel age as a proxy for engine age overstates the benefits of this policy, since many older vessels will already have replaced their original engines.
- Cost of the policy was calculated based on data from the Carl Moyer Program in California. The Carl Moyer Program provides grants for owners of vehicles, including fishing vessels, to replace equipment in order to reduce emissions of criteria pollutants. Fishing vessel engines typically cost about \$50,000 to replace. We calculated the capital

cost of these replacements, in addition to the cost savings on diesel fuel. [Fuel price forecasts were scaled up to reflect higher costs in Alaska using data from SEDS.](#)

**Key Assumptions:**

- Engines replaced by the program will improve fuel economy an average of 12%, based on information provided by Alaska fleet operators.
- We assume that the average fishing vessel uses 12,500 gallons of diesel fuel per year. This assumption is based on fishing vessels in California. Alaskan fishing vessels may travel further distances and therefore burn more fuel per year. Higher annual fuel usage would increase the emissions impact and reduce the cost of the policy option. For example, if fishing vessels burn 17,000 gallons of fuel annually, the option would produce a net cost savings within the period of analysis.

**Key Uncertainties**

*TBD – [as needed and approved by the TWGs]*

**Additional Benefits and Costs**

*TBD – [as needed and approved by the TWGs]*

**Feasibility Issues**

*TBD – [as needed and approved by the TWGs]*

**Status of Group Approval**

*TBD – [until CCMAG moves to final agreement]*

**Level of Group Support**

*TBD – [until CCMAG moves to final agreement]*

**Barriers to Consensus**

*TBD – [undetermined until final vote by the CCMAG]*

## T-9. Aviation Emission Reductions

### Policy Description

In addressing GHG emissions from the aviation sector, the State of Alaska must take into account its unique interests in the sector, the policies and practices of other states and territories, and other national and international laws and policies affecting aviation and environmental goals.

Aviation plays a critical role in the Alaskan economy and society. Its location on the great circle routes connecting Asia, North America and Europe, affords the State a vital role and unique opportunities within the international aviation system. At the intrastate level, vast distances between population centers and relatively underdeveloped infrastructure supporting other transportation modes require the State to rely more on intrastate aviation than other jurisdictions. Alaskan policy must take in account and protect these unique interests.

At the same time, both commercial air transportation and the climate change challenge are manifestly global in character. These factors intensify the need to calibrate policies carefully to ensure they do not merely deter or deflect economically beneficial aircraft operations (and associated emissions) to other jurisdictions.

Climate change policy also must account for and operate within the longstanding and complex frameworks of environmental and aviation policies. In the environmental sphere, Alaska has the responsibility to meet National Ambient Air Quality Standards for criteria pollutants such as particulate matter and carbon monoxide – recognizing that many measures aimed at reducing GHG emissions could have the co-benefit of reducing criteria pollutant emissions, policies should allocate limited resources accordingly. Similarly, aviation is subject to comprehensive Federal regulation designed to ensure safety and maximize the availability of affordable air transportation services throughout the country. State and local authority to directly regulate air carrier operations is necessarily limited by that framework and Alaska, like other states, must calibrate policies accordingly.

This mitigation option includes three components:

- Support Modernization of the Air Traffic Management System
- Operational Measures
- Alternative Fuels for Aviation

### Policy Design

#### Support Modernization of the Air Traffic Management System

Support the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) in the redesign and improvement of the existing, out-dated, air traffic management (ATM) system through the implementation of the Next Generation Air Transportation System project (NextGen). Implementation of NextGen,

which will include enhanced communications, navigation and surveillance, will reduce air traffic delays and shorten routes resulting in a more efficient National Airspace System with a significant reduction in GHG emissions. According to FAA, full implementation of NextGen has the potential to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by between 10 and 15 percent. The State of Alaska will take measures to support the implementation of NextGen and document the associated emissions reductions.

**Goals:**

- Identify opportunities to assist FAA's implementation of NextGen
  - Advocate for implementation of NextGen in the United States Congress
  - Identify state-specific actions that will assist with the timely implementation of NextGen.
- Determine potential GHG emissions reductions in Alaska resulting from implementation of NextGen
  - Catalogue emissions reductions associated with the existing use of advanced navigation technology.
  - Project potential emissions reductions associated with additional NextGen improvements.

**Timing:**

- 2010 - Identify opportunities to assist FAA in achieving goals in FAA's Roadmap for Implementation.
  - Carry out actions identified above on a timely basis to assist FAA achieve goals in Roadmap for implementation
- 2010 – Identify existing emissions reductions resulting from advanced navigation technologies
- 2011 – Identify potential emissions reductions associated with full implementation of NextGen.
  - Revise project as NextGen is implemented to determine whether projections are accurate and what level of emissions reductions are being achieved.

**Parties Involved:** The State of Alaska will lead this effort with input and assistance from airports and aircraft operators.

Operational Measures

Identify existing and new operational best practices for maximizing fuel efficiency in the aviation sector, facilitate (including through financial incentives) voluntary implementation of such practices where practical, and evaluate resulting emissions benefits where possible.

Potential operational strategies include:

- Using electric power supplied from airport gates in lieu of running aircraft auxiliary power units (APUs).

- Development of infrastructure to support the operation of electrified airport ground support equipment (GSE), which typically is provided by the airport but may be funded through federal programs.
- Strategies under pilot control that may result from a system-wide assessment of airline operations, such as more use of single-engine taxi, less use of reverse thrust, and minimizing excess fuel loading (to reduce weight).

Many of these practices require the cooperation of multiple parties. Therefore, the State will facilitate cooperation among airports, aircraft owners and operators, and other parties where necessary, to implement operational best practices.

**Goals:**

- Identify measures currently used and evaluate the emissions benefits that are achieved from those measures.
- Identify new measures that will lead to additional benefits.
- Identify means to facilitate voluntary implementation of identified measures.

**Timing:**

- Identify existing measures and means to facilitate voluntary implementation (2010-2011)
- Identify new measures and means to facilitate voluntary implementation (ongoing – prepare initial report 2011)

**Parties Involved:** Aircraft operators, airports, State of Alaska

Alternative Fuels for Aviation

Adopt a clear statement that it is the policy of the State of Alaska to facilitate the rapid introduction of alternative fuels for aviation that are both economically viable and have a reduced emissions profile on a life-cycle basis. Identify and implement measures to support the production, distribution and use of alternative aviation fuels. Implementation of this policy would be supported by TLU-10: Alternative Fuels Research and Development.

**Goals:** Similar to Operational Measure (above)

**Timing:** Similar to Operational Measure (above)

**Parties Involved:** Aircraft operators, airports, State of Alaska, fuel providers

**Implementation Mechanisms**

*TBD – [as needed and approved by the TWGs]*

**Related Policies/Programs in Place**

*TBD – No recent policies or programs have been identified as of yet. The TWG and DEC can work with CCS to identify existing or planned programs that address issues raised in this option.*

**Types(s) of GHG Reductions**

Primarily CO<sub>2</sub>. Small reductions in N<sub>2</sub>O and CH<sub>4</sub>.

**Estimated GHG Reductions and Net Costs or Cost Savings**

Not quantified.

**Data Sources:** N/A

**Quantification Methods:** N/A

**Key Assumptions:** N/A

**Key Uncertainties**

*TBD – [as needed and approved by the TWGs]*

**Additional Benefits and Costs**

*TBD – [as needed and approved by the TWGs]*

**Feasibility Issues**

*TBD – [as needed and approved by the TWGs]*

**Status of Group Approval**

*TBD – [until CCMAG moves to final agreement]*

**Level of Group Support**

*TBD – [until CCMAG moves to final agreement]*

**Barriers to Consensus**

*TBD – [undetermined until final vote by the CCMAG]*

## T-10. Alternative Fuels Research and Development

### Policy Description

The State will support research and development (R&D) of alternative transportation fuels that are feasible in the Alaska climate, result in significant life-cycle GHG reductions when used in Alaska, and can benefit Alaska's economy. Some alternative fuels being promoted in the Lower 48 do not work well in arctic climates. Furthermore, most of the existing research on life-cycle GHG impacts of alternative fuels does not consider the Alaska context, so there is uncertainty regarding which fuels and technologies will result in net GHG reductions in Alaska. This strategy would support research to answer these questions.

If viable low-carbon alternative fuels are identified for Alaska, the State should encourage in-state production and distribution of these fuels. This can help to ensure that Alaska receives economic benefits from the expanded use of alternative fuels.

Various incentives can encourage companies to continue or begin producing alternative fuels, such as granting state tax credits based on the amount of alternative fuel produced, reduced taxes for alternative fuel production facilities, or providing loans or grants to companies that are producing or want to produce alternative fuel.

Alaska would need to promote alternative fuels that are most appropriate for Alaska's climate, and can encourage collaboration with other research entities across the Arctic region (e.g., Norway) to identify such alternatives. The state could organize a public/private fuel-buying consortium that enters a long-term contract with a supplier to help overcome the risk of producing fuel. Application of these incentives should always consider the full cycle of energy and GHG impacts.

### Policy Design

Research should focus on existing alternative propulsion technologies and methods to make existing technologies more viable in Alaska, rather than development of new propulsion technologies. For example, biodiesel performs poorly in cold weather conditions; but vehicles with two fuel tanks can warm engines and biodiesel fuel using conventional fuel. Research might include pilot programs to evaluate the costs and benefits, including GHG emissions reduction, of various alternative propulsion technologies.

#### Goals:

- Determine market potential, cost, and GHG impacts of existing alternative fuel and vehicle types in Alaska
- Determine methods to encourage the in-state production and use of alternative fuels.

**Timing:** Begin immediately.

**Parties Involved:** Alaska Department of Transportation and Public Facilities, Alaska Energy Authority, University of Alaska, Alaska Department of Natural Resources, energy and electricity providers, vehicle manufacturers

### Implementation Mechanisms

The Alaska Center for Energy Power, at the University of Alaska, Fairbanks, is a likely lead organization for the research program. The Center should be consulted on the appropriate scope and design of the research program.

The State of Alaska should set aside dedicated funding for the proposed research. Federal funding may also be available through programs such as the Rural Energy for America Program, the State Energy Program, or the 2009 Recovery Act. Additional funding may be contributed by any private sector research partners.

### Related Policies/Programs in Place

The National Energy Act of 2005 includes provisions requiring an increasing volume of renewable fuel to be included in the gasoline sold in the United States starting in 2006 with 4 billion gallons, increasing to 7.5 billion gallons by 2012. In this Act, renewable fuel includes motor vehicle fuel produced from grain, starch, vegetable, animal, or other biomass material, cellulosic biomass ethanol, waste derived ethanol, and biodiesel.

### Types(s) of GHG Reductions

Primarily CO<sub>2</sub>. Small reductions in N<sub>2</sub>O and CH<sub>4</sub>.

### Estimated GHG Reductions and Net Costs or Cost Savings

Not quantified. This is an enabling policy for TLU-5 and TLU-9.

**Data Sources:** N/A

**Quantification Methods:** N/A

**Key Assumptions:** N/A

### Key Uncertainties

None identified.

### Additional Benefits and Costs

Development of a viable alternative fuels industry in Alaska would create economic development benefits for the state.

### Feasibility Issues

*TBD – [as needed and approved by the TWGs]*

### Status of Group Approval

*TBD – [until CCMAG moves to final agreement]*

### **Level of Group Support**

*TBD – [until CCMAG moves to final agreement]*

### **Barriers to Consensus**

*TBD – [undetermined until final vote by the CCMAG]*