



Commission on Climate Change

Maryland Climate Change Commission Technical Working Group

Transportation and Land Use

Meeting #8

January 9, 2008

Maryland Department of the Environment
Maryland Energy Administration
Center for Climate Strategies

Today's Agenda

- Call to order and roll call
- Review and approve prior meeting summary
- Review progress on straw proposals
- Discuss quantification to date
- Next steps for the TLU TWG
- Confirm agenda, time and date for next meeting & subsequent TWG meetings
- Public input and announcements

Stepwise Planning Process

1. Develop inventory and forecast of emissions - Ongoing
2. Identify a full range of possible actions - **Sept. 7-28**
3. Identify initial priorities for analysis - **Oct 26**
4. Develop straw proposals - **November**
5. Quantify GHG reductions and costs/savings - **Dec/Jan**
6. Evaluate externalities, feasibility issues - **Dec/Jan**
7. Develop alternatives to address barriers - **January**
8. Aggregate results - February
9. Iterate to final agreements - Feb/March
10. Finalize and report recommendations - March

Maryland Goals

- 2015
 - 10% below 2006 levels by 2012
 - 15% below 2006 levels by 2015
- 2020
 - 25-50% below 2006
- 2050
 - 90% below 2006 levels (80% from 1990)

Gross GHG Emissions from Transportation

Source	1990	2005	2020 (BAU)	2020 w/TLU-4 & 10
On-road gasoline	17.91	23.94	28.78	25.9
On-road diesel	2.91	5.89	9.18	8.26
Jet fuel/aviation	1.49	1.31	1.42	1.21
Boats and ships--ports/inshore	1.16	0.87	0.93	0.79
Boats and ships--offshore	0.21	0.31	0.37	0.31
Rail	0.39	0.06	0.06	0.05
Other	0.14	0.14	0.17	0.14
Total	24.21	32.52	40.91	36.67
GHGs to reach target 25% reduction from 2006			24.39	24.39
Reduction needed from 2020 estimate			16.52	12.27

* Emissions in MMt

MD GHG Reduction

- If MD were to implement TLU-4 & 10 they could expect a 12% reduction from the 2020 BAU estimates for transportation.
- This leaves a 12.27 MMt GHG shortfall to be achieved via our various VMT reduction options.
- A 36% VMT reduction in on-road gasoline and diesel would reduce 12.27 MMt.

TLU-7: VMT Reductions Proposal

- To reach 1990 levels by 2020 requires a 36% reduction in per capita VMT
- MWCOG and BMC say they can achieve a 10% reduction at best
- Given that transportation is the “low hanging” fruit, if we only do 10% reduction we are going to have great difficulty getting to 20% reduction by 2020.
25% and 40% are highly unrealistic.
- End Goal:
 - Some alternative target between 10-36%
 - What is realistic: different from road pricing, park pricing, pay as you drive insurance

TLU-7: VMT Reductions Proposal (cont.)

- Members of the TWG were told:
 - Not to consider the political landscape in making recommendations
 - Politics must be put aside
 - How we can get reductions:
 - Reduction of carbon content in fuel
 - 10% is the likely maximum amount of carbon content reduction that can be expected from more efficient fuels.
 - Improved technology
 - Improvements in technology cannot be expected to come from the state of Maryland.
 - Decrease per capita VMT
 - Reduction in per capita VMT is the lone realistic way for the state of MD to meet its 2020 goals.

TLU-11: Evaluate the GHG Emissions Impacts of Major Projects Proposal

After reading the IPCC report released a week ago, The UN Secretary General, said that the latest findings are frightening. The scientists have done their work, he said, now I call on the political leaders to do theirs.

That same day Rajendra Pachauri, head of the IPCC said “mankind has 2-3 years to act on climate change. . . . 2012 is too late. There is no time.”

MD has three major road projects either underway or planned: the ICC, the expansion of I-95, and BRAC. All of these projects will increase MD’s GHG emissions.

Maryland has ambitious goals for its reduction of GHG and wants to be seen as a leader in reducing carbon emissions.

TLU-11: Evaluate the GHG Emissions Impacts of Major Projects Proposal (cont.)

Being a leader in reducing GHG requires setting and observing a strict carbon budget. This can't be done without knowing the "cost", in terms of carbon emissions, of major projects. Estimating the carbon costs of major projects is therefore necessary before continuing or undertaking construction in order to know whether MD can reasonably expect to meet the 2020 and 2050 goals for carbon reductions that would establish MD as a leader. If these projects prove too costly to the carbon budget, alternative solutions to transportation needs can be sought.

Putting numbers on the carbon emissions of major projects and holding them up in light of an overall carbon budget takes the politics out of the issue and makes the issue a matter of arithmetic.

TWG/MWG Next Steps

- CCS works on quantifying effects of Proposals
- Present to MWG for review (Jan. 15)
- TWG's incorporate MWG feedback, refine policies and complete first draft of all straw proposals
- MWG approves progress and presents to MCCC (Jan 17)
- Present final drafts as MWG February Meeting

Key Dates

<u>Date</u>	<u>Meeting</u>
January 15 th , 2008	6 th MWG Meeting
February 19 th , 2008	7 th MWG Meeting
March 19 th , 2008	8 th MWG Meeting
April 20, 2008	Final Report
Between MWG Meetings	Technical Working Group (TWG) Calls and/or Meetings

Next TLU TWG Meetings

- Date and Time
 - January, 2008
 - After Jan. 15th MWG meeting
- Agenda
 - Review further developments of straw proposals
 - Finalize straw proposals



Public Input, Announcements