



www.scclimatechange.us

Transportation and Land Use Technical Work Group
Summary List of Recommended Priority Policy Options for Analysis

Draft Option #	Draft Policy Option Name	Straw Proposal Volunteers
TLU-1	Adopt California Clean Car Standards	
TLU -2	Transportation System Management	
TLU -3	Tax Credits for Efficient Vehicles	
TLU -4	Improve Development Patterns	
TLU -5	Transit & Bike-Pedestrian	
TLU -6	Alternative Fuel Infrastructure	
TLU -7	Anti-Idling	
TLU -8	Stricter Enforce of Speed Limits	
TLU -9	Make Full Use of CMAQ funds	
TLU -10	Commuter Choice	
TLU -11	Increased Fuel Tax (with use of revenue for travel alternatives)	
TLU -12	Low-GHG Fuel Standard	
TLU -13	Freight Vehicle Technology Improvements	

TLU-1. Adopt California Clean Car Standards

Policy Description

The California Clean Car standards require manufacturers to meet a declining fleet-wide average standard for GHG emissions per mile (they are also known as the “Pavley” standards after the sponsor of the legislation in California). These standards can be adopted to reduce GHG emissions from new light-duty vehicles. New cars and light trucks in all states must comply with federal emission standards, and, generally speaking, states have the choice of adopting a stronger set of standards applicable in California.

Policy Design

Goals: [CCS drafts based on inputs from volunteers for straw proposals and then moves proposed text to the full TWG for review/revision, then on to the CECAC at the next meeting].

- **Timing:** [TBD, as needed on TWG approval]
- **Parties Involved:** [TBD, as needed on TWG approval]
- **Other:** [As needed]

Implementation Mechanisms

TBD – [CCS drafts based on TWG inputs; this can be developed as they go along, and can start early or late as they prefer; the level of detail can vary on TWG approval]

Related Policies/Programs in Place

TBD – [as needed and approved by the TWGs]

Types(s) of GHG Reductions

TBD – [CCS to list GHG reductions with input / approval from TWG]

Estimated GHG Reductions and Net Costs or Cost Savings

TBD – [CCS should provide a worksheet and other reference material as needed for transparency]

- **Data Sources:** [TBD by CCS on TWG approval]
- **Quantification Methods:** [e.g. Full life-cycle analysis with supply/demand equilibrium adjustments on TWG approval]
- **Key Assumptions:** [TBD, as needed on TWG approval]

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

Pending – [until CECAC moves to final agreement at Meeting #5 or #6]

Level of Group Support

TBD – [blank until CECAC Meeting #5]

Barriers to Consensus

TBD – [blank until final vote by the CECAC]

TLU-2. Transportation System Management

Policy Description

Transportation system management improves vehicle flow on the roadway system, which can reduce fuel use and GHG emissions. Coordinated operation of the regional transportation network can improve system efficiency, reliability, and safety. Tools to reduce traffic congestion include HOV lanes, roundabouts at intersections, synchronized signals, incident management, variable message signs, and other forms of intelligent transportation systems (ITS).

Policy Design

Goals: [CCS drafts based on inputs from volunteers for straw proposals and then moves proposed text to the full TWG for review/revision, then on to the CECAC at the next meeting].

- **Timing:** [TBD, as needed on TWG approval]
- **Parties Involved:** [TBD, as needed on TWG approval]
- **Other:** [As needed]

Implementation Mechanisms

TBD – [CCS drafts based on TWG inputs; this can be developed as they go along, and can start early or late as they prefer; the level of detail can vary on TWG approval]

Related Policies/Programs in Place

TBD – [as needed and approved by the TWGs]

Types(s) of GHG Reductions

TBD – [CCS to list GHG reductions with input / approval from TWG]

Estimated GHG Reductions and Net Costs or Cost Savings

TBD – [CCS should provide a worksheet and other reference material as needed for transparency]

- **Data Sources:** [TBD by CCS on TWG approval]
- **Quantification Methods:** [e.g. Full life-cycle analysis with supply/demand equilibrium adjustments on TWG approval]
- **Key Assumptions:** [TBD, as needed on TWG approval]

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

Pending – [until CECAC moves to final agreement at Meeting #5 or #6]

Level of Group Support

TBD – [blank until CECAC Meeting #5]

Barriers to Consensus

TBD – [blank until final vote by the CECAC]

TLU-3. Tax Credits for Efficient Vehicles

Policy Description

The state could adopt a variety of programs to increase purchase of fuel-efficient or low-GHG vehicles (including pure electric, hybrid, plug-in hybrid, and other alternative fuel vehicles). State incentives could include registration fees, feebates, and/or tax credits. “Feebates” would provide incentives for reduced GHG emissions by creating: (1) fees on relatively high emissions/lower fuel economy vehicles and (2) rebates or tax credits on low emissions/higher fuel economy vehicles.

Implement a sliding scale tax that would allow purchasers of low greenhouse gas emitting vehicles to earn a rebate on their vehicle registration or sales tax of up to X%, and purchasers of high greenhouse gas emitting vehicles to be assessed a vehicle registration or additional sales tax of up to X%. The sliding scale could be designed to be revenue-neutral, i.e. such that rebates are offset by fees assessed.

Policy Design

Goals: [CCS drafts based on inputs from volunteers for straw proposals and then moves proposed text to the full TWG for review/revision, then on to the CECAC at the next meeting].

- **Timing:** [TBD, as needed on TWG approval]
- **Parties Involved:** [TBD, as needed on TWG approval]
- **Other:** [As needed]

Implementation Mechanisms

TBD – [CCS drafts based on TWG inputs; this can be developed as they go along, and can start early or late as they prefer; the level of detail can vary on TWG approval]

Related Policies/Programs in Place

TBD – [as needed and approved by the TWGs]

Types(s) of GHG Reductions

TBD – [CCS to list GHG reductions with input / approval from TWG]

Estimated GHG Reductions and Net Costs or Cost Savings

TBD – [CCS should provide a worksheet and other reference material as needed for transparency]

- **Data Sources:** [TBD by CCS on TWG approval]
- **Quantification Methods:** [e.g. Full life-cycle analysis with supply/demand equilibrium adjustments on TWG approval]

- **Key Assumptions:** [TBD, as needed on TWG approval]

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

Pending – [until CECAC moves to final agreement at Meeting #5 or #6]

Level of Group Support

TBD – [blank until CECAC Meeting #5]

Barriers to Consensus

TBD – [blank until final vote by the CECAC]

TLU-4. Improve Development Patterns

Policy Description

Development patterns can be improved in a variety of ways to impact emission of green houses gases. For example, infill and brownfield developments typically results in less vehicle travel and emission as compared to development on lower density exurban or “greenfield” locations. Households and workers in areas with higher density and mixed uses typically take shorter trips and have more alternatives to automobile travel. “Brownfields” are one type of infill location – commercial or industrial properties that are abandoned or are not being fully used because of actual or perceived environmental contamination.

Another example is transit oriented development that takes into consideration transportation patterns and enables shifts to lower emitting transportation modes by building compact, mixed-use development clustered around transit stops. This option would promote transit oriented development through incentives and/or regulation. Governments could require that planning/zoning for transit oriented development accompany new high capacity transit investments.

Smart growth planning on a state wide basis is a third example. Plan for the orderly and economical development of the metropolitan region and manage growth in a way that ensures efficient delivery of regional services. Under state law all metropolitan area communities must prepare local comprehensive plans which are consistent with regional plans.

Finally, targeted open space protection includes programs designed to protect and conserve State lands and other open spaces, and develop and improve neighborhood, community, and regional parks in ways that encourage location-efficient growth and broader mode choice. This option could also include policies to discourage the expansion of urban growth areas or urban growth boundaries. Policies that increase the value of rural resource lands for agricultural or forestry uses to serve local markets can promote these objectives.

Policy Design

Goals: [CCS drafts based on inputs from volunteers for straw proposals and then moves proposed text to the full TWG for review/revision, then on to the CECAC at the next meeting].

- **Timing:** [TBD, as needed on TWG approval]
- **Parties Involved:** [TBD, as needed on TWG approval]
- **Other:** [As needed]

Implementation Mechanisms

TBD – [CCS drafts based on TWG inputs; this can be developed as they go along, and can start early or late as they prefer; the level of detail can vary on TWG approval]

Related Policies/Programs in Place

Pending S.266 Priority Investment Area Legislation is recommended by the governor's Quality of Life Task Force in 2003. It promotes coordinated long-term planning among local governments and other relevant governmental bodies and provides development incentives for builders.

Types(s) of GHG Reductions

TBD – [CCS to list GHG reductions with input / approval from TWG]

Estimated GHG Reductions and Net Costs or Cost Savings

TBD – [CCS should provide a worksheet and other reference material as needed for transparency]

- **Data Sources:** [TBD by CCS on TWG approval]
- **Quantification Methods:** [e.g. Full life-cycle analysis with supply/demand equilibrium adjustments on TWG approval]
- **Key Assumptions:** [TBD, as needed on TWG approval]

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

Pending – [until CECAC moves to final agreement at Meeting #5 or #6]

Level of Group Support

TBD – [blank until CECAC Meeting #5]

Barriers to Consensus

TBD – [blank until final vote by the CECAC]

TLU-5. Transit & Bike-Pedestrian

Policy Description

Greater use of public transit and reduction in automobile travel can be achieved by expanding public transit infrastructure (e.g., rail lines, bus and bus rapid transit (BRT) routes). This option also could include expansion of intercity bus service. Use of SC DOT data on travel origins and destinations could help determine if there are intercity regional routes that need prioritization.

Improving, adding, and promoting sidewalks and bikeways can increase pedestrian and bicycle trips and reduce automobile use. Infrastructure improvements could include bicycle parking and shower/locker amenities at places of employment.

Local government “complete streets” policies would ensure that streets accommodate all modes: auto, transit, bike, and pedestrian.

Policy Design

Goals: [CCS drafts based on inputs from volunteers for straw proposals and then moves proposed text to the full TWG for review/revision, then on to the CECAC at the next meeting].

- **Timing:** [TBD, as needed on TWG approval]
- **Parties Involved:** [TBD, as needed on TWG approval]
- **Other:** [As needed]

Implementation Mechanisms

TBD – [CCS drafts based on TWG inputs; this can be developed as they go along, and can start early or late as they prefer; the level of detail can vary on TWG approval]

Related Policies/Programs in Place

Smartride –limited stop commuter bus service between Columbia and the Lugoff/Camden and Newberry areas.

CARTA Express –limited stop commute alternative that connects area residents into downtown Charleston.

York County -82x Express Bus service to Charlotte. Started in 2001, 214 daily riders.

Types(s) of GHG Reductions

TBD – [CCS to list GHG reductions with input / approval from TWG]

Estimated GHG Reductions and Net Costs or Cost Savings

TBD – [CCS should provide a worksheet and other reference material as needed for transparency]

- **Data Sources:** [TBD by CCS on TWG approval]

- **Quantification Methods:** [e.g. Full life-cycle analysis with supply/demand equilibrium adjustments on TWG approval]
- **Key Assumptions:** [TBD, as needed on TWG approval]

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

Pending – [until CECAC moves to final agreement at Meeting #5 or #6]

Level of Group Support

TBD – [blank until CECAC Meeting #5]

Barriers to Consensus

TBD – [blank until final vote by the CECAC]

TLU-6. Alternative Fuel Infrastructure

Policy Description

The development of an alternative fuel infrastructure can aid in the promotion of alternative fuel usage. The expense of equipment and installation costs can be offset by creating an infrastructure. The convenient locations of stations offering alternative fuels at competitive prices can increase the usage of the fuel.

Policy Design

Goals: [CCS drafts based on inputs from volunteers for straw proposals and then moves proposed text to the full TWG for review/revision, then on to the CECAC at the next meeting].

- **Timing:** [TBD, as needed on TWG approval]
- **Parties Involved:** [TBD, as needed on TWG approval]
- **Other:** [As needed]

Implementation Mechanisms

TBD – [CCS drafts based on TWG inputs; this can be developed as they go along, and can start early or late as they prefer; the level of detail can vary on TWG approval]

Related Policies/Programs in Place

Palmetto State Fuel Coalition –SC is the 2nd in the nation for number of biodiesel pumps and the 7th in the nation for ethanol pumps.

State is aggressively pursuing hydrogen technology.

SC Biomass Council is exploring the potential of biomass fuel.

Types(s) of GHG Reductions

TBD – [CCS to list GHG reductions with input / approval from TWG]

Estimated GHG Reductions and Net Costs or Cost Savings

TBD – [CCS should provide a worksheet and other reference material as needed for transparency]

- **Data Sources:** [TBD by CCS on TWG approval]
- **Quantification Methods:** [e.g. Full life-cycle analysis with supply/demand equilibrium adjustments on TWG approval]
- **Key Assumptions:** [TBD, as needed on TWG approval]

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

Pending – [until CECAC moves to final agreement at Meeting #5 or #6]

Level of Group Support

TBD – [blank until CECAC Meeting #5]

Barriers to Consensus

TBD – [blank until final vote by the CECAC]

TLU-7. Anti-Idling

Policy Description

Vehicle idling can be reduced by enforcing anti-idling ordinances and/or encouraging the use of alternatives. Many states and local governments have adopted idling regulations for trucks and buses. Alternatives to long-term truck idling include the use of technologies such as automatic engine shut down/start-up system controls, direct-fired heaters, auxiliary power units, and truck stop electrification. Idling reductions could also be considered for other vehicle types and fleets.

Policy Design

Goals: [CCS drafts based on inputs from volunteers for straw proposals and then moves proposed text to the full TWG for review/revision, then on to the CECAC at the next meeting].

- **Timing:** [TBD, as needed on TWG approval]
- **Parties Involved:** [TBD, as needed on TWG approval]
- **Other:** [As needed]

Implementation Mechanisms

TBD – [CCS drafts based on TWG inputs; this can be developed as they go along, and can start early or late as they prefer; the level of detail can vary on TWG approval]

Related Policies/Programs in Place

52-space truck stop electrification site in Anderson County.

Types(s) of GHG Reductions

TBD – [CCS to list GHG reductions with input / approval from TWG]

Estimated GHG Reductions and Net Costs or Cost Savings

TBD – [CCS should provide a worksheet and other reference material as needed for transparency]

- **Data Sources:** [TBD by CCS on TWG approval]
- **Quantification Methods:** [e.g. Full life-cycle analysis with supply/demand equilibrium adjustments on TWG approval]
- **Key Assumptions:** [TBD, as needed on TWG approval]

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

Pending – [until CECAC moves to final agreement at Meeting #5 or #6]

Level of Group Support

TBD – [blank until CECAC Meeting #5]

Barriers to Consensus

TBD – [blank until final vote by the CECAC]

TLU-8. Stricter Enforce of Speed Limits

Policy Description

Reduced vehicle speeds improve fuel economy, reduce CO2 emissions, and improve safety. This could be implemented by requiring interstates, freeways, and major arterials to be signed with a maximum speed that is lower than the current speed. Significant enforcement resources may be needed for this measure to achieve the expected reductions.

Policy Design

Goals: [CCS drafts based on inputs from volunteers for straw proposals and then moves proposed text to the full TWG for review/revision, then on to the CECAC at the next meeting].

- **Timing:** [TBD, as needed on TWG approval]
- **Parties Involved:** [TBD, as needed on TWG approval]
- **Other:** [As needed]

Implementation Mechanisms

TBD – [CCS drafts based on TWG inputs; this can be developed as they go along, and can start early or late as they prefer; the level of detail can vary on TWG approval]

Related Policies/Programs in Place

TBD – [as needed and approved by the TWGs]

Types(s) of GHG Reductions

TBD – [CCS to list GHG reductions with input / approval from TWG]

Estimated GHG Reductions and Net Costs or Cost Savings

TBD – [CCS should provide a worksheet and other reference material as needed for transparency]

- **Data Sources:** [TBD by CCS on TWG approval]
- **Quantification Methods:** [e.g. Full life-cycle analysis with supply/demand equilibrium adjustments on TWG approval]
- **Key Assumptions:** [TBD, as needed on TWG approval]

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

Pending – [until CECAC moves to final agreement at Meeting #5 or #6]

Level of Group Support

TBD – [blank until CECAC Meeting #5]

Barriers to Consensus

TBD – [blank until final vote by the CECAC]

TLU-9. Make Full Use of CMAQ funds

Policy Description

Fully allocate all CMAQ funding, possibly with emphasis on project that reduce GHGs.

Policy Design

Goals: [CCS drafts based on inputs from volunteers for straw proposals and then moves proposed text to the full TWG for review/revision, then on to the CECAC at the next meeting].

- **Timing:** [TBD, as needed on TWG approval]
- **Parties Involved:** [TBD, as needed on TWG approval]
- **Other:** [As needed]

Implementation Mechanisms

TBD – [CCS drafts based on TWG inputs; this can be developed as they go along, and can start early or late as they prefer; the level of detail can vary on TWG approval]

Related Policies/Programs in Place

TBD – [as needed and approved by the TWGs]

Types(s) of GHG Reductions

TBD – [CCS to list GHG reductions with input / approval from TWG]

Estimated GHG Reductions and Net Costs or Cost Savings

TBD – [CCS should provide a worksheet and other reference material as needed for transparency]

- **Data Sources:** [TBD by CCS on TWG approval]
- **Quantification Methods:** [e.g. Full life-cycle analysis with supply/demand equilibrium adjustments on TWG approval]
- **Key Assumptions:** [TBD, as needed on TWG approval]

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

Pending – [until CECAC moves to final agreement at Meeting #5 or #6]

Level of Group Support

TBD – [blank until CECAC Meeting #5]

Barriers to Consensus

TBD – [blank until final vote by the CECAC]

TLU-10. Commuter Choice

Policy Description

Commuter Choice Programs encourage employers to provide options such as telecommuting, transit subsidies, pre-tax transit fare program, parking cash-out, and guaranteed ride-home service in order to reduce automobile commutes. The telecommuting option includes the development and utilization of neighborhood telecommuting centers that offer office-type services in locations close to commuters' residences. As an incentive to develop and provide such services, a tax credit can be offered to companies. Government spending to encourage commuter choice can stimulate a large private-sector match (17 dollars of private incentives per dollar of public incentive, according to one source).

Policy Design

Goals: [CCS drafts based on inputs from volunteers for straw proposals and then moves proposed text to the full TWG for review/revision, then on to the CECAC at the next meeting].

- **Timing:** [TBD, as needed on TWG approval]
- **Parties Involved:** [TBD, as needed on TWG approval]
- **Other:** [As needed]

Implementation Mechanisms

TBD – [CCS drafts based on TWG inputs; this can be developed as they go along, and can start early or late as they prefer; the level of detail can vary on TWG approval]

Related Policies/Programs in Place

TBD – [as needed and approved by the TWGs]

Types(s) of GHG Reductions

TBD – [CCS to list GHG reductions with input / approval from TWG]

Estimated GHG Reductions and Net Costs or Cost Savings

TBD – [CCS should provide a worksheet and other reference material as needed for transparency]

- **Data Sources:** [TBD by CCS on TWG approval]
- **Quantification Methods:** [e.g. Full life-cycle analysis with supply/demand equilibrium adjustments on TWG approval]
- **Key Assumptions:** [TBD, as needed on TWG approval]

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

Pending – [until CECAC moves to final agreement at Meeting #5 or #6]

Level of Group Support

TBD – [blank until CECAC Meeting #5]

Barriers to Consensus

TBD – [blank until final vote by the CECAC]

TLU-11. Increased Fuel Tax (with use of revenue for travel alternatives)

Policy Description

Increasing the state tax on conventional fuels can reduce consumption and travel while encouraging the use of lower emissions vehicles, alternative fuels, and public transit. In addition, revenues can be used to fund transit and other transportation alternatives within a corridor or region.

Policy Design

Goals: [CCS drafts based on inputs from volunteers for straw proposals and then moves proposed text to the full TWG for review/revision, then on to the CECAC at the next meeting].

- **Timing:** [TBD, as needed on TWG approval]
- **Parties Involved:** [TBD, as needed on TWG approval]
- **Other:** [As needed]

Implementation Mechanisms

TBD – [CCS drafts based on TWG inputs; this can be developed as they go along, and can start early or late as they prefer; the level of detail can vary on TWG approval]

Related Policies/Programs in Place

TBD – [as needed and approved by the TWGs]

Types(s) of GHG Reductions

TBD – [CCS to list GHG reductions with input / approval from TWG]

Estimated GHG Reductions and Net Costs or Cost Savings

TBD – [CCS should provide a worksheet and other reference material as needed for transparency]

- **Data Sources:** [TBD by CCS on TWG approval]
- **Quantification Methods:** [e.g. Full life-cycle analysis with supply/demand equilibrium adjustments on TWG approval]
- **Key Assumptions:** [TBD, as needed on TWG approval]

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

Pending – [until CECAC moves to final agreement at Meeting #5 or #6]

Level of Group Support

TBD – [blank until CECAC Meeting #5]

Barriers to Consensus

TBD – [blank until final vote by the CECAC]

TLU-12. Low-GHG Fuel Standard

Policy Description

This option seeks to reduce GHG emissions by decreasing the carbon intensity of all passenger vehicle fuels sold in the state. The Low Carbon Fuel Standard (LCFS) would require all fuel providers in the state to ensure the mix of fuel they sell into the state market meet, on average, a declining standard for GHG emissions measured in CO₂ equivalent gram per unit of fuel energy sold. The State should regulate quality standards for low carbon fuels. Low carbon fuels include, but are not limited to, biodiesel, cellulosic ethanol, hydrogen, compressed natural gas, liquefied petroleum gas, electricity, and low carbon blends such as E10 or E85.

The standard would be measured on a lifecycle basis in order to include all emissions from fuel production to consumption. Options for compliance may include: blending or selling increasing amounts of lower carbon fuels, using previously banked credits, and purchasing credits from fuel providers who earned credits by exceeding the standard.

This option could also promote R&D related to biofuels production, such as the use of enzymes for breaking down cellulose to produce ethanol (as opposed to corn-based ethanol, which has a lower life cycle benefit).

Policy Design

Goals: [CCS drafts based on inputs from volunteers for straw proposals and then moves proposed text to the full TWG for review/revision, then on to the CECAC at the next meeting].

- **Timing:** [TBD, as needed on TWG approval]
- **Parties Involved:** [TBD, as needed on TWG approval]
- **Other:** [As needed]

Implementation Mechanisms

TBD – [CCS drafts based on TWG inputs; this can be developed as they go along, and can start early or late as they prefer; the level of detail can vary on TWG approval]

Related Policies/Programs in Place

TBD – [as needed and approved by the TWGs]

Types(s) of GHG Reductions

TBD – [CCS to list GHG reductions with input / approval from TWG]

Estimated GHG Reductions and Net Costs or Cost Savings

TBD – [CCS should provide a worksheet and other reference material as needed for transparency]

- **Data Sources:** [TBD by CCS on TWG approval]

- **Quantification Methods:** [e.g. Full life-cycle analysis with supply/demand equilibrium adjustments on TWG approval]
- **Key Assumptions:** [TBD, as needed on TWG approval]

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

Pending – [until CECAC moves to final agreement at Meeting #5 or #6]

Level of Group Support

TBD – [blank until CECAC Meeting #5]

Barriers to Consensus

TBD – [blank until final vote by the CECAC]

TLU-13. Freight Vehicle Technology Improvements

Policy Description

The fuel efficiency of freight trucks can be improved using a variety of equipment modifications (e.g., aerodynamic devices, wide-base tires, fuel efficient lubricants) as well as driver training. Government agencies can promote truck fuel efficiency improvements with incentives and outreach.

Policy Design

Goals: [CCS drafts based on inputs from volunteers for straw proposals and then moves proposed text to the full TWG for review/revision, then on to the CECAC at the next meeting].

- **Timing:** [TBD, as needed on TWG approval]
- **Parties Involved:** [TBD, as needed on TWG approval]
- **Other:** [As needed]

Implementation Mechanisms

TBD – [CCS drafts based on TWG inputs; this can be developed as they go along, and can start early or late as they prefer; the level of detail can vary on TWG approval]

Related Policies/Programs in Place

TBD – [as needed and approved by the TWGs]

Types(s) of GHG Reductions

TBD – [CCS to list GHG reductions with input / approval from TWG]

Estimated GHG Reductions and Net Costs or Cost Savings

TBD – [CCS should provide a worksheet and other reference material as needed for transparency]

- **Data Sources:** [TBD by CCS on TWG approval]
- **Quantification Methods:** [e.g. Full life-cycle analysis with supply/demand equilibrium adjustments on TWG approval]
- **Key Assumptions:** [TBD, as needed on TWG approval]

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

Pending – [until CECAC moves to final agreement at Meeting #5 or #6]

Level of Group Support

TBD – [blank until CECAC Meeting #5]

Barriers to Consensus

TBD – [blank until final vote by the CECAC]