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Research Questions & Objectives

1. **Policy Framework:** What is the framework for reducing GHGs from the transportation sector via transportation and land use strategies?

2. **Assessment:** What are strengths and weaknesses of the transportation-land use-climate policy framework at the state level? What are the obstacles to achieving GHG reduction goals?

3. **Knowledge Transfer:** What approaches are working well in the four case study states and what can they learn from each other? What can other states learn?
Background Information

• Transportation represents 33-50% of GHG emissions in our case study states

• In all case study states, the share of emissions from transportation has remained relatively steady since 1990

• In all case study states, VMT per capita has declined slightly since 1997 (but total VMT is rising because of population growth)
Conceptual Framework

Goals

Efforts

Results
## State-Level Statutory GHG Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Targets</th>
<th>Key Legislation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>By 2020, 10% below 1990 Levels. By 2050, 75% below 1990 Levels.</td>
<td>2007: HB 3543- Global Warming Actions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
California

- Climate
  - SB 375: Regional per-capita targets, MPOs develop Sustainable Communities Strategies (SCSs), voluntary local implementation

- Transportation
  - CalTrans updating CTP 2040
  - Regional RTPs integrating SCSs

- Land Use
  - Local general plans (no state level growth management program)
  - Relax CEQA to support SCSs (and move from LOS to VMT in CEQA – SB743)

- Nexus
  - Coordinated regional level transportation planning to reduce GHGs (SCS)
Maryland

- Climate:
  - GHG Reduction Act Plan of 2013: state level multi-sector and multi-agency plan
- Transportation
  - Maryland Transportation Plan 2035 (updated in 2014);
  - Annual: Consolidated Transportation Program, Attainment Report
- Land Use
  - Required local comprehensive plans addressing key elements and visions
  - Smart Growth: Priority Funding Areas
  - PlanMaryland (2011)
- Nexus
  - All 3 plans updated recently: cross-referencing and mention of integration
Washington

- Climate
  - HB 2815: GHG and VMT Per Capita Targets
  - EO 09-05: Delegate to regional level (Regional Transportation Planning Organizations)

- Transportation
  - Statutory VMT Targets

- Land Use
  - Growth Management Act – 14 goals; required Urban Growth Areas in some cities
  - County Wide Planning Policy (CWPP)

- Nexus
  - Local plans consistent with regional transportation plans
  - SB 6580: linking Growth Management Act to GHG targets and policies
Oregon

- Climate
  - Statewide Transportation Strategy - all modes statewide
  - Metropolitan targets (% per capita) & scenario planning - GHG from light duty vehicles only (only Portland/Eugene required)

- Transportation
  - Oregon Transportation Plan + modal plans
  - Goal 12: Transportation
  - Statewide Transportation Improvement Program

- Land Use
  - UGBs; 19 Statewide Goals; required local plans

- Nexus
  - Oregon Transportation and Growth Management Program (ODOT/DLCD)
  - Statewide Transportation Strategy / OSTI
Synthesis

• Goals
  o By 2020: range from reaching baseline to 10% below 1990 levels
  o MD: State, sector level
  o CA, OR, WA: regional and per capita
• Vertical
  o CA, OR, WA: regional level develops the plan and local implementation voluntary
• Horizontal
  o MD: several state agencies involved in climate plan; integration of transportation and land use plans
  o OR: OSTI and TGM
  o WA: integration with state growth management program
  o CA: Strategic Growth Council, Climate Action Team
• Monitoring
  o CA, MD, OR: GHG inventories; implementation reporting
  o WA: GHG and VMT levels
  o NO REAL ACCOUNTABILITY MECHANISM FOR REACHING TARGETS
Preliminary Observations: Process

• Environmental groups important in pushing legislation
• Important to allow flexibility within regions
• Heavy reliance on models, assumptions and scenario planning
  o Are the targets right?
• Need a statutorily created agency with oversight, authority and budget
  o Silos hamper implementation
• Framing outcomes as co-benefits
Preliminary Observations & Recommendations: Implementation

• Weak integration of land use plans and transportation plans (and funding decisions)
  ➢ Make transportation funding contingent on land use plans
  ➢ Performance measures integrated into transportation funding process
  ➢ Make UGB expansion contingent on scenario planning

• Lack of funding and incentives for planning at regional and local level
  ➢ Competitive process for funding (cap & trade funds in CA)

• Lack of funding for transit and redevelopment
  ➢ Regulatory relief
  ➢ Unconstrained funding sources for non-highway transportation

• Who holds states and regions accountable to targets?
  ➢ Importance of environmental groups and public opinion
Driving down GHG from Transportation: Assessing Efforts in Four States

2015 PIELC Conference
March 5, 2015
Rebecca Lewis, Robert Zako, Alexis Biddle, Rory Isbell, Emily Kettell, Elizabeth Miller