

March 21, 2012

9:00am

2012 Maritime Emission Inventory Steering Committee

Meeting called Port of Tacoma **Note taker:** Matoya Darby
Facilitator: Ron Stuart

Attendees: Ron Stuart, Matoya Darby, Cindy Lin, Bruce Anderson, Guiselle Andrette, Ellen Watson, Janice Gedlund, Jordan Royer, Carole Cenci, Frank Van Haren

Minutes

Agenda item: Review Action Items

- Discussion:**
- Ron to rework gant chart scheduled, not completed, will carry over to next meeting
 - Contact data managers to update matrix for harbor vessels, completed. Brandon working directly with Starcrest and data has been submitted.
 - Ron sent out invitations to proposed work group members, has received responses, need to schedule the first meeting
 - Ron was to send out website link to the forum attendees, completed with no response.

Action items	Person responsible	Deadline
✓ Rework gant chart schedule	Ron	Next meeting

Agenda item: Budget Update

Discussion:

Ron- Noticed file sent out previously had Port of Seattle invoices scattered throughout the spreadsheet, not relevant to this group, data collection by Starcrest for Port of Seattle was negotiated separately so those were removed. Group budget is doing very well. Task C has 6K of 20K remaining, Task D still has half the budget remaining, Meeting budget still remains and majority of the budget is left for the draft and final report. At this point 70% of the budget still remains available.

Bruce- Once data collection is done and calculations and QA are done that goes in to Task F.

Agenda item: Data Collection

Discussion:

- OGV (Bruce)- Have the marine exchange data, completed activity file which is taking the marine exchange data and routing through all of the routes and have verified almost the exact same number of calls the marine exchange data has. Really happy with the activity file. We have almost all POT and POS shorepower and fuel switch information; still trying to finish Princess. Will get with POS for help if we do not get a hold of them by the end of the month. Provided a draft of the tanker improvement project which includes all their data just went to Ports of LA and Long Beach for their review, expect a sign off in three to four weeks, will have that information for the emission estimates, no expected changes, will go to WSPPA as well and can program that data in the emission estimates as long as WSPA is okay with it. Can say that tanker data is complete. Reached out with Captain Moore's help with the pilots and discussed changes in 2005 and last year. Will meet with them soon. OGV just about finished with the data collection, should be complete end of this month or early next month.
- File created for next data collection update, called April update. Made tanker update complete Carole to contact American seafood to complete
- Harbor craft (Guiselle)- Waiting until the end of the month to call it complete to allow companies we have contacted to submit their data. Update from Brandon Dunlap towing submitted data. Making progress. Feel comfortable with data received up to now it will be enough to cover the 2011 activity for Harbor craft and for many that we did not contact we are leaving the same as 2005 except changing the fuel to ultra low sulfur diesel, was able to confirm all harbor craft was using this diesel in 2011. March 30th is the deadline for harbor craft information. Would like to move on from there to estimating emissions to keep the schedule for the draft report section.
- CHE (Guiselle)- data collection has been completed for some time. Estimated emissions through the non road, In the process of doing the QA in the post processing which includes those that have retrofits providing the emissions reduction for that equipment. Everything going well so far. For yard tractors it was mentioned at the beginning of the project wanted to confirm that right now we ran the yard tractors with the non road model which gives the default load factor that the nonroad model has. Initially at the beginning we mentioned we did a study in Port of LA that shows the load factor to be lower than what is used in EPA and CA model, wondering for the post processing if we should use the newer load factor for yard tractor which is specific to yard tractor and not based on any averages or defaults.
- Ron-First thought would be comparability with 2005
- Bruce-The data collected on the container terminals in LA/Long Beach are specifically for container terminals as opposed to EPA which is for all uses of a yard tractor. Would say it is a better data point and more indicative than EPA load factor and comparability to the past could post process ratios.
- Guiselle-if we were to use it we would ratio 2005 emissions to show for cargo handling equipment when comparing to 2011.
- Bruce-We would use load factor on both cases which is done when you have better data and does not give false reduction.
- Cindy- Do load factors have anything to do with terminal operations.
- Bruce-These were all inside and are a mix of setup of the terminals.
- Guiselle-Asking in case agencies in the area wanted to keep it strictly nonroad model because they would use it for their own purpose.
- Ron-Is EPA planning to adopt new load factors?
- Bruce-They do not adopt in to their load factor manual but Region 9 has agreed that they are appropriate for inventory.
- Ron- So we have that documentation we can use for a footnote.
- Cindy-Ron, Starcrest, and agencies get together to make sure everyone is comfortable.
- HDV/LDV (Guiselle)-data collection complete. Submitted information to an agency and waiting to hear back from them on running it through their model. In the review process of the data. The last email received said they were reviewing it, have not heard from them since then. Hoping the agency would be on the line to give an update.

- HDV/LDV(Joe)- We have the on terminal data from all of the terminals of the Ports and the model year distribution for POT, POS, and POE. Sent distributions off to Puget Sound Regional council have not heard back about questions or status report. I will ping them again on whether they have questions.
- MOVESMOVES v. Mobile 6 (Ron) Significant changes in emission rates for model years 1994-1997 so there is going to be an effect on emissions from our newer older trucks compared to the 2005 inventory which is very interesting.
- Frank- We ran that model for our Tacoma SCRAAPS program and we saw that emissions rate drop from 1997-1998, wondering if there was some engine technology change that was except. Got a reply from David Resinkski (sp) from EPA and he thought the change seen was a model artifact and not reality. Not sure what he met, Sally will be looking in to this closer and doing test runs.
- Joe-There is definitely a difference between the mobile and MOVES model in what they estimate and the difference varies by model year and pollutants, depending on what the models you were looking at it could have been the difference between using MOVES.
- Frank-David thinks the model may be grouping model years even though the output looks like individual model years.
- Ron- It would be good to have some explanation in the report between the jump in the two models.
- Cindy- Information sharing is part of the objective in the PSAEI project. When you get information can you forward to the funding members.
- Frank- Ecology will send it to Ron for distribution. Ron can forward the email from David to Starcrest.
- Joe- The biggest difference are that in the 1990 up to 2006 timeframe especially for PM and PM 2.5 the MOVES model predicts dramatically higher emissions from 2007 and older trucks compared to the Mobile model. For example the 2006 model, mobile predicts a .2 gram per model and .7 gram per model from MOVES all the way back to the mid 90's. The newer model year the PM is very similar for NOX. MOVES predicts lower NOX in new trucks. The reasons have to do with what EPA think is newer and better information on actual emissions from trucks. Mobile is based on old test data. The individual model year differences are quite pronounced.
- Ron- As we develop that section of the report we will be comparing 2005 MOVES and Mobile 6 and 2011 MOVES and Mobile 6.

Action items	Person responsible	Deadline
✓ Reach out to Trident Seafood for their data. Get contact info from POT	Carole Cenci	
✓ Schedule meeting with Starcrest and Agencies to discuss the use of the POLA CHE load factor	Ron	
✓ Contact Puget Sound Regional Council/Ecology about modeling status and confirm a schedule.	Joe	

Agenda item: Ecology Grant

Discussion:

- Ron- Main purpose is to nail down the deliverables in the grant agreement and make sure Starcrest can deliver those at the quoted price of the scope, schedule, and budget.
 - Ron- Agreed that if more money was found it would be applied towards enhanced reporting. In the scope there were two optional reporting items outlined. 1) Reporting emissions by measure by Port and 2) Comparing 2005 to 2011. Those two optional items is what Ecology is willing to fund as part of the grant for 35K. What has come out of the conversation is a more refined description of the tasks. Task 1- Quantify and report emission reductions by the Clean Air Strategy performance measures by Port and Task 2- Qualitatively compare the report emissions between 2005 and 2011. The 2005 and 2011 part of the report will be done simultaneously with the air emissions report. The report for the Clean Air Strategy by Port will be done later. Starcrest needs more time to put it together. Shooting for June 30th for the main report but August 31st for Task 1. Would like to clearly discuss what exactly Starcrest will do for Task 1.
 - Cindy-Original intent- Starcrest did the same thing for Port of LA/Long Beach update. I encourage everyone if you have questions about how the report will look, read those reports. The objective is because in 2005 and 2011 the cargo throughput is different and we do not want the public to think that the drop in emissions is because of the cargo volume drops. The intent is to pack the emissions to the cargo throughput TEU and tonnage.
 - Bruce- That is what we are trying to do. The intent of Task 1 is to take into account the change in cargo and the change in plan and show where the emissions reductions is coming from. In 2010 update we showed that the even with the drop in cargo the reduction in emissions is greater. Looking at what the changes are in cargos and we will need additional data from the Ports. There is a slight difference in this Task than what we do in inventories. Once the task is authorized we will need more data collections.
 - Cindy-Because the business model in the PacNW changed because of increase in export will the comparison address that too?
 - Bruce-Yes you would want to show imports vs. exports and talk about emissions going up and down and what the drivers behind those.
 - Guiselle-Task 1 as written will quantify the emissions reductions by the past performance. So taking the 2011 activity and estimate the reductions for the different measures in the Clean Air Strategy. And if it's just 2011 you are not comparing against another year and there is no metrics involved.
 - Bruce- Looking to see if cargo changes are more significant than the emissions reductions.
 - Ellen- It is measuring the success of the different programs we have implemented. We need some kind of baseline to measure against to decide whether the program was a success across the board.
 - Bruce-Compare baseline to what was done that year.
 - Ellen-This is the piece the public will want to read in the report.
 - Ron-Suggest tabling the discussion of the stakeholders will call to discuss this issue Ron- Hearing two things about Task 1; 1) we need a narrative describing the effect of the Clean Air Strategy on the reductions 2) other factors that contributed to reduced emissions other to the Clean Air Strategy.
 - Bruce- We would compare it to cargo changes and figure out the baseline for that. And use what the cargo volumes were when you started and what your cargo volumes were in 2011 and look and what the changes were in import/export roles.
 - Joe- The change in volume would be discussed in the comparison between 2005 and 2011
 - Guiselle- And not in Task 1, Task 1 is just 2011 emissions reductions as a measure
 - Task 1- is what would the emissions be with and without the measure regardless of the throughput.
 - Guiselle- We are going to show the data for 2005 TEU and 2011 TEU throughput, and
-

sow that difference whether there was an increase in throughput or decrease and make that first and then show reductions. Not planning to do more than that. Not planning to provide emissions by throughput like for LA/Long Beach; that would be a metrics section which would be different. But showing one table for throughput comparison. The reason for throughput it is not good to just show TEU if you have a Port that is not 100% containerized it's better to show the throughput in metric tons.

- Cindy- Suggest everyone read the section in LA/Long Beach to see if we like the model.
- Bruce-We need to nail down exactly what you want.
- Guiselle- For the cost estimate in Task 2 we would not be able to do it.
- Frank- Approval of the grant was difficult, I do not think that we could get more money so we have to be careful about that and weigh what we want to get out of the additional money.
- Guiselle- If Task 1 if the wording is not what you want then it is time to change that and we will provide what you want and work within the cost estimate.
- Bruce- We want to make sure that if we have a clear picture of what you want we can tell you if we can work within the budget you have versus your expectation.
- Frank- Put together a boundary of additional funds and I can try to get more funds. As far as what the tasks are that can change to what you want, it is the funds that cannot change.
- Ron- Conscience of how the existing contract reads, we have a scope, schedule and budget and option items that are stated. Would like to try to keep within the framework of the contract and budget.
- Cindy- We need to stay within the budget but this section is really important because whatever effort we have done to reduce the emissions can be overshadowed by the perception.
- Ron- Lets backup a bit and figure out what we want to do. It is important for the funding group to review the Port of LA/Long Beach 2010 cap update posted on their websites.
- Bruce/Guiselle- Look at 2010 cap update executive summary (section 9) and emissions inventory (section 9 on LA and 8 on Long Beach)
- Bruce- May want run this by the communications group to decide if this is what we want. Tell us what you want and we will let you know if it is possible with the existing budget.
- Inventory report scheduled mid-May

Action items

Person responsible

Deadline

✓ Schedule a face to face meeting to discuss Ecology Grant tasks

Ron