

1) Existing Buildings (EBE-1)

This strategy will involve undertaking efforts to reduce energy and water consumption in the portfolio of existing buildings (public and private) through actions such as improved energy code compliance, green purchasing, and government or utility efficiency programs. The proposed consensus recommendation is to implement efforts that would achieve a 15% reduction (1% per year for 15 years) in existing building energy use. Analysis results show this strategy could result in a 4.9% reduction in region-wide emissions (~5.3 MMT CO₂e reduction out of the 98 MMT CO₂e goal).

- 1) What is the likelihood of your jurisdiction implementing policies or programs to support the goal of reducing energy and water consumption in existing buildings? Please select from the answers below and add any additional comments on this strategy in the comment box.
 - a. This strategy is consistent with my jurisdiction’s policies and/however
 - i. ___my jurisdiction is already implementing such policies or programs.
 - ii. ___my jurisdiction plans to implement such policies or programs.
 - iii. ___my jurisdiction could implement such policies or programs, but there are currently no plans to implement.
 - iv. ___my jurisdiction is unlikely to implement such policies and/or programs.
 - v. ___my jurisdiction lacks the specific authority to implement actions to support this strategy.
 - b. ___This strategy is not consistent with my jurisdiction’s policies (Please comment in the box below and skip to the next strategy)

Additional comments for Question 1:

- 2) Is the proposed consensus recommendation of 15% a reasonable assumption for your jurisdiction? If not, what could be achieved in your jurisdiction?
- 3) What actions would your jurisdiction take and/or need to take to implement this strategy?
- 4) What supportive actions would be needed from other entities, such as state government, federal government, public utilities, regional entities, or the private sector?
- 5) What challenges, obstacles, opportunities or co-benefits do you see for your jurisdiction with this strategy?
- 6) What do you see as a timeframe to start implementing the policies and/or programs? When do you see those actions being fully in place?
- 7) Are there other thoughts or comments on this strategy that you wish to share?

2) New Building Efficiency (EBE-4)

This strategy will involve undertaking efforts to improve new building energy and water performance through improved energy codes; net zero building policies; and updates to development codes and policies. The proposed consensus recommendation is to implement efforts that would achieve 15% reduction in new building energy use by 2030; and 25% of new buildings net zero by 2040. Analysis results show this strategy could result in a 2.4 % reduction in region-wide emissions (~2.6 MMT CO₂e reduction out of the 98 MMT CO₂e goal).

- 1) What is the likelihood of your jurisdiction implementing policies or programs to support the goal of reducing energy and water consumption in new buildings? Please select from the answers below and add any additional comments on this strategy in the comment box.
 - a. This strategy is consistent with my jurisdiction’s policies and/however
 - i. ___my jurisdiction is already implementing such policies or programs.
 - ii. ___my jurisdiction plans to implement such policies or programs.
 - iii. ___my jurisdiction could implement such policies or programs, but there are currently no plans to implement.
 - iv. ___my jurisdiction is unlikely to implement such policies and/or programs.
 - v. ___my jurisdiction lacks the specific authority to implement actions to support this strategy.
 - b. ___This strategy is not consistent with my jurisdiction’s policies (Please comment in the box below and skip to the next strategy)

Additional comments for Question 1:

- 2) Are the proposed consensus recommendation of 15% and 25%, respectively, a reasonable assumption for your jurisdiction? If not, what could be achieved in your jurisdiction?
- 3) What actions would your jurisdiction take and/or need to take to implement this strategy?
- 4) What supportive actions would be needed from other entities, such as state government, federal government, public utilities, regional entities, or the private sector?
- 5) What challenges, obstacles, opportunities or co-benefits do you see for your jurisdiction with this strategy?
- 6) What do you see as a timeframe to start implementing the policies and/or programs? When do you see those actions being fully in place?
- 7) Are there other thoughts or comments on this strategy that you wish to share?

3) Infrastructure Energy (EBE-5)

This strategy will involve undertaking efforts to increase infrastructure efficiency and renewable energy use through investments in end use efficiency and deployment of on-site renewables by local and regional utilities and authorities. The proposed consensus recommendation is to implement efforts that would achieve a 35% reduction in fossil fuel use for infrastructure systems by 2040. Analysis results show this strategy could result in a 0.1 % reduction in region-wide emissions (~0.1 MMT CO₂e reduction out of the 98 MMT CO₂e goal).

- 1) What is the likelihood that your jurisdiction could implement policies or which support the region-wide goal of increased infrastructure efficiency and renewable energy use? Please select from the answers below and add any additional comments on this strategy in the comment box.
 - a. This strategy is consistent with my jurisdiction’s policies and/however
 - i. ___my jurisdiction is already implementing such policies or programs.
 - ii. ___my jurisdiction plans to implement such policies or programs.
 - iii. ___my jurisdiction could implement such policies or programs, but there are currently no plans to implement.
 - iv. ___my jurisdiction is unlikely to implement such policies and/or programs.
 - v. ___my jurisdiction lacks the specific authority to implement actions to support this strategy.
 - b. ___This strategy is not consistent with my jurisdiction’s policies (Please comment in the box below and skip to the next strategy)

Additional comments for Question 1:

- 2) Is the consensus recommendation of a 35% reduction a reasonable assumption for your jurisdiction? If not, what could be achieved in your jurisdiction?
- 3) What actions would your jurisdiction take and/or need to take to implement this strategy?
- 4) What supportive actions would be needed from other entities, such as state government, federal government, public utilities, regional entities, or the private sector?
- 5) What challenges, obstacles, opportunities or co-benefits do you see for your jurisdiction with this strategy?
- 6) What do you see as a timeframe to start implementing the policies and/or programs? When do you see those actions being fully in place?
- 7) Are there other thoughts or comments on this strategy that you wish to share?

4) Clean Power Supply (EBE-6)

This strategy will involve undertaking efforts to reduce electric power sector emissions by supporting state actions to achieve a 30% decrease in MT CO_{2e}. This would involve supporting full state implementation of the federal Clean Power Plan, or your states equivalent program. Analysis results show this strategy could result in a 7.4 % reduction in region-wide emissions (~8.1 MMT CO_{2e} reduction out of the 98 MMT CO_{2e} goal).

- 1) What is the likelihood of your jurisdiction implementing policies or programs to support your state’s adoption of the Clean Power Plan? Please select from the answers below and add any additional comments on this strategy in the comment box.
 - a. This strategy is consistent with my jurisdiction’s policies and/however
 - i. ___my jurisdiction is already implementing such policies or programs.
 - ii. ___my jurisdiction plans to implement such policies or programs.
 - iii. ___my jurisdiction could implement such policies or programs, but there are currently no plans to implement.
 - iv. ___my jurisdiction is unlikely to implement such policies and/or programs.
 - v. ___my jurisdiction lacks the specific authority to implement actions to support this strategy.
 - b. ___This strategy is not consistent with my jurisdiction’s policies (Please comment in the box below and skip to the next strategy)

Additional comments for Question 1:

- 2) Are there other thoughts or comments on this strategy that you wish to share?

5) Distributed Renewables (EBE-2)

This strategy will involve undertaking efforts to increase distributed renewable energy deployment through strategies such as solarize/solar co-op programs and municipal solar installations. Currently, there are approximately 30,000 (equivalent) residential Photovoltaic (PV) systems supplying 0.25% of the regional demand. The consensus recommended strategy will support a region wide goal of an increase to 250,000 (equivalent) residential Photovoltaic (PV) systems by 2040, supplying approximately 2% of the electrical needs for the region. Analysis results show this strategy could result in a 0.7% reduction in region-wide emissions (~0.8 MMT CO_{2e} reduction out of the 98 MMT CO_{2e} goal).

- 1) What is the likelihood that your jurisdiction could implement policies or which support the region-wide goal of increased distributed renewable energy deployment? Additionally, what target is reasonable for your jurisdiction? Please select from the answers below and add any additional comments on this strategy in the comment box.
 - a. This strategy is consistent with my jurisdiction's policies and/however
 - i. ___my jurisdiction is already implementing such policies or programs.
 - ii. ___my jurisdiction plans to implement such policies or programs.
 - iii. ___my jurisdiction could implement such policies or programs, but there are currently no plans to implement.
 - iv. ___my jurisdiction is unlikely to implement such policies and/or programs.
 - v. ___my jurisdiction lacks the specific authority to implement actions to support this strategy.
 - b. ___This strategy is not consistent with my jurisdiction's policies (Please comment in the box below and skip to the next strategy)

Additional comments for Question 1:

- 1) Is the proposed consensus recommended strategy to increase deployment of residential PV systems to account for 2 percent of electricity supply a reasonable assumption for your jurisdiction? If not, what could be achieved in your jurisdiction?
- 3) What actions would your jurisdiction take and/or need to take to implement this strategy?
- 4) What supportive actions would be needed from other entities, such as state government, federal government, public utilities, regional entities, or the private sector?
- 5) What challenges, obstacles, opportunities or co-benefits do you see for your jurisdiction with this strategy?
- 6) What do you see as a timeframe to start implementing the policies and/or programs? When do you see those actions being fully in place?
- 7) Are there other thoughts or comments on this strategy that you wish to share?

6) Solid Waste (EBE-8)

This strategy will involve undertaking efforts to reduce emissions associated with municipal solid waste through increased recycling, reuse, and composting; green purchasing; optimized methane recovery; and waste to energy recovery. The proposed consensus recommendation is to implement efforts that would achieve a 60-70% recycling rate and an 80% reduction in waste to landfills by 2040. Analysis results show this strategy could result in a 0.1 % reduction in region-wide emissions (~0.1 MMT CO₂e reduction out of the 98 MMT CO₂e goal).

- 1) What is the likelihood that your jurisdiction could implement policies or which support the region-wide municipal solid waste goals? Additionally, what targets are reasonable for your jurisdiction? Please select from the answers below and add any additional comments on this strategy in the comment box.
 - a. This strategy is consistent with my jurisdiction’s policies and/however
 - i. ___my jurisdiction is already implementing such policies or programs.
 - ii. ___my jurisdiction plans to implement such policies or programs.
 - iii. ___my jurisdiction could implement such policies or programs, but there are currently no plans to implement.
 - iv. ___my jurisdiction is unlikely to implement such policies and/or programs.
 - v. ___my jurisdiction lacks the specific authority to implement actions to support this strategy.
 - b. ___This strategy is not consistent with my jurisdiction’s policies (Please comment in the box below and skip to the next strategy)

Additional comments for Question 1:

- 2) Is the proposed consensus recommended strategy for the 60-70% recycling rate as well as an 80% landfill reduction, a reasonable assumption for your jurisdiction? If not, what could be achieved in your jurisdiction?
- 3) What actions would your jurisdiction take and/or need to take to implement this strategy?
- 4) What supportive actions would be needed from other entities, such as state government, federal government, public utilities, regional entities, or the private sector?
- 5) What challenges, obstacles, opportunities or co-benefits do you see for your jurisdiction with this strategy?
- 6) What do you see as a timeframe to start implementing the policies and/or programs? When do you see those actions being fully in place?
- 7) Are there other thoughts or comments on this strategy that you wish to share?

7) Non-Road Equipment (EBE-9)

This strategy will involve undertaking efforts to reduce emissions from non-road engines through government purchasing, retrofits, and anti-idling policies. The proposed consensus recommendation is to implement efforts that would achieve a 20% reduction in MT CO_{2e} emissions by 2040. Analysis results show this strategy could result in a 0.1 % reduction in region-wide emissions (~0.1 MMT CO_{2e} reduction out of the 98 MMT CO_{2e} goal).

- 1) What is the likelihood that your jurisdiction could implement policies or which support the region-wide goal of reduced emission from non-road engines? Additionally, what target is reasonable for your jurisdiction? Please select from the answers below and add any additional comments on this strategy in the comment box.
 - a. This strategy is consistent with my jurisdiction’s policies and/however
 - i. ___my jurisdiction is already implementing such policies or programs.
 - ii. ___my jurisdiction plans to implement such policies or programs.
 - iii. ___my jurisdiction could implement such policies or programs, but there are currently no plans to implement.
 - iv. ___my jurisdiction is unlikely to implement such policies and/or programs.
 - v. ___my jurisdiction lacks the specific authority to implement actions to support this strategy.
 - b. ___This strategy is not consistent with my jurisdiction’s policies (Please comment in the box below and skip to the next strategy)

Additional comments for Question 1:

- 2) Is the proposed consensus recommended strategy calling for a 20% reduction of emissions by 2040 a reasonable assumption for your jurisdiction? If not, what could be achieved in your jurisdiction?
- 3) What actions would your jurisdiction take and/or need to take to implement this strategy?
- 4) What supportive actions would be needed from other entities, such as state government, federal government, public utilities, regional entities, or the private sector?
- 5) What challenges, obstacles, opportunities or co-benefits do you see for your jurisdiction with this strategy?
- 6) What do you see as a timeframe to start implementing the policies and/or programs? When do you see those actions being fully in place?
- 7) Are there other thoughts or comments on this strategy that you wish to share?

8) Reduced Natural Gas Pipeline Leaks (EBE-7)

This strategy will involve supporting efforts to reduce natural gas distribution system leaks and fugitive emissions achieved through efforts to support cost recovery for utility programs that upgrade pipeline infrastructure. The proposed consensus recommendation is to implement efforts that would achieve a 20% reduction of natural gas fugitive emissions by 2040. Analysis results show this strategy could result in a 0.1 % reduction in region-wide emissions (~0.1 MMT CO₂e reduction out of the 98 MMT CO₂e goal).

- 1) What is the likelihood that your jurisdiction could implement policies or which support the region-wide goal of decreased fugitive emissions from natural gas leaks? Additionally, what target is reasonable for your jurisdiction? Please select from the answers below and add any additional comments on this strategy in the comment box.
 - a. This strategy is consistent with my jurisdiction’s policies and/however
 - i. ___my jurisdiction is already implementing such policies or programs.
 - ii. ___my jurisdiction plans to implement such policies or programs.
 - iii. ___my jurisdiction could implement such policies or programs, but there are currently no plans to implement.
 - iv. ___my jurisdiction is unlikely to implement such policies and/or programs.
 - v. ___my jurisdiction lacks the specific authority to implement actions to support this strategy.
 - b. ___This strategy is not consistent with my jurisdiction’s policies (Please comment in the box below and skip to the next strategy)

Additional comments for Question 1:

- 2) Is the proposed consensus recommended strategy of a 20% reduction in fugitive emissions a reasonable assumption for your jurisdiction? If not, what could be achieved in your jurisdiction?
- 3) What actions would your jurisdiction take and/or need to take to implement this strategy?
- 4) What supportive actions would be needed from other entities, such as state government, federal government, public utilities, regional entities, or the private sector?
- 5) What challenges, obstacles, opportunities or co-benefits do you see for your jurisdiction with this strategy?
- 6) What do you see as a timeframe to start implementing the policies and/or programs? When do you see those actions being fully in place?
- 7) Are there other thoughts or comments on this strategy that you wish to share?

9) Tree Canopy (TLU-1)

This strategy asks jurisdictions to consider implementing policies or programs that would mitigate the loss of tree canopy from new development. Some examples of policies and programs to implement this strategy include concentrating more of the jurisdiction’s expected future residential and commercial growth in compact mixed use centers, public sector tree planting programs and voluntary planting by development entities for project approval. The consensus recommendation is to mitigate tree canopy loss by concentrating more future growth in mixed use centers. Analysis results indicate this strategy could result in a 0.07% reduction in projected region-wide GHG emissions (~0.06 MMT CO₂e reduction out of the 98 MMT CO₂e goal).

- 1) What is the likelihood that your jurisdiction could implement policies or programs to reduce tree loss from new development? Please select from the answers below and add any additional comments on this strategy in the comment box.
 - a. This strategy is consistent with my jurisdiction’s policies and/however
 - i. ___my jurisdiction is already implementing such policies or programs.
 - ii. ___my jurisdiction plans to implement such policies or programs.
 - iii. ___my jurisdiction could implement such policies or programs, but there are currently no plans to implement.
 - iv. ___my jurisdiction is unlikely to implement such policies and/or programs.
 - v. ___my jurisdiction lacks the specific authority to implement actions to support this strategy.
 - b. ___This strategy is not consistent with my jurisdiction’s policies (Please comment in the box below and skip to the next strategy)

Additional comments for Question 1:

- 2) Is the proposed consensus recommendation to mitigate tree canopy by concentrating more future development in mixed use centers - a reasonable assumption for your jurisdiction? If not, what would be a reasonable assumption for your jurisdiction?
- 3) What actions would your jurisdiction take and/or need to take to implement this strategy?
- 4) What supportive actions would be needed from other entities, such as state government, federal government, public utilities, regional entities, or the private sector?
- 5) What challenges, obstacles, opportunities or co-benefits do you see for your jurisdiction with this strategy?
- 6) What do you see as a timeframe to start implementing the policies and/or programs? When do you see those actions being fully in place?
- 7) Are there other thoughts or comments on this strategy that you wish to share?

10) Sustainable Development Patterns (TLU-2)

This strategy asks jurisdictions to consider actions that would concentrate more of their expected future residential and commercial growth in compact mixed use centers to reduce GHG emissions by increasing the share of daily travel by walking, biking and transit, reducing the growth in daily vehicle miles of travel and in daily water and energy consumption. Such actions would include updating the current zoning to allow for greater concentration of future residential or commercial growth in Activity Centers and revised urban design requirements for developments in these centers. The consensus recommendation calls for a 10% increase in the concentration of forecast housing and job growth in Activity Centers above what is currently projected in the Round 8.4 Cooperative Forecasts. Based on this 10% increase, 68% of new housing and 83% of new jobs would be concentrated in Activity Centers instead of the 62% and 76% shares seen in the current Forecasts.

Analysis results indicate this strategy could result in a 0.27% reduction in projected region-wide on-road GHG emissions (~0.26 MMT CO₂e reduction out of the 98 MMT CO₂e goal).

For the built environment, analysis indicates this strategy could result in an additional 0.2% reduction in projected GHG emissions (~0.2 MMT CO₂e) because of the increased energy efficiency of multi-family and mixed-use structures in Activity Centers.

- 1) What is the likelihood that your jurisdiction could implement zoning and land use policy changes that would allow increased concentration of new housing and job growth in Activity Centers? Please select from the answers below and add any additional comments on this strategy in the comment box.
 - a. This strategy is consistent with my jurisdiction's policies and/however
 - i. ___my jurisdiction is already implementing such policies or programs.
 - ii. ___my jurisdiction plans to implement such policies or programs.
 - iii. ___my jurisdiction could implement such policies or programs, but there are currently no plans to implement.
 - iv. ___my jurisdiction is unlikely to implement such policies and/or programs.
 - v. ___my jurisdiction lacks the specific authority to implement actions to support this strategy.
 - b. ___This strategy is not consistent with my jurisdiction's policies (Please comment in the box below and skip to the next strategy)

Additional comments for Question 1:

- 2) Is the proposed consensus recommendation to increase an additional 10% increase in housing and job creation in Activity Centers a reasonable assumption for your jurisdiction? If not, what would be a reasonable assumption for your jurisdiction?
- 3) What actions would your jurisdiction take and/or need to take to implement this strategy?
- 4) What supportive actions would be needed from other entities, such as state government, federal government, public utilities, regional entities, or the private sector?

Multi-Sector Working Group Survey – Land Use

- 5) What challenges, obstacles, opportunities or co-benefits do you see for your jurisdiction with this strategy?
- 6) What do you see as a timeframe to start implementing the policies and/or programs? When do you see those actions being fully in place?
- 7) Are there other thoughts or comments on this strategy that you wish to share?

11) Improve Fuel Economy of Private Light-Duty Fleet (TLU-3)

This strategy asks jurisdictions to consider taking actions that would accelerate the replacement of existing gasoline-powered privately-owned (general public) light duty vehicles with electric and other types of extremely fuel efficient vehicles. Examples of such actions would include facilitating the rapid deployment of electric vehicle infrastructure, public charging facilities, electric vehicle-ready building codes, and incentives for the early replacement of older vehicles that have very poor fuel economy - (such as Cash for Clunkers). The consensus recommendation calls for a 10% improvement in the fuel economy of the light duty fleet beyond what would occur through normal vehicle turnover rates. Analysis results indicate this strategy could result in a 0.34% reduction in projected region-wide GHG emissions (~0.39 MMT CO_{2e} reduction out of the 98 MMT CO_{2e} goal).

- 1) What is the likelihood that your jurisdiction could implement policies or programs to accelerate the turnover and improvement in the fuel economy of the private light duty fleet? Please select from the answers below and add any additional comments on this strategy in the comment box.
 - a. This strategy is consistent with my jurisdiction’s policies and/however
 - i. ___my jurisdiction is already implementing such policies or programs.
 - ii. ___my jurisdiction plans to implement such policies or programs.
 - iii. ___my jurisdiction could implement such policies or programs, but there are currently no plans to implement.
 - iv. ___my jurisdiction is unlikely to implement such policies and/or programs.
 - v. ___my jurisdiction lacks the specific authority to implement actions to support this strategy.
 - b. ___This strategy is not consistent with my jurisdiction’s policies (Please comment in the box below and skip to the next strategy)

Additional comments for Question 1:

- 2) Is the proposed consensus recommendation to increase more fuel efficient vehicles through accelerated turnover of the private light duty fleet by 10% a reasonable assumption for your jurisdiction? If not, what would be a reasonable assumption for your jurisdiction?
- 3) What actions would your jurisdiction take and/or need to take to implement this strategy?
- 4) What supportive actions would be needed from other entities, such as state government, federal government, public utilities, regional entities, or the private sector?
- 5) What challenges, obstacles, opportunities or co-benefits do you see for your jurisdiction with this strategy?
- 6) What do you see as a timeframe to start implementing the policies and/or programs? When do you see those actions being fully in place?
- 7) Are there other thoughts or comments on this strategy that you wish to share?

12) Increase use of Alternative Fuels in Public Sector Fleets (TLU-4)

This strategy asks jurisdictions to consider actions that would increase the adoption and use of alternative fuels in public sector fleets. Examples of such actions would include increased purchases of zero-emission and bio-diesel vehicles for public sector fleets and the retrofitting garages and refueling facilities for these vehicles. The consensus recommendation is to increase the use of alternative fuels in public sector fleets by 10%. Analysis results indicate this strategy could result in a 0.03% reduction in projected region-wide GHG emissions (~0.04 MMT CO₂e reduction out of the 98 MMT CO₂e goal).

- 1) What is the likelihood that your jurisdiction could increase the adoption of alternative fuels in its public sector fleet? Please select from the answers below and add any additional comments on this strategy in the comment box.
 - a. This strategy is consistent with my jurisdiction’s policies and/however
 - i. ___my jurisdiction is already implementing such policies or programs.
 - ii. ___my jurisdiction plans to implement such policies or programs.
 - iii. ___my jurisdiction could implement such policies or programs, but there are currently no plans to implement.
 - iv. ___my jurisdiction is unlikely to implement such policies and/or programs.
 - v. ___my jurisdiction lacks the specific authority to implement actions to support this strategy.
 - b. ___This strategy is not consistent with my jurisdiction’s policies (Please comment in the box below and skip to the next strategy)

Additional comments for Question 1:

- 2) Is the proposed consensus recommendation to increase alternative fuel use in the public sector fleet by 10% a reasonable assumption for your jurisdiction? If not, what would be a reasonable assumption for your jurisdiction?
- 3) What actions would your jurisdiction take and/or need to take to implement this strategy?
- 4) What supportive actions would be needed from other entities, such as state government, federal government, public utilities, regional entities, or the private sector?
- 5) What challenges, obstacles, opportunities or co-benefits do you see for your jurisdiction with this strategy?
- 6) What do you see as a timeframe to start implementing the policies and/or programs? When do you see those actions being fully in place?
- 7) Are there other thoughts or comments on this strategy that you wish to share?

13) Low-Carbon Fuel Standard (TLU-6)

This strategy asks jurisdictions to consider actions that would support the adoption of a regional low-carbon fuel standard to lower the carbon intensity of fuels used by on-road vehicles. Implementing this strategy would involve state-level actions to enact a regional low-carbon fuel standard. The consensus recommendation is to enact a regional low-carbon fuel standard that would reduce on-road GHG emissions in the region by 5%. Analysis results indicate this strategy could result in a 0.52% reduction in projected region-wide GHG emissions (~0.51 MMT CO₂e reduction out of the 98 MMT CO₂e goal).

- 1) What is the likelihood that your jurisdiction could support a state efforts to introduce a Low-Carbon Fuel Standard for the region? Please select from the answers below and add any additional comments on this strategy in the comment box.
 - a. This strategy is consistent with my jurisdiction’s policies and/however
 - i. ___my jurisdiction is already implementing such policies or programs.
 - ii. ___my jurisdiction plans to implement such policies or programs.
 - iii. ___my jurisdiction could implement such policies or programs, but there are currently no plans to implement.
 - iv. ___my jurisdiction is unlikely to implement such policies and/or programs.
 - v. ___my jurisdiction lacks the specific authority to implement actions to support this strategy.
 - b. ___This strategy is not consistent with my jurisdiction’s policies (Please comment in the box below and skip to the next strategy)

Additional comments for Question 1:

- 2) Are there other thoughts or comments on this strategy that you wish to share?

14) Truck Stop Electrification (TLU-5)

This strategy asks jurisdictions to consider actions to support the installation of truck stop electrification equipment that would reduce the idling of heavy-duty trucks at truck stops in their jurisdictions. The consensus recommendation is to install 20 truck bays at six truck stops in the region. Analysis results indicate this strategy could result in a 0.002% reduction in projected region-wide GHG emissions (~0.002 MMT CO₂e reduction out of the 98 MMT CO₂e goal).

- 1) Are there existing or planned truck stops in your jurisdiction?
 - a. ___ Yes (How many? ____)
 - b. ___ No (skip to the next strategy)

- 2) What is the likelihood that your jurisdiction could support policies or programs to install electrification equipment at existing or planned truck stop(s) in you jurisdiction? Please select from the answers below and add any additional comments on this strategy in the comment box.
 - a. This strategy is consistent with my jurisdiction’s policies and/however
 - i. ___my jurisdiction is already implementing such policies or programs.
 - ii. ___my jurisdiction plans to implement such policies or programs.
 - iii. ___my jurisdiction could implement such policies or programs, but there are currently no plans to implement.
 - iv. ___my jurisdiction is unlikely to implement such policies and/or programs.
 - v. ___my jurisdiction lacks the specific authority to implement actions to support this strategy.
 - b. ___This strategy is not consistent with my jurisdiction’s policies (Please comment in the box below and skip to the next strategy)

Additional comments for Question 1:

- 3) What is a reasonable assumption for the number of the existing and proposed truck stops to have electrification equipment installed?

- 4) What actions would your jurisdiction take and/or need to take to implement this strategy?

- 5) What supportive actions would be needed from other entities, such as state government, federal government, public utilities, regional entities, or the private sector?

- 6) What challenges, obstacles, opportunities or co-benefits do you see for your jurisdiction with this strategy?

- 7) What do you see as a timeframe to start implementing the policies and/or programs? When do you see those actions being fully in place?

- 8) Are there other thoughts or comments on this strategy that you wish to share?

15) Travel Demand Management (TLU-9)

This strategy asks jurisdictions to consider actions to implement policies and programs that would encourage commuters to shift travel from single-occupant vehicles to alternative modes such as carpool, vanpool, transit, or bicycle. This strategy could be implemented through policies such as federal, state, or local incentives or requirements for alternative commute subsidies. The consensus recommendation is that 60% of commuters be eligible to receive a \$50/month subsidy for using alternative commute modes. Analysis results indicate this strategy could result in a 0.07% reduction in projected region-wide GHG emissions (~0.067 MMT CO₂e reduction out of the 98 MMT CO₂e goal).

- 1) What is the likelihood that your jurisdiction could implement policies or programs to increase the number of commuters who are eligible to receive a commuter subsidy? Please select from the answers below and add any additional comments on this strategy in the comment box.
 - a. This strategy is consistent with my jurisdiction’s policies and/however
 - i. ___my jurisdiction is already implementing such policies or programs.
 - ii. ___my jurisdiction plans to implement such policies or programs.
 - iii. ___my jurisdiction could implement such policies or programs, but there are currently no plans to implement.
 - iv. ___my jurisdiction is unlikely to implement such policies and/or programs.
 - v. ___my jurisdiction lacks the specific authority to implement actions to support this strategy.
 - b. ___This strategy is not consistent with my jurisdiction’s policies (Please comment in the box below and skip to the next strategy)

Additional comments for Question 1:

- 2) Is the proposed consensus recommendation that 60% of commuters be eligible to receive \$50/month alternative commuting subsidy a reasonable assumption for your jurisdiction? If not, what would be a reasonable assumption for your jurisdiction?
- 3) What actions would your jurisdiction take and/or need to take to implement this strategy?
- 4) What supportive actions would be needed from other entities, such as state government, federal government, public utilities, regional entities, or the private sector?
- 5) What challenges, obstacles, opportunities or co-benefits do you see for your jurisdiction with this strategy?
- 6) What do you see as a timeframe to start implementing the policies and/or programs? When do you see those actions being fully in place?
- 7) Are there other thoughts or comments on this strategy that you wish to share?

16) Transit Service Enhancements (TLU-10)

This strategy asks jurisdictions to consider actions that would improve current transit service runtimes and headways in their jurisdictions. Some examples of actions that would improve transit run times include the addition of more express service, giving transit vehicles signal priority at intersections, running buses on shoulders in congested time periods, designating exclusive bus lanes and/or constructing dedicated busways. Actions that would improve transit headways include providing more frequent service on existing transit lines. The consensus recommendation is to improve runtimes and headways regionally by 15%. Analysis indicates that regionally a 15% improvement in transit runtimes and headways could reduce projected GHG emissions by 0.06% (~0.06 MMT CO_{2e} reduction out of the 98 MMT CO_{2e} goal).

- 1) What is the likelihood that your jurisdiction could implement policies or programs to improve the runtimes and headways of the transit service that your jurisdiction operates? Please select from the answers below and add any additional comments on this strategy in the comment box.
 - a. This strategy is consistent with my jurisdiction’s policies and/however
 - i. ___my jurisdiction is already implementing such policies or programs.
 - ii. ___my jurisdiction plans to implement such policies or programs.
 - iii. ___my jurisdiction could implement such policies or programs, but there are currently no plans to implement.
 - iv. ___my jurisdiction is unlikely to implement such policies and/or programs.
 - v. ___my jurisdiction lacks the specific authority to implement actions to support this strategy.
 - b. ___This strategy is not consistent with my jurisdiction’s policies (Please comment in the box below and skip to the next strategy)

Additional comments for Question 1:

- 2) Is the proposed consensus recommendation of a 15% improvement in transit runtimes and headways a reasonable assumption for your jurisdiction? If not, what would be a reasonable assumption for your jurisdiction?
- 3) What actions would your jurisdiction take and/or need to take to implement this strategy?
- 4) What supportive actions would be needed from other entities, such as state government, federal government, public utilities, regional entities, or the private sector?
- 5) What challenges, obstacles, opportunities or co-benefits do you see for your jurisdiction with this strategy?
- 6) What do you see as a timeframe to start implementing the policies and/or programs? When do you see those actions being fully in place?
- 7) Are there other thoughts or comments on this strategy that you wish to share?

17) Transit Fare Reduction (TLU-11)

This strategy asks jurisdictions to consider actions that would reduce fares on transit services that they operate in order to increase transit ridership. Such actions would include policies and program to provide discounted fares, free transfers between transit vehicles, and free off-peak service. The consensus recommendation is to reduce transit fares region-wide by an average of 25%. Analysis results indicate this strategy could result in a 0.1% reduction in projected region-wide GHG emissions (~0.1 MMT CO₂e reduction out of the 98 MMT CO₂e goal).

- 1) What is the likelihood that your jurisdiction could implement policies or programs to reduce transit fares the transit service that your jurisdiction operates? Please select from the answers below and add any additional comments on this strategy in the comment box.
 - a. This strategy is consistent with my jurisdiction’s policies and/however
 - i. ___my jurisdiction is already implementing such policies or programs.
 - ii. ___my jurisdiction plans to implement such policies or programs.
 - iii. ___my jurisdiction could implement such policies or programs, but there are currently no plans to implement.
 - iv. ___my jurisdiction is unlikely to implement such policies and/or programs.
 - v. ___my jurisdiction lacks the specific authority to implement actions to support this strategy.
 - b. ___This strategy is not consistent with my jurisdiction’s policies (Please comment in the box below and skip to the next strategy)

Additional comments for Question 1:

- 2) Is the proposed consensus recommendation of a 25% reduction in transit fares a reasonable assumption for your jurisdiction? If not, what would be a reasonable assumption for your jurisdiction?
- 3) What actions would your jurisdiction take and/or need to take to implement this strategy?
- 4) What supportive actions would be needed from other entities, such as state government, federal government, public utilities, regional entities, or the private sector?
- 5) What challenges, obstacles, opportunities or co-benefits do you see for your jurisdiction with this strategy?
- 6) What do you see as a timeframe to start implementing the policies and/or programs? When do you see those actions being fully in place?
- 7) Are there other thoughts or comments on this strategy that you wish to share?

18) Enhancing System Operations (TLU-7)

This strategy asks jurisdictions to consider actions that would reduce fuel consumption through enhanced transportation system operations. Such actions would include an eco-driving campaign, infrastructure and services for connected/autonomous vehicles, traffic signal retiming, integrated corridor management, ramp metering, and intersection efficiency improvements. The consensus recommendation assumes that infrastructure and services would be provided so that 30% of vehicles are operating under eco-driving principles such as smooth acceleration and deceleration and reduced idling. Analysis results indicate this strategy could result in a 0.21% reduction in projected region-wide GHG emissions (~0.21 MMT CO₂e reduction out of the 98 MMT CO₂e goal).

- 1) What is the likelihood that your jurisdiction could implement actions to enhance transportation system operations on the facilities it owns and/or operates? Please select from the answers below and add any additional comments on this strategy in the comment box.
 - a. This strategy is consistent with my jurisdiction’s policies and/however
 - i. ___my jurisdiction is already implementing such policies or programs.
 - ii. ___my jurisdiction plans to implement such policies or programs.
 - iii. ___my jurisdiction could implement such policies or programs, but there are currently no plans to implement.
 - iv. ___my jurisdiction is unlikely to implement such policies and/or programs.
 - v. ___my jurisdiction lacks the specific authority to implement actions to support this strategy.
 - b. ___This strategy is not consistent with my jurisdiction’s policies (Please comment in the box below and skip to the next strategy)

Additional comments for Question 1:

- 2) Is the proposed consensus recommendation of a 30% improvement in transportation system operations a reasonable assumption for your jurisdiction? If not, what would be a reasonable assumption for your jurisdiction?
- 3) What actions would your jurisdiction take and/or need to take to implement this strategy?
- 4) What supportive actions would be needed from other entities, such as state government, federal government, public utilities, regional entities, or the private sector?
- 5) What challenges, obstacles, opportunities or co-benefits do you see for your jurisdiction with this strategy?
- 6) What do you see as a timeframe to start implementing the policies and/or programs? When do you see those actions being fully in place?
- 7) Are there other thoughts or comments on this strategy that you wish to share?

19) Reducing Speeding on Freeways (TLU-8)

This strategy asks jurisdictions to consider actions that would reduce speeding on the region’s freeways, focusing on the freeway segments outside the heavily congested areas. According to the Department of Energy, going from 60 mph to 70 mph degrades fuel economy by 13.6% and going from 50 mph to 70 mph degrades fuel economy by 24.5%. The consensus recommendation is to increase resources for speed limit enforcement on freeways and limited access facilities through manual and/or electronic enforcement of speed limits. Analysis results indicate this strategy could result in a 0.006% reduction in projected region-wide GHG emissions (~0.006 MMT CO₂e reduction out of the 98 MMT CO₂e goal).

- 1) Are there freeways in your jurisdiction?
 - a. Yes
 - b. No (skip to the next strategy)

- 2) What is the likelihood that your jurisdiction could implement programs to increase speeding enforcement on the freeways within your jurisdiction? Please select from the answers below and add any additional comments on this strategy in the comment box.
 - a. This strategy is consistent with my jurisdiction’s policies and/however
 - i. my jurisdiction is already implementing such policies or programs.
 - ii. my jurisdiction plans to implement such policies or programs.
 - iii. my jurisdiction could implement such policies or programs, but there are currently no plans to implement.
 - iv. my jurisdiction is unlikely to implement such policies and/or programs.
 - v. my jurisdiction lacks the specific authority to implement actions to support this strategy.
 - b. This strategy is not consistent with my jurisdiction’s policies (Please comment in the box below and skip to the next strategy)

Additional comments for Question 1:

- 3) Is the proposed consensus recommendation of increasing enforcement a reasonable assumption for your jurisdiction? If not, what would be a reasonable assumption for your jurisdiction?

- 4) What actions would your jurisdiction take and/or need to take to implement this strategy?

- 5) What supportive actions would be needed from other entities, such as state government, federal government, public utilities, regional entities, or the private sector?

- 6) What challenges, obstacles, opportunities or co-benefits do you see for your jurisdiction with this strategy?

- 7) What do you see as a timeframe to start implementing the policies and/or programs? When do you see those actions being fully in place?

- 8) Are there other thoughts or comments on this strategy that you wish to share?