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## 1. Introduction

The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) in cooperation with the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (SCCRTC), the County of Santa Cruz, proposes to widen Highway 1 (State Route 1 [SR1]) to include auxiliary lanes, accommodate bus-on-shoulder (BOS) operations between the Freedom Boulevard and State Park Drive interchanges, and construct Coastal Rail Trail Segment 12. The project is subject to federal and State environmental review requirements. The project limits extend from the State Park Drive interchange on SR 1, at post mile (PM) 8.1, to the Freedom Boulevard interchange (PM 10.7) within an unincorporated area of the County. Caltrans is the lead agency under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

The purpose of the Energy Analysis Report is to identify energy requirements for construction and operation of the Build Alternative. Every activity results in some kind of energy consumption. Energy is either used for work (kinetic energy) or stored (potential energy). Kinetic energy is the amount of work necessary to move an object. In transportation, thermal energy from fuel combustion is converted into kinetic energy to propel vehicles. Electrical energy is used to power facilities such as highway lighting and converted to heat and power for buildings.

Transportation energy is generally described in terms of direct and indirect energy. In the context of transportation, direct energy involves all energy consumed by vehicle propulsion (e.g., automobiles, trains, airplanes). The one-time energy expenditure involved in constructing a project is also considered direct energy. Fuel consumed by equipment required for periodic maintenance of the physical system associated with a project is considered indirect energy. The use of highway maintenance equipment and landscaping involve indirect consumption of energy after a facility is built. The Energy Analysis Report also discusses consistency with federal, state, and local energy conservation plans.

The Energy Analysis Report is organized as follows:

- Chapter 1 Introduction
- Chapter 2 Project Description
- Chapter 3 Affected Environment
- Chapter 4 Study Methods
- Chapter 5 Environmental Consequences
- Chapter 6 References


Figure 1.1. Map of the Project Location

## 2. Project Description

### 2.1 Location and Background

SR 1 is a primary route connecting in the southern and central areas of Santa Cruz County and is the only continuous commuter route linking Watsonville, Capitola, Aptos, Cabrillo College, Santa Cruz, and the University of California Santa Cruz. SR 1 is also a southern terminus for SR 9 and SR 17, which bring heavy tourist traffic to coastal destinations in Santa Cruz and Monterey counties.

Improvements in the project area were addressed previously in a combined Tier I/Tier II Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Assessment (EIR/EA), which was adopted in December 2018. The Tier I component, referred to as the corridor improvement project, proposed approximately 8.9 miles of new high-occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes, HOV on-ramp bypass lanes, auxiliary lanes, pedestrian and bicycle overcrossings, and reconstructed interchanges. It was recognized that the Tier I project would likely be implemented in phases. The Tier II component therefore analyzed the first phase of the corridor improvement project, which included auxiliary lanes between $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue and Soquel Avenue/Drive among other improvements within the Tier II project limits.

The project is the second phase of the improvements described in the Tier I EIR/EA. The SCCRTC developed an implementation plan for building out the Tier I corridor improvement project based on traffic operation criteria to ensure that each phase identified as a future construction-level project would have independent utility because it would individually provide a benefit to traffic operations on SR 1. The project has independent utility and logical termini because it would resolve a congestion problem on SR 1 between Freedom Boulevard and State Park Drive.

### 2.2 Purpose and Need

The purpose of the project is to do the following.

- Reduce congestion along SR 1 through the project limits.
- Enhance bicycle and pedestrian connectivity along Segment 12 of the Coastal Rail Trail.
- Promote the use of alternative transportation modes to increase transportation system capacity and reliability.
- Provide Coastal Rail Trail access across SR 1 at the two railroad bridges.

This project is needed for the following reasons.

- Several bottlenecks along SR 1 in the southbound and northbound directions cause congestion during peak hours, significantly delaying drivers.
- Cut-through traffic, or traffic on local streets, is increasing because drivers are seeking to avoid congestion on SR 1.
- There are limited opportunities for pedestrians and bicyclists to safely cross SR 1 and navigate the project corridor, even though portions of the project area are designated as regional bicycle routes.


### 2.3 No Build Alternative

The No Build (No Action) Alternative consists of those transportation projects that are already planned for construction by or before the horizon year 2045. Consequently, the No Build Alternative represents future travel conditions in the study area without the project and is the baseline against which the other Build Alternatives will be assessed to meet NEPA requirements.

Under the No-Build Alternative, there would be no construction of auxiliary lanes or BOS features on SR 1 within the project area, and Coastal Rail Trail Segment 12 would not be constructed. The existing transportation facilities within the project area would remain unchanged. The No-Build Alternative assumes the construction of other planned and programmed projects in the region, including other auxiliary lanes projects on SR 1 and other segments of the Coastal Rail Trail.

Average weekday daily mainline traffic in the SR 1 northbound and southbound directions under the No Build conditions and within the project limits is expected to grow between the existing year (2019) and the opening year (2025) by 4.2 percent and 5.7 percent, respectively. Average weekday daily mainline traffic in the SR 1 northbound and southbound directions under the No Build conditions and within the project limits is expected to grow between the existing year (2019) and the horizon year (2045) by 17.4 percent and 20.9 percent, respectively.

The peak spreading in the future years (2025 and 2045) would become more common (that is, over a greater number of hours in a day) than in the existing year (2019). As a result, traffic volume growth in the AM and PM peak periods are lower compared to the daily total traffic volume growth. Table 21 shows the No Build Alternative vehicle northbound operational performance summary in terms of total model volumes (in vehicles/hour) and truck model volumes, VMT, VHT, average speed (mph), delay (minutes/vehicle) and LOS. Table 2-2 shows the No Build Alternative vehicle southbound operational performance summary for the same scenarios and performance measure as Table 2-1. Due to lack of detailed vehicle classification counts, an average truck percentage of 4 percent was assumed on all roadway segments and under all scenarios.

Table 2.1. Summary of Project Operational Performance for Northbound No Build Alternative Traffic Conditions by Time Period

| Direction of Movement \& Time Period | Performance Measure | Analysis Duration | Existing (2019) <br> No Build <br> Alternative | Opening Year (2025) No Build Alternative | Horizon Year (2045) No Build Alternative |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SR 1 NB AM Peak Period = (6AM-12PM, Peak Hour = 7AM-8AM) | Avg. Hourly Volume (vehicles/hr.) | Peak Hour | 3,270 | 3,428 | 3,288 |
|  |  | Peak Period | 3,142 | 3,251 | 3,071 |
|  | Hourly Truck Volume (trucks/hr.) | Peak Hour | 131 | 137 | 132 |
|  |  | Peak Period | 126 | 130 | 123 |
|  | Daily VMT (vehicle miles traveled) | Peak Hour | 16,840 | 17,653 | 17,201 |
|  |  | Peak Period | 97,070 | 100,445 | 94,311 |
|  | Daily VHT (vehicle hours traveled) | Peak Hour | 590 | 555 | 744 |
|  |  | Peak Period | 2,747 | 3,332 | 6,017 |
|  | Segment LOS | Peak Hour | F | F | F |
|  |  | Peak Period | E | F | F |
|  | Avg. Segment Speed (mph) | Peak Hour | 29 | 32 | 23 |
|  |  | Peak Period | 35 | 30 | 16 |
|  | Avg. Delay (min/veh) | Peak Hour | 5.8 | 4.7 | 8.4 |
|  |  | Peak Period | 3.8 | 5.3 | 14.7 |
| SR 1 NB PM (Peak Period $=$ 2PM-8PM, Peak Hour = 4PM-5PM) | Avg. Hourly Volume (vehicles/hr.) | Peak Hour | 2,822 | 2,979 | 3,400 |
|  |  | Peak Period | 2,400 | 2,537 | 2,905 |
|  | Hourly Truck Volume (trucks/hr.) | Peak Hour | 113 | 119 | 136 |
|  |  | Peak Period | 96 | 101 | 116 |
|  | Daily VMT (vehicle miles traveled) | Peak Hour | 14,535 | 15,341 | 17,508 |
|  |  | Peak Period | 74,149 | 78,396 | 89,753 |
|  | Daily VHT (vehicle hours traveled) | Peak Hour | 235 | 249 | 290 |
|  |  | Peak Period | 1,200 | 1,270 | 1,487 |
|  | Segment LOS | Peak Hour | C | C | C |
|  |  | Peak Period | C | C | C |
|  | Avg. Segment Speed (mph) | Peak Hour | 62 | 62 | 60 |
|  |  | Peak Period | 62 | 62 | 60 |
|  | Avg. Delay (min/veh) | Peak Hour | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 |
|  |  | Peak Period | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 |

Source: CDM Smith, 2020.

Table 2.2. Summary of Project Operational Performance for Southbound No Build Alternative Traffic Conditions by Time Period

| Direction of Movement \& Time Period | Perf. Measure | Analysis Duration | Existing (2019) No Build Alternative | Opening Year (2025) No <br> Build <br> Alternative | Horizon Year (2045) No <br> Build <br> Alternative |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SR 1 SB AM <br> Peak Period = <br> (6AM-12PM, <br> Peak Hour = <br> 7AM-8AM) | Avg. Hourly Volume (vehicles/hr.) | Peak Hour | 3,042 | 3,154 | 3,614 |
|  |  | Peak Period | 2,873 | 3,024 | 3,458 |
|  | Hourly Truck Volume (trucks/hr.) | Peak Hour | 122 | 126 | 145 |
|  |  | Peak Period | 115 | 121 | 138 |
|  | Daily VMT (vehicle miles traveled) | Peak Hour | 28,896 | 29,965 | 34,330 |
|  |  | Peak Period | 163,737 | 172,394 | 197,101 |
|  | Daily VHT (vehicle hours traveled) | Peak Hour | 486 | 497 | 625 |
|  |  | Peak Period | 2,738 | 2,839 | 3,378 |
|  | Segment LOS | Peak Hour | C | C | D |
|  |  | Peak Period | C | C | C |
|  | Avg. Segment Speed (mph) | Peak Hour | 59 | 60 | 55 |
|  |  | Peak Period | 60 | 61 | 58 |
|  | Avg. Delay (min/veh) | Peak Hour | 0.2 | 0.1 | 1.0 |
|  |  | Peak Period | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.4 |
| SR 1 SB PM <br> (Peak Period $=$ 2PM-8PM, <br> Peak Hour = 4PM-5PM) | Avg. Hourly Volume (vehicles/hr.) | Peak Hour | 3,470 | 3,526 | 3,269 |
|  |  | Peak Period | 3,391 | 3,533 | 3,635 |
|  | Hourly Truck Volume (trucks/hr.) | Peak Hour | 139 | 141 | 131 |
|  |  | Peak Period | 136 | 141 | 145 |
|  | Daily VMT (vehicle miles traveled) | Peak Hour | 32,962 | 33,498 | 31,056 |
|  |  | Peak Period | 193,281 | 201,373 | 207,207 |
|  | Daily VHT (vehicle hours traveled) | Peak Hour | 1,419 | 1,520 | 2,274 |
|  |  | Peak Period | 6,045 | 6,953 | 10,789 |
|  | Segment LOS | Peak Hour | F | F | F |
|  |  | Peak Period | F | F | F |
|  | Avg. Segment Speed (mph) | Peak Hour | 23 | 22 | 14 |
|  |  | Peak Period | 32 | 29 | 19 |
|  | Avg. Delay (min/veh) | Peak Hour | 15.2 | 16.5 | 32.4 |
|  |  | Peak Period | 8.5 | 10.3 | 20.3 |

Source: CDM Smith, 2020.

### 2.3.1 Build Alternative

There is one Build Alternative and a No Build Alternative being considered for this project. The assessment of alternatives considers the opening year (2025) and the 20-year design/horizon year (2045).

### 2.3.1.1 Build Alternative

The Build Alternative proposes to improve operations on SR 1 from State Park Drive to Freedom Boulevard by adding auxiliary lanes and bus on shoulder (BOS) features in the northbound and southbound directions, replacing the SR 1 bridge over Aptos Creek and Spreckels Drive, replacing the two railroad bridges over SR 1, and constructing a bicycle and pedestrian trail along a segment of the Santa Cruz Branch Line railroad right of way. The proposed auxiliary lanes and BOS improvements would extend approximately 2.6 miles along SR 1 in unincorporated Santa Cruz County between the Freedom Boulevard interchange and the State Park Drive interchange, from PM 8.1 to PM 10.7. The proposed Coastal Rail Trail Segment 12 would extend approximately 1.14 miles along the Santa Cruz Branch Line railroad, between Rio Del Mar Boulevard and State Park Drive. The Santa Cruz Branch Line railroad corridor is an active freight line and is owned by the SCCRTC.

The auxiliary lanes would connect the interchange entrance and exit ramps. This would improve merging and weaving movements between the ramps and improve traffic flow by allowing greater separation between vehicles entering and exiting the freeway from mainline traffic. The proposed BOS improvements would support future bus operations on the shoulders of SR 1 through the interchanges at Freedom Boulevard, Rio Del Mar Boulevard, and State Park Drive during peak congestion periods to achieve transit travel time and reliability improvements. Buses would use the auxiliary lanes between the interchanges.

The limits of Coastal Rail Trail Segment 12 extend from the southern terminus of the trail segment at Sumner Avenue, just of the south of the Rio Del Mar Boulevard underpass, to the northern terminus at State Park Drive. The proposed Coastal Rail Trail Segment 12 includes the construction of a paved bicycle and pedestrian shared use trail within the SCBRL right-of-way on the inland side of the tracks. The trail segment would include a new at-grade trail connection to Sumner Avenue just south of the Rio Del Mar Boulevard underpass where the existing railroad tracks pass under Rio Del Mar Boulevard and a new sidewalk on the north side of Sumner Avenue between the terminus of the trail and the existing sidewalk on Rio Del Mar Boulevard.

The Build Alternative is anticipated to require right of way acquisitions and utility relocations to accommodate highway widening, trail pavement, and bridge work. Temporary construction easements are anticipated to be needed to construct retaining walls, soundwalls, and the bridges. Table 2.3 shows the Build Alternative vehicle northbound operational performance summary in terms of total model volumes (in vehicles/hour) and truck model volumes, VMT, VHT, average speed (mph), delay (minutes/vehicle) and LOS. Table 2-4 shows the Build Alternative vehicle southbound operational performance summary for the same scenarios and performance measure as Table 2-3. Due to lack of detailed vehicle classification counts, an average truck percentage of 4 percent was assumed on all roadway segments and under all scenarios.

Table 2.3. Summary of Project Operational Performance for Northbound Build Alternative Traffic Conditions by Time Period

| Direction of Movement \& Time Period | Perf. Measure | Analysis Duration | Existing (2019) Build Alternative | Opening Year (2025) Build Alternative | Horizon Year (2045) Build Alternative |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SR 1 NB AM <br> Peak Period = <br> (6AM-12PM, <br> Peak Hour = <br> 7AM-8AM) | Avg. Hourly Volume (vehicles/hr.) | Peak Hour | 3,270 | 3,492 | 3,288 |
|  |  | Peak Period | 3,142 | 3,255 | 3,071 |
|  | Hourly Truck Volume (trucks/hr.) | Peak Hour | 131 | 140 | 132 |
|  |  | Peak Period | 126 | 130 | 123 |
|  | Daily VMT (vehicle miles traveled) | Peak Hour | 16,843 | 17,981 | 16,931 |
|  |  | Peak Period | 97,205 | 100,559 | 94,880 |
|  | Daily VHT (vehicle hours traveled) | Peak Hour | 590 | 575 | 863 |
|  |  | Peak Period | 2,747 | 3,893 | 7,121 |
|  | Segment LOS | Peak Hour | F | E | F |
|  |  | Peak Period | E | F | F |
|  | Avg. Segment Speed (mph) | Peak Hour | 29 | 31 | 20 |
|  |  | Peak Period | 35 | 26 | 13 |
|  | Avg. Delay (min/veh) | Peak Hour | 5.8 | 4.9 | 10.8 |
|  |  | Peak Period | 3.8 | 7.0 | 18.2 |
| SR 1 NB PM <br> (Peak Period $=$ 2PM-8PM, <br> Peak Hour = 4PM-5PM) | Avg. Hourly Volume (vehicles/hr.) | Peak Hour | 2,822 | 3,000 | 3,397 |
|  |  | Peak Period | 2,400 | 2,555 | 2,902 |
|  | Hourly Truck Volume (trucks/hr.) | Peak Hour | 113 | 120 | 136 |
|  |  | Peak Period | 96 | 102 | 116 |
|  | Daily VMT (vehicle miles traveled) | Peak Hour | 14,535 | 15,447 | 17,492 |
|  |  | Peak Period | 74,149 | 78,937 | 89,654 |
|  | Daily VHT (vehicle hours traveled) | Peak Hour | 235 | 249 | 283 |
|  |  | Peak Period | 1,200 | 1,270 | 1,449 |
|  | Segment LOS | Peak Hour | C | C | C |
|  |  | Peak Period | C | C | C |
|  | Avg. Segment Speed (mph) | Peak Hour | 62 | 62 | 62 |
|  |  | Peak Period | 62 | 62 | 62 |
|  | Avg. Delay (min/veh) | Peak Hour | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | Peak Period | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |

Source: CDM Smith, 2020.

Table 2.4. Summary of Project Operational Performance for Southbound Build Alternative Traffic Conditions by Time Period

| Direction of Movement \& Time Period | Perf. Measure | Analysis Duration | Existing (2019) Build Alternative | Opening Year (2025) Build Alternative | Horizon Year (2045) Build Alternative |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SR 1 SB AM <br> Peak Period $=$ <br> (6AM-12PM, <br> Peak Hour = <br> 7AM-8AM) | Avg. Hourly Volume (vehicles/hr.) | Peak Hour | 3,042 | 3,241 | 3,648 |
|  |  | Peak Period | 2,873 | 3,027 | 3,464 |
|  | Hourly Truck Volume (trucks/hr.) | Peak Hour | 122 | 130 | 146 |
|  |  | Peak Period | 115 | 121 | 139 |
|  | Daily VMT (vehicle miles traveled) | Peak Hour | 28,996 | 30,793 | 34,660 |
|  |  | Peak Period | 164,715 | 172,559 | 197,458 |
|  | Daily VHT (vehicle hours traveled) | Peak Hour | 486 | 507 | 592 |
|  |  | Peak Period | 2,738 | 2,835 | 3,304 |
|  | Segment LOS | Peak Hour | C | C | C |
|  |  | Peak Period | C | C | C |
|  | Avg. Segment Speed (mph) | Peak Hour | 59 | 61 | 59 |
|  |  | Peak Period | 60 | 61 | 60 |
|  | Avg. Delay (min/veh) | Peak Hour | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.4 |
|  |  | Peak Period | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.2 |
| SR 1 SB PM (Peak Period $=$ 2PM-8PM, Peak Hour = 4PM-5PM) | Avg. Hourly Volume (vehicles/hr.) | Peak Hour | 3,470 | 3,894 | 3,927 |
|  |  | Peak Period | 3,391 | 3,581 | 3,968 |
|  | Hourly Truck Volume (trucks/hr.) | Peak Hour | 139 | 156 | 157 |
|  |  | Peak Period | 136 | 143 | 159 |
|  | Daily VMT (vehicle miles traveled) | Peak Hour | 33,554 | 36,992 | 37,307 |
|  |  | Peak Period | 194,344 | 204,116 | 226180 |
|  | Daily VHT (vehicle hours traveled) | Peak Hour | 1,419 | 1,520 | 1,515 |
|  |  | Peak Period | 6,045 | 6,953 | 7,796 |
|  | Segment LOS | Peak Hour | F | F | F |
|  |  | Peak Period | F | F | F |
|  | Avg. Segment Speed (mph) | Peak Hour | 23 | 22 | 25 |
|  |  | Peak Period | 32 | 29 | 29 |
|  | Avg. Delay (min/veh) | Peak Hour | 15.2 | 16.5 | 13.8 |
|  |  | Peak Period | 8.5 | 10.3 | 10.3 |

Source: CDM Smith, 2020.

### 2.4 Construction Activities and Schedule

The construction period is planned to last approximately three years ( 36 months) beginning in 2025. Because no construction activities are anticipated to last more than five years at any individual site, emissions from construction-related activities are thus considered temporary as defined in 40 Code
of Federal Regulations (CFR) 93.123(c)(5); and are not required to be included in PM hot-spot analyses to meet conformity requirements.

Table 2.5 shows the length of the project construction period is approximately three years ( 36 months) and milestone completion dates. These dates are estimates for planning purposes and for use in the Energy Report. Temporary construction easements are anticipated to be needed to construct retaining walls, soundwalls, and the bridges.

Table 2.5. Construction Activities and Schedule

| Construction Phase | Description/List of Activities | Begin Date | Completion Date |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Advertisement and Award of Contract | Procurement | Spring <br> 2024 | Winter 2024 |
| Grubbing/Land Clearing | Grubbing/Land Clearing would require soil export volume of 1,500 cubic yards per day. Construction equipment to be utilized during this construction phase includes 4 crawler tractors and 4 excavators. | January 2025 | March 2025 |
| Grading/Excavation | Grading/Excavation would require soil export volume of 1,500 cubic yards per day. Construction equipment to be utilized during this construction phase includes 2 cranes, 4 crawler tractors, 6 excavators, 4 graders, 4 rollers, 4 scrapers, and 4 tractors/loaders/backhoes. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { April } \\ & 2025 \end{aligned}$ | June 2026 |
| Drainage/Utilities/SubGrade | Drainage/Utilities/Sub-Grade would require soil export volume of 150 cubic yards per day. Construction equipment to be utilized during this construction phase includes 2 excavators, 2 forklifts, 2 generator sets, 2 graders, 2 scrapers, and 2 tractors/loaders/backhoes. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { July } \\ & 2026 \end{aligned}$ | June 2027 |
| Paving | Paving would require asphalt import volume of 1,500 cubic yards per day. Construction equipment to be utilized during this construction phase includes 4 paving equipment, 4 rollers, and 4 surfacing equipment. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { July } \\ & 2027 \end{aligned}$ | January 2028 |
| End of Construction |  | - | 2028 |

## 3. Affected Environment

This section provides background information on state and local energy resources and usage, as well as current federal, state, and local energy regulations, policies, and legislation.

### 3.1 Regulations

### 3.1.1 Federal

NEPA (42 U.S. Code Part 4332) requires the identification of all potentially significant impacts on the environment, including impacts on energy resources. Guidance for evaluating energy impacts of transportation projects subject to NEPA is outlined in Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Technical Advisory 6640.8A (Technical Advisory). The Technical Advisory energy analysis requirement applies to projects for which an Environmental Impact Statement is prepared, although it may also be applied to EAs. The Technical Advisory indicates that documentation should discuss energy requirements for construction and operation, and the overall conservation potential for project alternatives. The relationship of the project alternatives to applicable state or regional energy plan should also be documented. Additional conservation measures, such use of high-occupancy vehicle incentives and other measures to improve traffic flow should also be identified.

Other measures to improve energy efficiency in the transportation sector have been implemented at the federal level. In recent years, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA) and the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration issued Final Rules governing Corporate Average Fuel Economy (CAFE) standards and other improvements to fuel economy to new vehicles. The Energy Independence and Security Act consists of provisions designed to increase energy efficiency and the availability of renewable energy. Key provisions of this Act include:

- The CAFE, which sets a target of 54.5 miles per gallon for the combined fleet of cars and light trucks by model year 2025.
- The Renewable Fuels Standard, which sets a modified standard that starts at 9.0 billion gallons in 2008 and rises to 36 billion gallons by 2022.
- The Energy Efficiency Equipment Standards, which includes a variety of new standards for lighting and for residential and commercial appliance equipment.
- The Repeal of Oil and Gas Tax Incentives, which includes repeal of two tax subsidies in order to offset the estimated cost to implement the CAFE provision.

On September 27, 2019, the U.S. EPA and the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration published the "Safer Affordable Fuel-Efficient Vehicles Rule Part One: One National Program" (84 Code of Federal Regulations Vol. 84, No. 188 p. 51310). The Part One Rule revokes California's authority to set its own greenhouse gas emissions standards and set zero-emission vehicle mandates in California.

### 3.1.2 State

On December 28, 2018, the Governor's Office of Planning and Research and the California Natural Resources Agency updated the CEQA Guidelines to require that an Environmental Impact Report include an analysis of a project's potential for significant environmental effects resulting from wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary use of energy; or wasteful use of energy resources (Guidelines § 15126.2(b)). Appendix F, Energy Conservation, of the CEQA Guidelines outlines requirements for the evaluating energy impacts of projects subject to CEQA. The appendix outlines criteria to consider in reviewing potential impacts, and places particular emphasis on avoiding the "inefficient, wasteful, and unnecessary consumption of energy."

The State has passed several bills directing state agencies and entities such as the California Energy Commission (CEC) and the California Public Utilities Commission to implement renewable energy portfolio targets and energy efficiency measures to reduce energy consumption and greenhouse gas emissions. The CEC is the state's primary energy policy and planning agency. Created by legislature in 1974, the CEC has five major responsibilities: (1) forecasting future energy needs and keeping historical energy data, (2) licensing thermal power plants 50 megawatts or larger, (3) promoting energy efficiency through appliance and building standards, (4) developing energy technologies and supporting renewable energy, and (5) planning for and directing the state's response to energy emergencies. Senate Bill 1389 (Chapter 568, Statutes of 2002) requires the CEC to prepare a biennial integrated energy policy report assessing major energy trends and issues facing the state's electricity, natural gas, and transportation fuel sectors. The report also provides policy recommendations to conserve resources, protect the environment, and ensure reliable, secure and diverse energy supplies.

The California Transportation Plan is a statewide, long-range transportation plan to meet future mobility needs. It defines performance-based goals, policies, and strategies to achieve an integrated, multimodal transportation system. The California Transportation Plan addresses how the state will achieve maximum feasible emissions reductions, taking into consideration the use of alternative fuels, new vehicle technology and tailpipe emissions reductions. Caltrans must consult and coordinate with related state agencies, air quality management districts, public transit operators and regional transportation planning agencies.

The California Code of Regulations (CCR) includes vehicle requirements for public transit agencies. Sections 1956.1, 2020, 2023, 2023.1, and 2023.4 of Title 13 of the CCR. The Fleet Rule for Transit Agencies includes stringent exhaust emission standards for new Urban Bus engines and vehicles. The regulation also promotes advanced technologies by providing for zero-emission bus demonstration projects and requiring zero emission bus acquisitions applicable to larger transit agencies.

### 3.1.3 Regional

The Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG) is the designated Metropolitan Planning Organization for Monterey, Santa Cruz, and San Benito Counties and their respective cities. The 2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (MTP/SCS) includes a comprehensive discussion of regional energy policies and use. AMBAG has taken steps to assess
what regional infrastructure is needed to accommodate more alternative fuel choices across the region. In 2012, AMBAG adopted the Electric Vehicle Infrastructure for the Monterey Bay Area Plan. This plan presents a siting prioritization method to help identify potential charging locations and presents a framework for establishing a robust electric vehicle charging network in the region. The siting analysis in the plan provides guidance to local and regional stakeholders based on potential demand for electric vehicle charging stations.

In 2013, AMBAG and other regional organizations completed the Monterey Bay Plug-In Electric Vehicle Readiness Plan. The goal of this plan is to encourage the mass adoption of plug-in electric vehicles in the region and reduce greenhouse gas emissions by providing a toolbox of recommended approaches for public, private, and non-profit organizations. These tools range from innovative approaches to plug-in electric vehicle marketing and streamlining electric vehicle supply equipment permitting, to guidelines on establishing an electric vehicle fleet. The Readiness Plan identifies specific regional targets for significantly expanding plug-in electric vehicle adoption in the Monterey Bay Area by 2015, 2020 and 2025. AMBAG and our transportation partners continue to work with local jurisdictions and other organizations to implement charging stations and to increase adoption of electric vehicles around the region.

Within the Monterey Bay Area, the 21 local governments are committed to energy efficiency and climate planning and are working in collaboration with other local governments and their communities. It was through this shared vision of maximizing energy as a resource that the AMBAG Energy Watch program was developed in 2006. The AMBAG Energy Watch programs are designed in two major categories. The first category is implementation programs. These programs achieve direct and measurable energy efficient targets through the installation of energy efficiency equipment. These programs have been developed to serve the diverse stakeholders in the region including residents, municipalities, special districts, non-profit organizations, agriculture, school districts and hospitality businesses. The second category of programs is in the area of climate planning support for jurisdictions. The AMBAG Energy Watch program worked collaboratively with staff from each of the 21 AMBAG jurisdictions to complete each jurisdiction's 2005 municipal and community-wide greenhouse gas inventory, as well as their 2009 and 2010 communitywide greenhouse gas inventory updates. This data was used in the creation of a draft community-wide Energy Action Strategy developed for each of the jurisdictions, which in some cases were incorporated into their Climate Action Plans.

### 3.2 Existing Setting

### 3.2.1 Federal

Transportation infrastructure in the United States developed during a period of easy access to relatively inexpensive fossil fuels. The shock of an oil shortage in 1973 contributed to an awareness of petroleum as a finite resource that is ever diminishing as petroleum-based fuels are consumed around the world. Combustion of fossil fuels has also been linked to climate change. The dual concerns of potential energy shortages and environmental impacts of climate change have spurred legislative action at the federal and state levels as well as innovation geared toward conservation of
existing fuel supplies, development of renewable fuels, and energy efficiency measures. A notable legislative act was the introduction of federal CAFE standards in 1975 to mandate fuel efficiency improvements in motor vehicles. Energy use in the transportation sector accounted for 29 percent of total U.S. energy use in the year 2017, second only to the industrial sector.

### 3.2.2 State

In California, the transportation sector accounts for 39 percent of total energy use. California has the highest number of registered motor vehicles among the U.S. states, but in 2013 ranked $41^{\text {st }}$ in vehicle miles traveled per capita and ranked 39th in 2014. California is the second-highest energy consumer in the U.S., which correlates with its status as the country's largest economy and most populous state, estimated at 39.8 million as of 2018 . However, California ranks $48^{\text {th }}$ in total energy consumed per capita.

Energy efficiency efforts in California have dramatically reduced statewide per capita energy consumption relative to historical averages. California's per capita energy use is the third lowest in the nation. This statistic is partially attributable to the State's continuous pursuit of policies to reduce energy consumption, promote renewable energy, and reduce reliance on fossil fuels. California's net taxable gasoline sales in 2016 were below 2002 levels, despite a population growth of at least 15 percent during the same time period. Furthermore, gasoline consumption in the State decreased by approximately 2.2 percent between 2005 and 2017, even as VMT increased by 7.5 percent, from 329 billion in 2005 to 354 billion in 2017. These improvements are due in large part to a more fuelefficient vehicle fleet. Annual trend lines of statewide gasoline consumption and VMT are shown in Figure 3.1.

California's transportation energy consumption has become increasingly efficient due to technological growth, environmental policies, and innovation. Gasoline and diesel represent the largest fraction of fuel consumed by the transportation sector in California. However, it is anticipated that CAFE regulations, renewable fuel uptake, and zero-emission vehicle regulations will gradually displace gasoline-propulsion systems in favor of more energy-efficient systems with lower GHG emissions. As of 2014, renewable fuels represented a growing fraction of transportation energy consumption at 6.2 percent, with ethanol representing 4.5 percent and other renewables representing 1.7 percent of total transportation energy consumption.


Figure 3.1. California Annual Gasoline Consumption and Vehicle Miles Traveled, 1998-2017

### 3.2.3 Regional

The region's need for gasoline and diesel is projected to decline from about 129 million gallons per day in 2010 to about 112 million gallons per day by 2035. The projected reduction in fuel consumption is due in large part to state fuel efficiency standards for vehicles and state mandated increases in the supply and use of alternative transportation fuels. Electric vehicles in particular are an important alternative to conventional vehicles as they have the potential to reduce greenhouse gas emissions resulting from the consumption of fossil fuels, particularly in a state with a cleaner energy mix.

The U.S. Census Bureau estimates that the Santa Cruz County population was approximately 274,255 in 2019. The existing population is heavily dependent on automobile travel due to the suburban development throughout most of the County. The majority of energy consumed is from transportation fuels. The California Air Resources Board (CARB) Mobile Source Emissions Inventory (MSEI) EMFAC2017 web database estimates that the 2019 annual VMT in Santa Cruz County is approximately $1,977,948,655$ miles.

### 3.2.4 Project Site

Under CEQA, the baseline for environmental impact analysis consists of the existing conditions (referred to in this document as Baseline) at the time of the Notice of Preparation. The Baseline year has been established as 2019. Emission estimations based on information contained in the Traffic Operations Analysis Report (CDM Smith, 2020). Within the limits of the project, SR 1 currently has two lanes in each direction with multiple on ramps and off ramps.

The existing/baseline project corridor annual VMT is $250,908,760$ with 96 percent non-trucks and 4 percent trucks. This results in an annual fuel consumption of approximately 9,440,052 gallons per year of gasoline and 776,551 gallons per year of diesel fuel. Existing traffic management systems include metered ramps and changeable message boards. Standard Caltrans lighting is provided at on and off-ramps, but there is no existing lighting in between the interchanges. The Build Alternative does not include substantial light replacement or upgrades that would significantly change existing energy use. The existing pavement surface is considered to be in good condition, which contributes to energy efficiencies.

Table 3.1 shows the existing vehicle corridor-wide operational performance conditions (including the freeway mainline segments within the project limits and upstream of the project limits). The data describe traffic conditions corresponding to peak periods and peak hours within those peak periods. The AM peak period is 6:00 AM-12:00 PM and the AM peak hour is 7:00 AM-8:00 AM. The PM peak period is 2:00 PM-8:00 PM and the PM peak hour is 4:00 PM-5:00 PM. Table 3.1 presents the average hourly volumes of total vehicles and trucks during the peak hour and remaining five hours of the peak period, the total daily VMT and VHT during those times, and the corresponding LOS, average speed (mph), and delay (minutes/vehicle). Due to lack of detailed vehicle classification counts, an average truck percentage of 4 percent was assumed on all roadway segments and under all scenarios.

Table 3.1. Summary of Existing Traffic Conditions

| Direction of Movement \& Time Period | Analysis <br> Duration | Average Hourly Volume (veh/hr.) | Average Hourly Truck Volume (veh/hr.) | Daily VMT | Daily VHT | LOS | Average <br> Vehicle <br> Speed <br> (mph) | Average Vehicle Delay (min/veh) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SR-1 NB AM Peak Period | Peak Hour | 3,270 | 131 | 16,840 | 590 | F | 29 | 5.8 |
|  | Peak Period | 3,142 | 126 | 97,070 | 2,747 | E | 35 | 3.8 |
| SR-1 NB PM <br> Peak Period | Peak Hour | 2,822 | 113 | 14,535 | 235 | C | 62 | 0.0 |
|  | Peak Period | 2,400 | 96 | 74,149 | 1,200 | C | 62 | 0.0 |
| SR-1 SB AM <br> Peak Period | Peak Hour | 3,042 | 122 | 28,896 | 486 | C | 59 | 0.2 |
|  | Peak Period | 2,873 | 115 | 163,737 | 2,738 | C | 60 | 0.2 |
| SR-1 SB PM Peak Period | Peak Hour | 3,470 | 139 | 32,962 | 1,419 | F | 23 | 15.2 |
|  | Peak Period | 3,391 | 136 | 193,281 | 6,045 | F | 32 | 8.5 |

Source: CDM Smith, 2020

## 4. Study Methods

Congestion relief and capacity-increasing projects affect the ability of a transportation facility to accommodate existing and future traffic demand. This results in changes to direct energy consumption (i.e., fuel usage) by vehicles using the facilities. Congestion relief and capacityincreasing projects require construction, which is a one-time direct energy source that ceases to consume energy once work is complete. Maintenance and landscaping activities would result in long-term indirect energy consumption through the use of equipment required to maintain the facility and associated facilities.

Some projects may also include features such as new or replacement roadway lighting or other features requiring electricity which is an ongoing and permanent source of direct energy consumption. The Build Alternative does not include substantial light replacement or upgrades that would significantly change existing energy use.

### 4.1 Direct Energy (Mobile Sources)

In the context of transportation, direct energy involves all energy consumed by vehicle propulsion (e.g., automobiles, trains, airplanes). This energy consumption is a function of traffic characteristics such as VMT, speed, vehicle mix, and thermal value of the fuel being used. The procedure for analyzing direct energy consumption by mobile sources is to calculate fuel consumption using CTEMFAC2017. CT-EMFAC2017 is an emissions model developed by Caltrans that calculates projectlevel emissions and fuel consumption using data from the CARB's MSEI EMFAC model. CT-EMFAC produces speed-based consumption factors for diesel fuel and gasoline fuel based on regional location (Santa Cruz County for the project) and vehicle fleet mix (determined to be 4 percent trucks by transportation engineers).

### 4.2 Direct Energy (Construction)

The one-time energy expenditure involved in constructing a project is also considered direct energy. The procedure for analyzing direct energy consumption from construction activities is to obtain fuel consumption projections in gallons. The Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District Road Construction Emissions Model was used to estimate air quality and greenhouse gas emissions for the Build Alternative. For this reason, the Road Construction Emissions Model was also used to estimate fuel use. It is acknowledged that the Caltrans Construction Emission Tool can also be used to estimate fuel use. The Caltrans Construction Emission Tool was not used in this analysis to ensure consistency between project impact analyses. It is preferable to break out construction fuel consumption by diesel and gasoline sources, as the carbon content differs between the two types of fuels. Typical gasoline sources are employee commute vehicles (e.g., light duty automobiles and trucks) and smaller construction equipment pieces (e.g., tampers and mowers). Typical diesel sources are off-road construction equipment (e.g., graders, dozers).

The Air Quality Report prepared for the Draft Environmental Document includes a quantification of construction-related carbon dioxide ( $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ ) emissions from off-road equipment and on-road vehicles using the Road Construction Emissions Model. These emissions were used to estimate construction energy from $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ emission factors derived for the CARB GHG emissions inventory. For gasoline fuel, approximately 19.4 pounds of $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ are generated per gallon combusted, and for diesel fuel approximately 22.5 pounds of $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ are generated per gallon combusted. The $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ emissions output in units of tons per construction phase from gasoline vehicles and diesel vehicles were converted to pounds and divided by the corresponding $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ factor to estimate one-time gasoline and diesel fuel consumption during construction of the project.

Similar to the analysis in the Air Quality Report, the equipment list used to estimate energy use is adequate to construct both the roadway and coastal rail trail components. Less equipment would be needed to individually construct the components thereby generating less energy use than shown below for combined construction activities.

### 4.3 Indirect Energy (Maintenance)

Maintenance and landscaping activities would result in long-term indirect energy consumption through the use of equipment to maintain the project and associated facilities. Roadway construction projects will require new periodic maintenance, which could result in indirect energy consumption from equipment and vehicles. Generally, these impacts can be discussed qualitatively as attempting to estimate fuel data or greenhouse gas emissions for these activities, the frequency of which is unknown, would be speculative.

## 5. Environmental Consequences

### 5.1 Direct Energy

### 5.1.1 Mobile Sources

Congestion relief and capacity-increasing projects affect the capability of a roadway facility to address existing and future traffic demand. This results in changes to direct energy consumption (i.e., fuel usage) from vehicles using the facility. Another important consideration is that for operation of a project over the long term, newer and more fuel-efficient vehicles will enter the fleet, resulting in an overall lower potential for an increase in energy consumption due to vehicle traffic. Table 5.1 shows that under the Existing/Baseline condition in 2019, annual fuel consumption along the project corridor is approximately $9,440,052$ gallons of gasoline and 776,551 gallons of diesel fuel. With substantial improvements in engine fuel efficiency anticipated, fuel consumption per vehicle mile will decrease in the future.

Table 5.1. Annual VMT, Vehicle Percentages, and Operational Fuel Consumption

| Analysis Scenario \& Year | Annual VMT | Regional <br> Fleet Mix <br> (Truck \%) | Annual Fuel Consumption (Gallons) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Gasoline | Diesel |
| Existing Conditions (2019) | 250,908,760 | 4\% | 9,440,052 | 776,551 |
| Opening (2025) No Build Alternative | 262,474,270 | 4\% | 8,567,164 | 776,800 |
| Opening (2025) Build Alternative | 264,150,280 | 4\% | 8,679,027 | 758,503 |
| Design (2045) No Build Alternative | 279,217,020 | 4\% | 8,129,385 | 762,194 |
| Design (2045) Build Alternative | 288,391,700 | 4\% | 8,019,654 | 760,263 |

In 2025, the baseline project corridor annual VMT under the No Build Alternative would be 262,474,270, with vehicle travel consuming approximately 776,800 gallons of diesel fuel and 8,567,164 gallons of gasoline per year. Implementation of the project would increase regional gasoline consumption by approximately 111,863 gallons per year and would decrease regional diesel fuel consumption by approximately 18,297 gallons per year through the expanded corridor capacity accommodating 1,676,010 additional annual VMT relative to the No Build Alternative condition, as well as reduced congestion. The change in average vehicle speeds affects gasoline vehicles and diesel vehicles to different degrees and fewer diesel vehicles are expected in future years, which explains the increase for gasoline consumption and the decrease for diesel consumption. The MSEI estimates that Santa Cruz County on-road vehicle travel will consume approximately $68,919,268$ gallons of gasoline and $9,693,575$ gallons of diesel fuel in 2025. The additional fuel consumption spurred by the Project would represent an increase of approximately 0.2 percent for countywide gasoline consumption and a decrease of 0.2 percent for countywide diesel consumption.

By 2045, implementation of the project would decrease annual gasoline and diesel fuel consumption by approximately 109,732 gallons per year and 1,932 gallons per year, respectively, relative to the No Project condition. The MSEI estimates that Santa Cruz County vehicle travel will consume approximately $54,803,966$ gallons of gasoline and $7,678,675$ gallons of diesel fuel in 2045. The reduction in annual fuel consumption spurred by the Project would represent decreases of approximately 0.2 percent for countywide gasoline consumption and 0.03 percent for countywide diesel consumption in the design year of 2045.

### 5.1.2 Construction

Construction energy effects involve the one-time, non-recoverable energy costs associated with construction of roadways and structures. Site preparation and roadway construction typically involves clearing, cut-and-fill activities, grading, removing or improving existing roadways, building bridges, and paving roadway surfaces. Construction-related effects on energy from most highway projects would be greatest during the site preparation and concrete paving phases because the excavation, handling, and transport of materials requires equipment and truck fuels.

The fuel consumption was estimated from the equipment and vehicles that would be employed in construction activities. Diesel engines are installed in heavy-duty off-road construction equipment and on-road haul trucks. Gasoline engines are typically found in passenger vehicles that would be used for construction worker daily commutes. Table 5.2 presents the direct, one-time expenditure of fuel consumption associated with construction activities, including both the roadway and coastal rail trail components. Construction would require approximately $377,602.8$ gallons of diesel and 23,320.2 gallons of gasoline over a three-year period. Annual average consumption of petroleum fuels during construction activities would be approximately $125,867.6$ gallons of diesel fuel and 7,773.4 gallons of gasoline per year.

Table 5.2. Construction Fuel Consumption

| Construction Phase | Duration <br> (Months) | Fuel Consumption (gallons) |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Diesel | Gasoline |
| Grubbing/Land Clearing | 3.6 | 47,598 | 1,295 |
| Grading/Excavation | 14.4 | 214,518 | 11,487 |
| Drainage/Utilities/Sub-Grade | 12.6 | 54,727 | 7,174 |
| Paving | 5.4 | 57,987 | 2,572 |
| Total | 36.0 | 374,829 | $\mathbf{2 2 , 5 2 8}$ |

### 5.2 Indirect Energy (Maintenance)

Maintenance comprises energy for the day-to-day upkeep of equipment and systems, as well as the energy embedded in any replacement equipment, materials, and supplies. The energy needed to maintain the Build Alternative improvements would not be measurably greater than the energy used
to maintain the existing facility within the project limits. For example, operations would not require Caltrans to purchase additional maintenance vehicles.

### 5.3 Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures

The following measures are recommended to reduce energy use.

- Landscaping reduces surface warming and, through photosynthesis, decreases carbon dioxide. The final design plans shall provide landscaping where necessary within the corridor to provide aesthetic treatment, replacement planting, or mitigation planting.
- The final design plans shall incorporate the use of energy-efficient lighting, such as lightemitting diode (LED) traffic signals, to the extent feasible. LED bulbs cost $\$ 60$ to $\$ 70$ each but last 5 to 6 years, compared to the 1 -year average lifespan of the incandescent bulbs previously used. The LED bulbs themselves consume ten percent of the electricity of traditional lights.
- The construction contractor shall comply with Caltrans Standard Specification Provisions that restrict idling time for lane closure during construction to ten minutes in each direction. In addition, the construction contractor must comply with Title 13, CCR Section 2449(d)(3), which was adopted by the California Air Resources Board on June 15, 2008. That regulation restricts idling of construction vehicles to no longer than five consecutive minutes.
- The Build Alternative shall incorporate the following Best Available Control Technologies related to energy use:
- Use cement blended with the maximum feasible amount of flash or other materials (i.e., limestone);
- Recycle construction materials;
- Use lighter-colored pavement where feasible to increase albedo;
- Use recycled water or grey water for fugitive dust control;
- Employ energy- and fuel-efficient vehicles and equipment, zero- and/or near-zero emission technologies; and
- Encourage ride-sharing and carpooling for construction crews.
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## Appendix A

Summary of Forecast Traffic Activities

Daily Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)

| VMT No Build vs. Build Alternative |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2019 | 2025 | 2045 |  |
| Northbound |  |  |  |  |
| No Project | 218,034 | 227,226 | 256,571 |  |
| Build Alternative | 219,477 | 230,768 | 259,226 |  |
| Percent Change | $0.7 \%$ | $1.6 \%$ | $1.0 \%$ |  |
| Southbound |  |  |  |  |
| No Project | 211,031 | 221,102 | 233,908 |  |
| Build Alternative | 212,240 | 224,195 | 245,529 |  |
| Percent Change | $0.6 \%$ | $1.4 \%$ | $5.0 \%$ |  |


| Year | Alternative | NB AM Period | NB PM Period | SB AM Period | SB PM Period |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2019 | No Build | 86,523 | 67,637 | 73,667 | 79,154 |
|  | Interim Build | 87,067 | 68,096 | 74,182 | 79,392 |
|  | Build | 87,033 | 68,096 | 74,182 | 79,392 |
|  | No Build | 87,677 | 70,493 | 77,808 | 82,938 |
|  | Interim Build | 87,756 | 71,153 | 78,272 | 84,209 |
|  | Build | 87,727 | 71,669 | 78,896 | 84,163 |
| 2045 | No Build | 86,835 | 82,121 | 84,312 | 86,603 |
|  | Interim Build | 86,529 | 82,864 | 89,076 | 90,103 |
|  | Build | 86,548 | 82,980 | 89,188 | 90,092 |

Source: VMT within Project Limits calculated from FREQ output: (Sum of (average hourly volume during the peak period * Distance for each segment)) * Number of hours during the peak period

| Year | Alternative | Direction | AM Period | PM Period | Daily | Factor |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2019 | No Build | Northbound | 21,760 | 16,350 | 53,900 | 1.4 |
|  |  | Southbound | 17,700 | 19,160 | 50,900 | 1.4 |
|  | Build Alternative | Northbound | 21,910 | 16,470 | 54,300 | 1.4 |
|  |  | Southbound | 17,830 | 19,290 | 51,300 | 1.4 |
| 2025 | No Build | Northbound | 22,130 | 17,060 | 56,300 | 1.4 |
|  |  | Southbound | 18,650 | 20,100 | 53,300 | 1.4 |
|  | Build Alternative | Northbound | 22,100 | 17,340 | 57,100 | 1.4 |
|  |  | Southbound | 18,940 | 20,480 | 54,200 | 1.4 |
| 2045 | No Build | Northbound | 21,840 | 19,910 | 63,400 | 1.5 |
|  |  | Southbound | 21,180 | 23,100 | 60,600 | 1.4 |
|  | Build Alternative | Northbound | 21,800 | 20,120 | 64,100 | 1.5 |
|  |  | Southbound | 21,340 | 23,420 | 61,300 | 1.4 |

Source: Developed Volumes

| Performance Measure | Units | Time Period | Year 2019 No Build Alternative |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Northbound AM | Northbound PM | Southbound AM | Southbound PM |
| Average Travel Time | Minutes per Vehicle | Peak Hour | 6.1 | 4.0 | 4.2 | 7.4 |
|  |  | Peak Period | 5.2 | 4.0 | 4.1 | 5.3 |
| Average Speed | Miles per Hour | Peak Hour | 40 | 62 | 59 | 34 |
|  |  | Peak Period | 47 | 61 | 60 | 47 |
| Average Travel Delay | Minutes per Vehicle | Peak Hour | 2.2 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 3.4 |
|  |  | Peak Period | 1.2 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 1.3 |
| Number of Vehicle Trips (vehicle | Vehicles per Hour | Peak Hour | 3,944 | 3,058 | 3,104 | 3,638 |
|  |  | Peak Period | 3,693 | 2,766 | 2,963 | 3,322 |
| Number of Person Trips (person | Persons per Hour | Peak Hour | 4,457 | 3,792 | 3,600 | 4,293 |
|  |  | Peak Period | 4,173 | 3,430 | 3,437 | 3,920 |
| Freeway Travel Time (VHT) | VehicleHours | Peak Hour | 404 | 202 | 216 | 448 |
|  |  | Peak Period | 1,833 | 1,103 | 1,227 | 1,696 |
| Travel Distance (VMT) | Vehicle-Miles | Peak Hour | 16,072 | 12,461 | 12,862 | 15,075 |
|  |  | Peak Period | 86,523 | 67,637 | 73,667 | 79,154 |
| Average Vehicle Occupancy | Persons per Vehicle | Peak Hour | 1.13 | 1.24 | 1.16 | 1.18 |
|  |  | Peak Period | 1.13 | 1.24 | 1.16 | 1.18 |
| Average Density | Passenger Cars per Mile | Peak Hour | 48.7 | 24.5 | 25.9 | 51.7 |
|  |  | Peak Period | 39.1 | 22.4 | 24.5 | 35.3 |
| Average Level of Service (LOS) | - | Peak Hour | F | C | C | F |
|  |  | Peak Period | E | C | C | E |

Notes:
Peak Hour: 7-8 AM, 4-5 PM
Peak Period: 6 AM-12 PM, 2-8 PM

| Performance Measure | Units | Time Period | Year 2025 No Build Alternative |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Northbound AM | Northbound PM | Southbound AM | Southbound PM |
| Average Travel Time | Minutes per Vehicle | Peak Hour | 6.2 | 4.0 | 4.3 | 8.8 |
|  |  | Peak Period | 5.3 | 4.0 | 4.4 | 6.6 |
| Average Speed | Miles per Hour | Peak Hour | 39 | 62 | 57 | 28 |
|  |  | Peak Period | 46 | 61 | 56 | 38 |
| Average Travel Delay | Minutes per Vehicle | Peak Hour | 2.3 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 4.8 |
|  |  | Peak Period | 1.3 | 0.1 | 0.4 | 2.6 |
| Number of Vehicle Trips (vehicle | Vehicles per Hour | Peak Hour | 3,930 | 3,197 | 3,222 | 3,574 |
|  |  | Peak Period | 3,742 | 2,883 | 3,129 | 3,481 |
| Number of Person Trips (person | Persons per Hour | Peak Hour | 4,440 | 3,964 | 3,737 | 4,218 |
|  |  | Peak Period | 4,229 | 3,575 | 3,630 | 4,107 |
| Freeway Travel Time (VHT) | VehicleHours | Peak Hour | 407 | 212 | 233 | 525 |
|  |  | Peak Period | 1,887 | 1,156 | 1,383 | 2,191 |
| Travel Distance (VMT) | Vehicle-Miles | Peak Hour | 16,012 | 13,027 | 13,351 | 14,812 |
|  |  | Peak Period | 87,677 | 70,493 | 77,808 | 82,938 |
| Average Vehicle Occupancy | Persons per Vehicle | Peak Hour | 1.13 | 1.24 | 1.16 | 1.18 |
|  |  | Peak Period | 1.13 | 1.24 | 1.16 | 1.18 |
| Average Density | Passenger Cars per Mile | Peak Hour | 49.0 | 25.8 | 27.9 | 59.1 |
|  |  | Peak Period | 40.0 | 23.5 | 27.7 | 44.7 |
| Average Level of Service (LOS) | - | Peak Hour | F | C | D | F |
|  |  | Peak Period | E | C | D | E |

Notes:
Peak Hour: 7-8 AM, 4-5 PM
Peak Period: 6 AM-12 PM, 2-8 PM

| Performance Measure | Units | Time Period | Year 2045 No Build Alternative |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Northbound AM | Northbound PM | Southbound AM | Southbound PM |
| Average Travel Time | Minutes per Vehicle | Peak Hour | 6.3 | 4.4 | 4.9 | 10.2 |
|  |  | Peak Period | 5.4 | 4.2 | 5.0 | 7.6 |
| Average Speed | Miles per Hour | Peak Hour | 39 | 55 | 51 | 24 |
|  |  | Peak Period | 45 | 58 | 50 | 33 |
| Average Travel Delay | Minutes per Vehicle | Peak Hour | 2.3 | 0.5 | 0.9 | 6.1 |
|  |  | Peak Period | 1.4 | 0.3 | 1.0 | 3.5 |
| Number of Vehicle Trips (vehicle | Vehicles per Hour | Peak Hour | 3,907 | 3,939 | 3,502 | 3,482 |
|  |  | Peak Period | 3,706 | 3,359 | 3,391 | 3,635 |
| Number of Person <br> Trips (person | Persons per Hour | Peak Hour | 4,415 | 4,885 | 4,063 | 4,109 |
|  |  | Peak Period | 4,188 | 4,165 | 3,934 | 4,289 |
| Freeway Travel Time (VHT) | VehicleHours | Peak Hour | 409 | 290 | 287 | 589 |
|  |  | Peak Period | 1,912 | 1,418 | 1,692 | 2,633 |
| Travel Distance (VMT) | Vehicle-Miles | Peak Hour | 15,920 | 16,052 | 14,513 | 14,429 |
|  |  | Peak Period | 86,835 | 82,121 | 84,312 | 86,603 |
| Average Vehicle Occupancy | Persons per Vehicle | Peak Hour | 1.13 | 1.24 | 1.16 | 1.18 |
|  |  | Peak Period | 1.13 | 1.24 | 1.16 | 1.18 |
| Average Density | Passenger Cars per Mile | Peak Hour | 49.3 | 35.4 | 33.9 | 65.1 |
|  |  | Peak Period | 40.4 | 29.0 | 33.6 | 51.8 |
| Average Level of Service (LOS) | - | Peak Hour | F | E | D | F |
|  |  | Peak Period | E | D | D | F |

Notes:
Peak Hour: 7-8 AM, 4-5 PM
Peak Period: 6 AM-12 PM, 2-8 PM

| Performance Measure | Units | Time Period | 2019 Existing Build Alternative |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Northbound AM | Northbound PM | Southbound AM | Southbound PM |
| Average Travel Time | Minutes per Vehicle | Peak Hour | 5.4 | 3.9 | 4.0 | 7.0 |
|  |  | Peak Period | 4.7 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 5.0 |
| Average Speed | Miles per Hour | Peak Hour | 46 | 62 | 62 | 36 |
|  |  | Peak Period | 53 | 62 | 62 | 50 |
| Average Travel Delay | Minutes per Vehicle | Peak Hour | 1.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.9 |
|  |  | Peak Period | 0.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 |
| Number of Vehicle Trips (vehicle | Vehicles per Hour | Peak Hour | 4,068 | 3,082 | 3,143 | 3,700 |
|  |  | Peak Period | 3,715 | 2,785 | 2,984 | 3,332 |
| Number of Person Trips (person | Persons per Hour | Peak Hour | 4,597 | 3,821 | 3,645 | 4,365 |
|  |  | Peak Period | 4,197 | 3,454 | 3,461 | 3,932 |
| Freeway Travel Time (VHT) | Vehicle- <br> Hours | Peak Hour | 363 | 203 | 212 | 429 |
|  |  | Peak Period | 1,657 | 1,102 | 1,201 | 1,588 |
| Travel Distance (VMT) | Vehicle-Miles | Peak Hour | 16,577 | 12,557 | 13,023 | 15,331 |
|  |  | Peak Period | 87,033 | 68,096 | 74,182 | 79,392 |
| Average Vehicle Occupancy | Persons per Vehicle | Peak Hour | 1.13 | 1.24 | 1.16 | 1.18 |
|  |  | Peak Period | 1.13 | 1.24 | 1.16 | 1.18 |
| Average Density | Passenger Cars per Mile | Peak Hour | 37.1 | 20.5 | 21.2 | 41.3 |
|  |  | Peak Period | 29.4 | 18.5 | 19.9 | 27.8 |
| Average Level of Service (LOS) |  | Peak Hour | E | C | C | E |
|  |  | Peak Period | D | C | C | D |

Notes:
Peak Hour: 7-8 AM, 4-5 PM
Peak Period: 6 AM-12 PM, 2-8 PM

| Performance Measure | Units | Time Period | Year 2025 Build Alternative |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Northbound AM | Northbound PM | Southbound AM | Southbound PM |
| Average Travel Time | Minutes per Vehicle | Peak Hour | 5.4 | 4.0 | 4.1 | 9.5 |
|  |  | Peak Period | 4.7 | 4.0 | 4.1 | 6.9 |
| Average Speed | Miles per Hour | Peak Hour | 45 | 62 | 61 | 26 |
|  |  | Peak Period | 52 | 62 | 61 | 36 |
| Average Travel Delay | Minutes per Vehicle | Peak Hour | 1.5 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 5.5 |
|  |  | Peak Period | 0.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.9 |
| Number of Vehicle Trips (vehicle | Vehicles per Hour | Peak Hour | 4,065 | 3,377 | 3,342 | 3,703 |
|  |  | Peak Period | 3,744 | 2,931 | 3,173 | 3,532 |
| Number of Person Trips (person | Persons per Hour | Peak Hour | 4,593 | 4,188 | 3,877 | 4,370 |
|  |  | Peak Period | 4,231 | 3,635 | 3,681 | 4,168 |
| Freeway Travel Time (VHT) | VehicleHours | Peak Hour | 367 | 223 | 227 | 588 |
|  |  | Peak Period | 1,673 | 1,163 | 1,285 | 2,328 |
| Travel Distance (VMT) | Vehicle-Miles | Peak Hour | 16,563 | 13,762 | 13,851 | 15,345 |
|  |  | Peak Period | 87,727 | 71,669 | 78,896 | 84,163 |
| Average Vehicle Occupancy | Persons per Vehicle | Peak Hour | 1.13 | 1.24 | 1.16 | 1.18 |
|  |  | Peak Period | 1.13 | 1.24 | 1.16 | 1.18 |
| Average Density | Passenger Cars per Mile | Peak Hour | 37.5 | 22.6 | 22.8 | 55.2 |
|  |  | Peak Period | 29.7 | 19.6 | 21.4 | 39.6 |
| Average Level of Service (LOS) | - | Peak Hour | E | C | C | F |
|  |  | Peak Period | D | C | C | E |

Notes:
Peak Hour: 7-8 AM, 4-5 PM
Peak Period: 6 AM-12 PM, 2-8 PM

| Performance Measure | Units | Time Period | Year 2025 Build Alternative |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Northbound AM | Northbound PM | Southbound AM | Southbound PM |
| Average Travel Time | Minutes per Vehicle | Peak Hour | 5.7 | 4.1 | 4.6 | 17.5 |
|  |  | Peak Period | 4.9 | 4.0 | 4.3 | 12.1 |
| Average Speed | Miles per Hour | Peak Hour | 43 | 60 | 54 | 14 |
|  |  | Peak Period | 50 | 61 | 57 | 21 |
| Average Travel Delay | Minutes per Vehicle | Peak Hour | 1.8 | 0.2 | 0.6 | 13.5 |
|  |  | Peak Period | 0.9 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 8.1 |
| Number of Vehicle Trips (vehicle | Vehicles per Hour | Peak Hour | 3,986 | 3,938 | 3,788 | 3,481 |
|  |  | Peak Period | 3,694 | 3,394 | 3,587 | 3,781 |
| Number of Person <br> Trips (person | Persons per Hour | Peak Hour | 4,505 | 4,883 | 4,394 | 4,107 |
|  |  | Peak Period | 4,174 | 4,209 | 4,161 | 4,462 |
| Freeway Travel Time (VHT) | VehicleHours | Peak Hour | 381 | 269 | 291 | 1,017 |
|  |  | Peak Period | 1,720 | 1,371 | 1,557 | 4,387 |
| Travel Distance (VMT) | Vehicle-Miles | Peak Hour | 16,244 | 16,046 | 15,698 | 14,424 |
|  |  | Peak Period | 86,548 | 82,980 | 89,188 | 90,092 |
| Average Vehicle Occupancy | Persons per Vehicle | Peak Hour | 1.13 | 1.24 | 1.16 | 1.18 |
|  |  | Peak Period | 1.13 | 1.24 | 1.16 | 1.18 |
| Average Density | Passenger Cars per Mile | Peak Hour | 38.5 | 27.4 | 29.7 | 91.0 |
|  |  | Peak Period | 30.4 | 23.3 | 26.2 | 69.4 |
| Average Level of Service (LOS) |  | Peak Hour | E | D | D | F |
|  |  | Peak Period | D | C | D | F |

Notes:
Peak Hour: 7-8 AM, 4-5 PM
Peak Period: 6 AM-12 PM, 2-8 PM

## Appendix B

## Operational Fuels Consumption

- Project Corridor Fuels Consumption Calculations
- Gasoline and Diesel Fuel Consumption Rates
- CT EMFAC Output - 2019
- CT EMFAC Output - 2025
- CT EMFAC Output - 2045

| Year Alt | Direction | Time Period | Time Sum | $\underline{\text { VMT }}$ Speed | Gas Gal/Day |  | Diesel Gal/Day | Gas Gal/Year | Diesel Gal/Year |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2019 NB | North | AM/PH | PH | 16,840 | 29 | 626.704 | 56.828 | 217,466.277 | 19,719.408 |
| 2019 NB | North | AM/PP | PP | 80,230 | 37 | 2,751.761 | 246.033 | 954,860.939 | 85,373.561 |
| 2019 NB | North | PM/PH | PH | 14,535 | 62 | 564.057 | 43.954 | 195,727.723 | 15,251.982 |
| 2019 NB | North | PM/PP | PP | 59,614 | 62 | 2,313.429 | 180.273 | 802,759.716 | 62,554.639 |
| 2019 NB | North | OP | OP | 76,111 | 62 | 2,953.624 | 230.160 | 1,024,907.651 | 79,865.403 |
| 2019 NB | South | AM/PH | PH | 28,896 | 59 | 1,096.378 | 84.787 | 380,443.100 | 29,420.965 |
| 2019 NB | South | AM/PP | PP | 134,841 | 60 | 5,155.241 | 402.635 | 1,788,868.666 | 139,714.423 |
| 2019 NB | South | PM/PH | PH | 32,962 | 23 | 1,458.100 | 127.095 | 505,960.853 | 44,101.923 |
| 2019 NB | South | PM/PP | PP | 160,319 | 35 | 5,677.858 | 507.089 | 1,970,216.623 | 175,959.882 |
| 2019 NB | South | OP | OP | 118,732 | 62 | 4,607.609 | 359.046 | 1,598,840.315 | 124,588.812 |
| NB Total |  |  |  | 723,080 |  | 27,204.8 | 2,237.9 | 9,440,051.9 | 776,551.0 |
| 2019 B | North | AM/PH | PH | 16,843 | 29 | 626.8 | 56.8 | 217,505.0 | 19,722.9 |
| 2019 B | North | AM/PP | PP | 80,362 | 36 | 2,801.2 | 250.3 | 972,014.4 | 86,858.1 |
| 2019 B | North | PM/PH | PH | 14,659 | 62 | 568.9 | 44.3 | 197,397.5 | 15,382.1 |
| 2019 B | North | PM/PP | PP | 59,989 | 62 | 2,328.0 | 181.4 | 807,809.5 | 62,948.1 |
| 2019 B | North | OP | OP | 76,397 | 62 | 2,964.7 | 231.0 | 1,028,758.9 | 80,165.5 |
| 2019 B | South | AM/PH | PH | 28,996 | 60 | 1,108.6 | 86.6 | 384,675.5 | 30,044.0 |
| 2019 B | South | AM/PP | PP | 135,719 | 60 | 5,188.8 | 405.3 | 1,800,516.7 | 140,624.2 |
| 2019 B | South | PM/PH | PH | 33,554 | 24 | 1,415.8 | 124.4 | 491,291.1 | 43,177.8 |
| 2019 B | South | PM/PP | PP | 160,790 | 36 | 5,604.7 | 500.8 | 1,944,827.1 | 173,787.6 |
| 2019 B | South | OP | OP | 119,411 | 62 | 4,634.0 | 361.1 | 1,607,983.7 | 125,301.3 |
| B Total |  |  |  | 726,720 |  | 27,241.4 | 2,242.1 | 9,452,779.5 | 778,011.6 |
| 2025 NB | North | AM/PH | PH | 17,653 | 32 | 541.4 | 52.8 | 187,858.6 | 18,336.3 |
| 2025 NB | North | AM/PP | PP | 82,792 | 30 | 2,674.8 | 260.9 | 928,152.9 | 90,524.5 |
| 2025 NB | North | PM/PH | PH | 15,341 | 62 | 503.7 | 43.5 | 174,779.3 | 15,077.8 |
| 2025 NB | North | PM/PP | PP | 63,055 | 62 | 2,070.3 | 178.6 | 718,382.7 | 61,973.2 |
| 2025 NB | North | OP | OP | 79,499 | 62 | 2,610.2 | 225.2 | 905,728.5 | 78,135.0 |
| 2025 NB | South | AM/PH | PH | 29,965 | 60 | 969.3 | 83.4 | 336,334.7 | 28,926.8 |
| 2025 NB | South | AM/PP | PP | 142,429 | 61 | 4,641.7 | 399.8 | 1,610,673.1 | 138,739.9 |
| 2025 NB | South | PM/PH | PH | 33,498 | 22 | 1,310.8 | 126.7 | 454,840.4 | 43,951.9 |
| 2025 NB | South | PM/PP | PP | 167,875 | 31 | 5,286.0 | 515.7 | 1,834,235.6 | 178,963.7 |
| 2025 NB | South | OP | OP | 124,303 | 62 | 4,081.2 | 352.1 | 1,416,178.4 | 122,170.3 |
| NB Total |  |  |  | 756,410 |  | 24,689.2 | 2,238.6 | 8,567,164.2 | 776,799.5 |
| 2025 B | North | AM/PH | PH | 17,981 | 31 | 566.2 | 55.2 | 196,464.0 | 19,168.7 |
| 2025 B | North | AM/PP | PP | 82,578 | 25 | 3,006.4 | 292.7 | 1,043,204.8 | 101,580.4 |
| 2025 B | North | PM/PH | PH | 15,447 | 62 | 507.2 | 43.8 | 175,987.0 | 15,182.0 |
| 2025 B | North | PM/PP | PP | 63,490 | 62 | 2,084.5 | 179.8 | 723,338.7 | 62,400.7 |
| 2025 B | North | OP | OP | 79,794 | 62 | 2,619.9 | 226.0 | 909,089.4 | 78,425.0 |
| 2025 B | South | AM/PH | PH | 30,793 | 61 | 1,003.5 | 86.4 | 348,225.8 | 29,995.4 |
| 2025 B | South | AM/PP | PP | 141,766 | 61 | 4,620.1 | 398.0 | 1,603,175.5 | 138,094.0 |
| 2025 B | South | PM/PH | PH | 36,992 | 53 | 1,125.2 | 95.4 | 390,448.9 | 33,117.5 |
| 2025 B | South | PM/PP | PP | 167,124 | 59 | 5,365.5 | 453.6 | 1,861,840.6 | 157,413.6 |
| 2025 B | South | OP | OP | 125,275 | 62 | 4,113.1 | 354.8 | 1,427,252.4 | 123,125.6 |
| B Total |  |  |  | 761,240 |  | 25,011.6 | 2,185.9 | 8,679,027.0 | 758,502.9 |


| Year Alt | Direction | Time Period | Time Sum | VMT | Speed | Gas Gal/Day |  | Diesel Gal/Day | Gas Gal/Year | Diesel Gal/Year |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2045 NB | North | AM/PH | PH |  | 17,201 | 23 | 506.5 | 52.2 | 175,754.9 | 18,108.0 |
| 2045 NB | North | AM/PP | PP |  | 77,110 | 15 | 3,109.2 | 299.6 | 1,078,899.8 | 103,951.6 |
| 2045 NB | North | PM/PH | PH |  | 17,508 | 60 | 446.1 | 40.0 | 154,784.4 | 13,882.0 |
| 2045 NB | North | PM/PP | PP |  | 72,245 | 60 | 1,840.6 | 165.1 | 638,702.4 | 57,282.7 |
| 2045 NB | North | OP | OP |  | 81,826 | 62 | 2,116.1 | 190.8 | 734,298.1 | 66,208.2 |
| 2045 NB | South | AM/PH | PH |  | 34,330 | 55 | 841.7 | 74.4 | 292,079.7 | 25,826.3 |
| 2045 NB | South | AM/PP | PP |  | 162,771 | 59 | 4,116.1 | 361.2 | 1,428,291.3 | 125,343.8 |
| 2045 NB | South | PM/PH | PH |  | 31,056 | 14 | 1,308.0 | 127.8 | 453,868.1 | 44,347.2 |
| 2045 NB | South | PM/PP | PP |  | 176,151 | 21 | 5,665.9 | 571.9 | 1,966,058.5 | 198,446.5 |
| 2045 NB | South | OP | OP |  | 134,462 | 62 | 3,477.4 | 313.5 | 1,206,648.1 | 108,797.9 |
| NB Total |  |  |  |  | 804,660 |  | 23,427.6 | 2,196.5 | 8,129,385.3 | 762,194.2 |
| 2045 B | North | AM/PH | PH |  | 16,931 | 20 | 567.6 | 56.8 | 196,957.6 | 19,699.1 |
| 2045 B | North | AM/PP | PP |  | 77,949 | 12 | 3,562.8 | 356.7 | 1,236,280.4 | 123,762.2 |
| 2045 B | North | PM/PH | PH |  | 17,492 | 62 | 452.4 | 40.8 | 156,971.4 | 14,153.4 |
| 2045 B | North | PM/PP | PP |  | 72,162 | 62 | 1,866.2 | 168.3 | 647,574.3 | 58,388.8 |
| 2045 B | North | OP | OP |  | 82,036 | 62 | 2,121.6 | 191.3 | 736,182.6 | 66,378.2 |
| 2045 B | South | AM/PH | PH |  | 34,660 | 59 | 876.5 | 76.9 | 304,136.3 | 26,690.4 |
| 2045 B | South | AM/PP | PP |  | 162,798 | 60 | 4,147.7 | 372.0 | 1,439,261.9 | 129,081.7 |
| 2045 B | South | PM/PH | PH |  | 37,307 | 25 | 1,069.2 | 109.4 | 371,027.3 | 37,969.2 |
| 2045 B | South | PM/PP | PP |  | 188,873 | 30 | 4,803.8 | 490.3 | 1,666,911.6 | 170,139.1 |
| 2045 B | South | OP | OP |  | 140,892 | 62 | 3,643.7 | 328.5 | 1,264,350.2 | 114,000.6 |
| B Total |  |  |  |  | 831,100 |  | 23,111.4 | 2,191.0 | 8,019,653.7 | 760,262.6 |

CT-EMFAC FUEL
CONSUMPTION RATES gallons/fleet-mile
Year Speed Gas Diesel
$2019 \quad 10 \quad 0.074026 \quad 0.006468$
$2019 \quad 11 \quad 0.0713330 .006181$
$2019 \quad 120.068639 \quad 0.005895$
$2019 \quad 13 \quad 0.065946 \quad 0.005608$
$2019 \quad 140.0632520 .005322$
$2019 \quad 15 \quad 0.060559 \quad 0.005035$
$2019 \quad 16 \quad 0.0578660 .004748$
$2019 \quad 17 \quad 0.0551720 .004462$
$2019 \quad 18 \quad 0.0524790 .004175$
$2019 \quad 19 \quad 0.049785 \quad 0.003889$
$2019 \quad 20 \quad 0.050357 \quad 0.004298$
$2019 \quad 21 \quad 0.048317 \quad 0.004151$
$2019 \quad 220.0462760 .004003$
$2019 \quad 230.044236 \quad 0.003856$
$2019 \quad 240.0421950 .003708$
$2019 \quad 25 \quad 0.043056 \quad 0.003785$
$2019 \quad 260.0415960 .003682$
$2019 \quad 27 \quad 0.040136 \quad 0.00358$
$2019 \quad 28 \quad 0.038675 \quad 0.003477$
$2019 \quad 290.0372150 .003375$
$2019 \quad 30 \quad 0.03821 \quad 0.003404$
$2019 \quad 31 \quad 0.037241 \quad 0.003328$
$2019 \quad 320.0362720 .003252$
$2019 \quad 33 \quad 0.0353020 .003175$
$2019 \quad 34 \quad 0.0343330 .003099$
$2019 \quad 35 \quad 0.035416 \quad 0.003163$
$2019 \quad 36 \quad 0.034857 \quad 0.003115$
$2019 \quad 37 \quad 0.034298 \quad 0.003067$
$2019 \quad 38 \quad 0.03374 \quad 0.003018$
$2019 \quad 39 \quad 0.033181 \quad 0.00297$
$2019 \quad 40 \quad 0.03427 \quad 0.002975$
$2019 \quad 41 \quad 0.034041 \quad 0.002937$
$2019 \quad 420.033812 \quad 0.0029$
$2019 \quad 430.0335820 .002862$
$2019 \quad 44 \quad 0.0333530 .002825$
$2019 \quad 45 \quad 0.0343730 .002853$
$2019 \quad 460.0343940 .002829$
$2019 \quad 47 \quad 0.0344140 .002804$
$2019 \quad 48 \quad 0.034435 \quad 0.00278$
$2019 \quad 49 \quad 0.0344550 .002755$
$2019 \quad 50 \quad 0.035361 \quad 0.002837$
$2019 \quad 510.0355590 .002834$
$2019 \quad 52 \quad 0.0357560 .002831$
$2019 \quad 53 \quad 0.035954 \quad 0.002827$

CT-EMFAC FUEL
CONSUMPTION RATES gallons/fleet-mile
Year Speed Gas Diesel
$2019 \quad 54 \quad 0.036151 \quad 0.002824$
$2019 \quad 550.0367950 .002891$
$2019 \quad 560.0370820 .002902$
$2019 \quad 57 \quad 0.0373690 .002913$
$2019 \quad 580.0376550 .002923$
$2019 \quad 590.0379420 .002934$
$2019 \quad 60 \quad 0.0382320 .002986$
$2019 \quad 61 \quad 0.038519 \quad 0.003005$
$2019 \quad 620.0388070 .003024$
$2019 \quad 630.0390940 .003043$
$2019 \quad 640.0393820 .003062$
$2019 \quad 650.0382510 .003098$
$2025 \quad 100.0607340 .006114$
$2025 \quad 110.0585230 .005834$
$2025 \quad 120.0563120 .005554$
$2025 \quad 13 \quad 0.05410 .005275$
$2025 \quad 140.051889 \quad 0.004995$
$2025 \quad 150.049678 \quad 0.004715$
$2025 \quad 160.0474670 .004435$
$2025 \quad 170.0452560 .004155$
$2025 \quad 180.0430440 .003876$
$2025 \quad 190.0408330 .003596$
$2025 \quad 200.0413060 .004048$
$2025 \quad 210.0396320 .003915$
$2025 \quad 220.037957 \quad 0.003781$
$2025 \quad 230.0362830 .003648$
$2025 \quad 24 \quad 0.034608 \quad 0.003514$
$2025 \quad 250.0353150 .003545$
$2025 \quad 260.034117 \quad 0.003444$
$2025 \quad 270.032919 \quad 0.003344$
$2025 \quad 28 \quad 0.031720 .003243$
$2025 \quad 290.0305220 .003143$
$2025 \quad 300.031339 \quad 0.003151$
$2025 \quad 31 \quad 0.030544 \quad 0.003072$
$2025 \quad 320.029749 \quad 0.002993$
$2025 \quad 330.0289530 .002915$
$2025 \quad 34 \quad 0.028158 \quad 0.002836$
$2025 \quad 350.029048 \quad 0.002897$
$2025 \quad 36 \quad 0.02859 \quad 0.002846$
$2025 \quad 370.0281320 .002795$
$2025 \quad 380.0276730 .002745$
$2025 \quad 390.0272150 .002694$
$2025 \quad 400.0281130 .002705$
$2025 \quad 41 \quad 0.027926 \quad 0.002667$

CT-EMFAC FUEL
CONSUMPTION RATES gallons/fleet-mile
Year Speed Gas Diesel
$2025 \quad 42 \quad 0.0277390 .002628$
$2025 \quad 430.0275520 .00259$
$2025 \quad 44 \quad 0.027365 \quad 0.002551$
$2025 \quad 45 \quad 0.028202 \quad 0.002588$
$2025 \quad 46 \quad 0.02822 \quad 0.002565$
$2025 \quad 47 \quad 0.028238 \quad 0.002541$
$2025 \quad 48 \quad 0.028255 \quad 0.002518$
$2025 \quad 49 \quad 0.0282730 .002494$
$2025 \quad 50 \quad 0.029017 \quad 0.002583$
$2025 \quad 51 \quad 0.02918 \quad 0.002582$
$2025 \quad 520.0293430 .002581$
$2025 \quad 530.0295060 .00258$
$2025 \quad 54 \quad 0.029669 \quad 0.002579$
$2025 \quad 550.030198 \quad 0.002656$
$2025 \quad 56 \quad 0.0304340 .002671$
$2025 \quad 57 \quad 0.03067 \quad 0.002685$
$2025 \quad 58 \quad 0.030907 \quad 0.0027$
$2025 \quad 59 \quad 0.0311430 .002714$
$2025 \quad 60 \quad 0.031377 \quad 0.002782$
$2025 \quad 61 \quad 0.031613 \quad 0.002807$
$2025 \quad 620.0318490 .002832$
$2025 \quad 63 \quad 0.032084 \quad 0.002858$
$2025 \quad 64 \quad 0.032320 .002883$
$2025 \quad 650.0313910 .002942$
$2045 \quad 10 \quad 0.043846 \quad 0.005036$
$2045 \quad 11 \quad 0.04225 \quad 0.004806$
$2045 \quad 12 \quad 0.0406530 .004576$
$2045 \quad 13 \quad 0.039057 \quad 0.004345$
$2045 \quad 14 \quad 0.03746 \quad 0.004115$
$2045 \quad 15 \quad 0.0358640 .003885$
$2045 \quad 160.034268 \quad 0.003655$
$2045 \quad 17 \quad 0.032671 \quad 0.003425$
$2045 \quad 180.0310750 .003194$
$2045 \quad 19 \quad 0.029478 \quad 0.002964$
$2045 \quad 20 \quad 0.029818 \quad 0.003353$
$2045 \quad 21 \quad 0.028609 \quad 0.003247$
$2045 \quad 22 \quad 0.0274 \quad 0.00314$
$2045 \quad 23 \quad 0.02619 \quad 0.003034$
$2045 \quad 240.0249810 .002927$
$2045 \quad 25 \quad 0.0254920 .002933$
$2045 \quad 26 \quad 0.024627 \quad 0.002849$
$2045 \quad 27 \quad 0.0237620 .002765$
$2045 \quad 28 \quad 0.022896 \quad 0.002681$
$2045 \quad 290.022031 \quad 0.002597$

## CT-EMFAC FUEL



| File Name: | Santa Cruz (NCC) - 2019-Annual.EF |
| :--- | :--- |
| CT-EMFAC2017 Version: | 1.0.2.27401 |
| $\quad$ Run Date: | 2/19/2020 17:18 |
| $\quad$ Area: | Santa Cruz (NCC) |
| Analysis Year: | Annual |



FleetAverageFuelConsumption(gallons/veh-mile)

| Fueltype | < $=5 \mathrm{mph}$ |  | 10 mph | 15 mph | 20 mph | 25 mph | 30 mph | 35 mph | 40 mph | 45 mph | 50 mph | 55 mph | 60 mph | 65 mph | 70 mph | 75 mph |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gasoline |  | 0.091189 | 0.074026 | 0.060559 | 0.050357 | 0.043056 | 0.03821 | 0.035416 | 0.03427 | 0.034373 | 0.035361 | 0.036795 | 0.038232 | 0.038251 | 0.038251 | 0.038251 |
| Diesel |  | 0.007574 | 0.006468 | 0.005035 | 0.004298 | 0.003785 | 0.003404 | 0.003163 | 0.002975 | 0.002853 | 0.002837 | 0.002891 | 0.002986 | 0.003098 | 0.003098 | 0.003098 |



FleetAverageFuelConsumption(gallons/veh-mile)

| Fu | h |  | 10 | 15 mph | 20 mph | 25 mph | 30 mph | 35 mph | 40 mph | 45 mph | 50 mph | 55 mph | 60 mph | 65 mph | 70 mph | 75 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gasoline |  | 0.074803 | 0.060734 | 0.049678 | 0.041306 | 0.035315 | 0.031339 | 0.029048 | 0.028113 | 0.028202 | 0.029017 | 0.030198 | 0.031377 | 0.031391 | 0.031391 | 0.03 |
| Dies |  | 0.007279 | 0.006114 | 0.004715 | 0.004048 | 0.003545 | 0.003151 | 0.002897 | 0.002705 | 0.002588 | 0.002583 | 0.002656 | 0.002782 | 0.002942 | 0.002942 | 0.002 |


| File Name: | Santa Cruz (NCC) - 2045 - Annual.EF |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CT-EMFAC2017 Version: | 1.0.2.27401 |  |
| Run Date: | 2/19/2020 17:22 |  |
| Area: | Santa Cruz (NCC) |  |
| Analysis Year: | 2045 |  |
| Season: | Annual |  |
|  |  |  |
| Vehicle Category | VMT Fraction Diesel VM1Gas VMT Fraction |  |
|  | Across Category Within Cat Within Category |  |
| Truck 1 | 0.019 | $0.521 \quad 0.479$ |
| Truck 2 | 0.021 | 0.926 0.062 |
| Non-Truck | 0.96 | $0.015 \quad 0.931$ |
| ================================================================== |  |  |
| Road Type: | Freeway |  |
| Silt Loading Factor: | CARB | $0.015 \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m} 2$ |
| Precipitation Correction: | None | $\mathrm{P}=\mathrm{NA} \quad \mathrm{N}=\mathrm{NA}$ |

FleetAverageFuelConsumption(gallons/veh-mile)

| FuelType | < $=5 \mathrm{mph}$ | 10 mph | 15 mph | 20 mph | 25 mph | 30 mph | 35 mph | 40 mph | 45 mph | 50 mph | 55 mph | 60 mph | 65 mph | 70 mph | 75 mph |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gasoline | 0.054002 | 0.043846 | 0.035864 | 0.029818 | 0.025492 | 0.022622 | 0.020968 | 0.020295 | 0.020362 | 0.020953 | 0.021808 | 0.022661 | 0.022671 | 0.022671 | 0.022671 |
| Diesel | 0.006039 | 0.005036 | 0.003885 | 0.003353 | 0.002933 | 0.002596 | 0.002372 | 0.002206 | 0.002108 | 0.002104 | 0.002168 | 0.002285 | 0.002444 | 0.002444 | 0.002444 |

## Appendix C

## Construction Fuels Consumption

- Construction Fuel Consumption Calculations
- Road Construction Emissions Model Output
- Road Construction Emissions Model Input
- Emission Factors for GHG Inventories - USEPA 2020


## Worker Commute

| Emissions | CO2 |  | Source | Fuel | Total CO2 <br> Emissions (tons) | Combustion Factor (poundsCO2/gallon) | Gallons Fuel |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pounds per day - Grubbing/Land Clearing | 316.43 |  | Worker Vehicles | Gas | 218.03 | 19.36 | 22,527.55 |
| Tons per const. Period - Grubbing/Land Clearing | 12.53 | 1,294.7 | Soil Haul Trucks | Diesel | 1,765.98 | 22.51 | 156,912.42 |
| Pounds per day - Grading/Excavation | 701.87 |  | Asphalt Trucks | Diesel | 482.06 | 22.51 | 42,832.51 |
| Tons per const. Period - Grading/Excavation | 111.18 | 11,487.2 | Water Trucks | Diesel | 57.96 | 22.51 | 5,149.70 |
| Pounds per day - Drainage/Utilities/Sub-Grade | 500.93 |  | Equipment | Diesel | 1,912.54 | 22.51 | 169,934.44 |
| Tons per const. Period - Drainage/Utilities/Sub-Grad | 69.43 | 7,173.7 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pounds per day - Paving | 419.04 |  |  |  |  | Total Gasoline (Gallons) | 22,527.6 |
| Tons per const. Period - Paving | 24.89 | 2,571.8 |  |  |  | Total Diesel Fuel (Gallons) | 374,829.1 |
| Total tons per construction project | 218.03 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Annual Average |  |
| Soil Hauling |  |  |  |  |  | Gasoline | 7,509.2 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Diesel | 124,943.0 |
| Hauling Emissions | CO2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pounds per day - Grubbing/Land Clearing | 8344.737871 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tons per const. Period - Grubbing/Land Clearing | 330.4516197 | 47,597.5 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pounds per day - Grading/Excavation | 8299.795735 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tons per const. Period - Grading/Excavation | 1314.687644 | \#\#\#\#\#\#\# |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pounds per day - Drainage/Utilities/Sub-Grade | 871.8972311 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tons per const. Period - Drainage/Utilities/Sub-Grad | 120.8449562 | 54,727.0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pounds per day - Paving | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tons per const. Period - Paving | 0 | 57,986.5 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total tons per construction project | 1765.98422 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Asphalt Hauling

| Emissions | CO2 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Pounds per day - Grubbing/Land Clearing |  |
| Tons per const. Period - Grubbing/Land Clearing |  |
| Pounds per day - Grading/Excavation |  |
| Tons per const. Period - Grading/Excavation |  |
| Pounds per day - Drainage/Utilities/Sub-Grade |  |
| Tons per const. Period - Drainage/Utilities/Sub-Grad |  |
| Pounds per day - Paving | 8115.52416 |
| Tons per const. Period - Paving | 482.062135 |
| Total tons per construction project | 482.062135 |

Water Trucks

| Emissions | CO2 |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Pounds per day - Grubbing/Land Clearing |  | 148.3508955 |
| Tons per const. Period - Grubbing/Land Clearing | 5.874695461 |  |
| Pounds per day - Grading/Excavation | 147.5519242 |  |
| Tons per const. Period - Grading/Excavation | 23.37222479 |  |
| Pounds per day - Drainage/Utilities/Sub-Grade | 145.3162052 |  |
| Tons per const. Period - Drainage/Utilities/Sub-Grad | 20.14082604 |  |
| Pounds per day - Paving | 144.2759852 |  |
| Tons per const. Period - Paving | 8.569993519 |  |
| Total tons per construction project | 57.95773981 |  |


|  |  | CO2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grubbing/Land Clearing | pounds per day | 5034.42966 |
| Grubbing/Land Clearing | tons per phase | 199.363415 |
| Grading/Excavation | pounds per day | 6794.524 |
| Grading/Excavation | tons per phase | 1076.2526 |
| Drainage/Utilities/Sub-Grade | pounds per day | 3426.72449 |
| Drainage/Utilities/Sub-Grade | tons per phase | 474.944015 |
| Paving | pounds per day | 2726.96367 |
| Paving | tons per phase | 161.981642 |
| All Activities | total tons project | 1912.54167 |

Road Construction Emissions Model, Version 9.0.0




| User Input Soil Hauling Emisisions | User Override of Miles/Round Trip | Program Estimate ofMiles/Round Trip |  | User Override of Truck Round Trips/Day | Default Values Round Trips/Day | Calculated Daily VMT | sox | co2 | CH4 | ${ }^{2} 20$ | core |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Milestroun dip: Gububingland Cleationg |  | $\xrightarrow{30.00} 3$ |  |  | 75 75 | ${ }_{\text {2250.00 }}^{2250.00}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minestround tip: rainasenvilitessub-Grade |  | 30.00 |  |  | 8 | 240.00 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Miestround tip: Paving |  | 30.00 |  |  | 0 | 0.00 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Emission Rates | Ros | co |  | ${ }_{\text {Nox }}^{346}$ | ${ }_{\text {PM10 }}{ }_{0}$ | PM2.5 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grubingl Land Clearing (gramsmmile) | ${ }_{0}^{0.04}$ | - 0.43 |  |  |  | 0.05 | 0.02 | ${ }^{1,68227}$ | 0.00 | 0.26 |  |
|  | ${ }_{0}^{0.04}$ | 0.430.43 |  | ${ }_{\substack{3.41 \\ 3.40}}$ | ${ }_{0}^{0.11}$ | ${ }_{0}^{0.05}$ | ${ }_{0}^{0.02}$ | ${ }_{\substack{1,67321 \\ 1,64786}}^{1.802}$ | ${ }_{0}^{0.00}$ | - ${ }_{0}^{0.26}$ | (1,751.093 |
| Paving Gramsmmie) |  |  |  | 0.11 |  | 0.02 | 1.636.06 | 0.00 | 0.26 | 1,712.74 |  |
|  | 0.000.00 |  | 0.00 0.00 |  | 4.46 4.46 | ${ }_{0}^{0.00}$ | 0.00 0.00 | ${ }_{0}^{0.000}$ | 0.00 0.00 | ${ }_{0}^{0.00}$ | ${ }_{0}^{0.000}$ | 0.00 0.00 |
| Draininguvilitess Sub-Grade (gramstrip) |  |  | 0.00 | 4.47 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
|  | - |  | ${ }_{\text {cose }}^{0.00}$ | ${ }_{\substack{4.48 \\ \text { Nox }}}^{\text {dic }}$ | ${ }_{\text {PM10 }}^{0.00}$ | ${ }_{\text {PM25 }}^{0.00}$ | coso sox | ${ }_{\text {O. }}^{0}$ | ${ }_{\text {c }}^{0.00}$ | - | - 0.00 |
| Pounds persday - Gubbingl Land Clearing | R0.20 |  | 2.12 | ${ }_{17.90}$ |  | 0.26 | 0.08 |  | 0.01 | ${ }^{131}$ |  |
| Tons per const Period -Gubbingland Cle |  |  | 0.08 | 0.71 | 0.02 | 0.01 | 0.00 |  | 0.00 | , 05 | 5,94 |
|  | ${ }^{0.01}$ |  | 2.12 | 17.84 | 0.57 | 0.26 | 0.08 | 8,29.80 | 01 | 1.30 | 8.88.80 |
| Tons ere const Period - GradingExacavaion | 0.200.03 |  | 0.34 | 2.83 | 0.09 | 0.04 | 0.01 | 1.314 .69 | 00 | 0.21 | 6.31 |
| Pounds per day - Draingeelulititesslub-Grade | 0.02 |  | 0.23 | 1.89 | 0.06 | 0.03 | 0.01 | ${ }^{87.90}$ | 0.00 | 0.14 | ${ }^{912.76}$ |
| Tons eer onst Period. Orainagevililies/Sub-Grade | 0.00 |  | ${ }^{0.03}$ | ${ }^{0.26}$ | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.00 | ${ }^{120.84}$ | 0.00 | ${ }^{0.02}$ |  |
| Pounds perday - Paving | 0.000.00 |  | 0.00 | ${ }^{0.00}$ | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Tons epe const Period - Paving Toial tons per constuction projet | $\begin{aligned} & \begin{array}{l} 0.00 \\ 0.04 \end{array} \\ & \hline 0 \end{aligned}$ |  | 0.00 0.45 | lo.00 3.80 | 0.00 0.12 | 0.00 0.05 | 0.00 0.02 | 1.0.00 1,76.98 | 0.00 0.00 | 0.00 0.28 |  |

Note: Asphat Hauling emisision defaut values can be overididen in cells D94 through D94, and f91 hrough F94


Nole: Worker commule defaut talues can be vermiden in colls 0121 through 0126



Nole: Fugitive dust defaut values can be verididen in cells 0183 through 0185

| Fugitive Dust | $\xrightarrow{\text { User OVeride of Max }}$ Acrease isturediday | ${ }_{\text {Maximum }}^{\text {Defult }}$ | ${ }_{\text {pM10 }}^{\text {PMoustay }}$ | $\xrightarrow{\text { PMM10 }}$ | $\xrightarrow[\text { PM2.5 }]{\text { poundsay }}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Iotive Dust-Grubingland cleaxing |  | ${ }_{3}^{3} \mathbf{0 0}$ | 30.00 | ${ }^{1}$ | ${ }_{6} 624$ |  |
|  |  | 3.00 3.00 | ${ }^{30.00} 3000$ | ${ }_{4.16}^{4.15}$ |  | 0.86 |



| mopexasation | Numberateverices |  |  |  | Ros | co | nox | pmo | pm25 | sox | ${ }^{0} 2$ | +4 | N20 | ${ }^{\text {core }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Progamestimate |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\frac{\text { nestay }}{0.00}$ | pounststay | pounstas |
|  |  |  |  | coin | 0, | 0,00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | On | (200 | $\begin{gathered} 0.00 \\ \substack{000} \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | 0 |  | (0.00 |  |
|  |  |  | Muse ofatil | Comen end (oatar Mees | (000 | - | -0, | 0.00 | 000 | $\begin{gathered} \text { yovo } \\ \text { oon } \\ 000 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { youc } \\ 0.000 \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { youd } \\ \text { ouc } \\ 0.0 \end{gathered}$ | - |  |
| 200 | 1 |  | Uned | Crawler Tractors | (0, |  | (oin | $\begin{gathered} 000 \\ 0.030 \\ 0.000 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.020 \\ 0.020 \\ 0.00 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 000 \\ & \text { a00 } \\ & 000 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 000 \\ 0.090 \\ 0.000 \end{gathered}$ |  |  |
| ${ }^{200}$ | 3 |  |  |  |  |  | (en |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.00 \\ 0.00 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | 1.00088 | and 0.32 0.00 |  |  |
| 400 | 2 |  | Mode ofailier |  | - |  | (os | - | - | $\begin{gathered} 000 \\ 0.000 \\ 0.0 \end{gathered}$ | ${ }_{\text {25000 }}$ | - | -0, | (iseos |
|  |  |  | Iosalod | Off-Highway Tractors | 0.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 000 |  |  |
|  |  |  | Wodiolosut Ter |  | -000 | 0,00 | ${ }_{0}^{0.00}$ | 0.00 | 0.00 | -000 | 0,00 | $\begin{gathered} 0.00 \\ \substack{000 \\ 0 \\ 0} \end{gathered}$ | 0.00 | 0,000 |
|  |  |  | Model ofeaut Ter |  | -000 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0.00 | 0,00 | -000 | 0,00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | -0, |
|  |  |  | Modot ofiller |  | -0, | -000 | -0, | -000 | O.00 | -0, | - | $\begin{gathered} \text { oon } \\ \text { on } \\ \text { in } \end{gathered}$ | -0, | -0,000 |
|  |  |  |  |  | (000 |  |  |  |  | - |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { o.00 } \\ 0.00 \end{gathered}$ |  | O,000 |
|  | 2 |  | Mesefopobut Ter |  | 000 | 000 | 0, | 0.00 | 000 | -0, | ${ }_{\text {cose }}$ | 0,00 | 0,00 | (1300 |
|  |  |  | Oese ofout teer |  | 0,00 | 0,00 | 0,000 | 0.00 | 0.00 | -000 |  | $\bigcirc$ | -0.00 | 5000 |
| 0,00 |  |  |  |  | (oico |  |  | (0.00 | (000 | - | (000 | - | 䢒 | -0, |
|  | ${ }_{6}^{2}$ |  |  |  | - | coiol | (0.00 |  | (oicle | - | - | - |  | -0, |
|  |  |  |  |  | -000 | - | -0, | - | O, | -000 | (000 | -0,00 | - | -0, |
| 400 | 4 |  | Nodeto ofatut or | Sutame Eipent | -0,53 | ${ }_{802}^{890}$ | ${ }_{5}^{534}$ | -022 | O20 | 001 |  | -039 | 0.00 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | (0.00 | ¢ | (0,00 | (0, | (000 | - | (0, | (000 | (0, | - 0000 |
| nood oftroas Euwimom |  |  |  |  |  |  | nox | pmo | pm25 | ${ }^{\text {sox }}$ | ${ }_{\text {coz }}$ | ${ }^{\text {che }}$ | N20 | core |
| (ent |  | ${ }_{\text {d }}$ |  | Trpe |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (000 |  |  |  |  |  | - | -0, | - | - | - | (000 | - | - | O00 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }_{\substack{0.00 \\ 0.00}}^{\substack{0}}$ | 0 | 0,000 | -0, | 0 | 0,000 | (0, | - | -0,00 |
| 0 |  | ${ }_{\text {NA }}$ |  |  |  | (000 | (0.00 |  |  | - | (0, | (000 | (0.00 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | ${ }_{\substack{3.13 \\ 0.50}}^{\text {a }}$ | ${ }_{4.71}^{20.71}$ | ${ }_{\substack{324.15}}^{5.0}$ | $\underbrace{1 .}_{\substack{124 \\ 020}}$ | ${ }_{\text {a }}^{1.14}$ | ${ }_{0}^{0.07}$ |  | 220 0.35 | ${ }_{0}^{0.06}$ |  |


| Iagouniliess Sugrate | Numbearaveremines |  |  |  | Rоя | co | nox | pmo | PM25 | sox | coz | $\mathrm{CH}_{4}$ | ${ }^{2} 2$ | cose |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Progamestimae |  |  |  | comustay | ounstay | pounstay | poundstay |  |  |  | nostay |  | ponstasas |
| ${ }_{0}^{0.00}$ | 1 |  |  |  |  | 0 | coiol |  |  |  | coion | coiol |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | coicemem | - |  |  | -0.00 | O. 0.00 | -0, | $\stackrel{\substack{0.00 \\ 0.00}}{ }$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { yono } \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ | (0.00 | (iol |
|  |  |  |  | coicce | -0, | -0, | -0.00 | -0, | 0.00 0.00 0 | -0.00 | $\stackrel{0}{0.00}$ | 0.00 0.00 0 | - | -0, |
|  |  |  |  |  | (000 | -0, | - | - |  | 0.00 <br> 0.00 <br> 0.0 <br> 0.0 | (0, | $\begin{aligned} & 0.00 \\ & 0.00 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | - | - |
| (200 |  |  |  |  | O, 0 | ${ }_{20} 020$ | - | -0, | 0.00 | 0.000 0.00 0.0 | $\xrightarrow{2000}$ | coio 0 | -000 | $\xrightarrow{2000}$ |
| ${ }_{2}^{200}$ | ! |  |  |  | 0.53 0.02 | ${ }_{\text {l }}^{17.3}$ | ${ }_{6}^{4.91}$ | (0, | O.190 | 0.01 |  | - | ${ }^{0.01}$ | , |
|  |  |  |  | Generator Sets Graders Off-Highway Tractors | (000 | -0, | -0.00 | - | -0, | -0, |  | - | - | -0, |
|  |  |  |  | Off-Highway Trucks | (000 | -000 | -000 | - | -0, | -0, | - | - |  | -0,000 |
|  |  |  |  | - | -0, | - | - | -000 | -0, | -0, | - | - |  | -0, |
| 0.00 | 1 |  | Noded ofotult |  | O. | -00 | (o.00 |  | 0.00 |  | O.00 | - | (0.00 | -0, |
| 0.00 | 1 |  |  |  | (000 | -0, |  | -0, | -0, | -0, | - | - | - | -0, |
| 000 | 1 |  |  |  | (0, | -0, | - | -0, | - | -0, |  | - | - | -0, |
|  |  |  |  | Rough Terrain Forklifts Rubber Tired Dozers | - |  | - |  |  | - | (000 | (oic | - | -0, |
| O.00 | $\frac{1}{6}$ |  |  |  | -0, | -0, | - | -0, | - | -0, | (000 | - | -0, | -0, |
|  |  |  |  |  | (0, | - |  | -0, | -000 | O, | - | - | -0, | -0, |
| 200 | 3 |  |  |  | 边 |  |  |  | (0.0.00 | -000 | coin | (oin | -0, | , |
|  |  |  |  |  | (0.00 | 0.00 0.00 |  |  |  |  | (0, | (en | (000 | (0, |
|  |  |  |  | trpe |  |  |  | pount | oums |  | ${ }_{\text {comes }}^{\text {cosal }}$ |  | pounssay |  |
| ¢000 |  | Cemer |  |  |  |  |  | pounsasay |  |  |  |  |  | (ond |
| 0,000 |  |  |  |  | 0.00 | 000 | 000 | 0,00 | 0.00 | 000 | O,000 | -000 |  |  |
| $\frac{0.00}{0.00}$ |  |  |  |  | -0,00 | -0, | - | -0, | -0, | -0,00 | -0, | - | - | -0,000 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Somel |  |  |  | pounds per day tons per phase | ${ }_{0}^{1.59}$ | $\underset{\substack{1723 \\ 239}}{ }$ | $\xrightarrow{1601}$ | (0, $\begin{aligned} & 0.61 \\ & 0.8\end{aligned}$ | ¢ | (009 |  | ${ }_{0}^{0.75}$ | 0 | ${ }_{\substack{3.454,15 \\ 4785}}^{\text {a }}$ |




| Equipment | User Override of Horsepowe | Default Values <br> Horsepower | User Override of Hours/day | Default Values Hours/day |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Aerial lifs |  | ${ }^{63}$ |  |  |
| Ari Compressors |  | ${ }^{78}$ |  | 8 |
|  |  | ${ }^{221}$ |  | ${ }_{8}^{8}$ |
| Concreeillndustrial Saws |  | 81 |  | 8 |
| Cranes |  | ${ }^{231}$ |  | 8 |
| ${ }_{\text {chen }}$ Crawer Tractors |  | $\frac{212}{85}$ |  | 8 |
| Excavalors |  | ${ }_{1} 158$ |  | 8 |
| Forkilis |  | 89 |  | 8 |
| Generator Sels |  | ${ }^{84}$ |  | 8 |
|  |  | ${ }_{124}^{187}$ |  | 8 |
| OffHiligway Tucks |  | 402 |  | 8 |
| Other Construcion Equipment |  | ${ }_{8}^{172}$ |  |  |
|  |  | ${ }_{168}$ |  | 8 |
| Pavers |  | ${ }^{130}$ |  | 8 |
| ${ }^{\text {Papaing Eauipment }}$ Prate compacors |  | ${ }^{132}$ |  | ${ }_{8}^{8}$ |
| Pressur Washers |  | 13 |  | 8 |
| Pumps |  | ${ }_{84}^{84}$ |  | 8 |
| $\underbrace{\substack{\text { Rough Terain Fookifits }}}_{\text {Rolers }}$ |  | 80 <br> 100 |  | ${ }_{8}^{8}$ |
| Rubber TTied Dozers |  | ${ }_{227}^{203}$ |  | 8 |
| Rubber Tired Loaders |  | $\stackrel{203}{367}$ |  | 8 |
| Signal Boards |  | 6 |  | 8 |
| ${ }^{\text {Skid Stier Loaders }}$ |  | ${ }_{26}{ }^{65}$ |  | 8 |
|  |  | ${ }_{64}^{263}$ |  | 8 |
| Tratorst loaders Backhoes |  | ${ }^{97}$ |  | 8 |
|  |  | ${ }_{46}$ |  | ${ }_{8}^{8}$ |

end of data entry sheet

## Emission Factors for Greenhouse Gas Inventories

Red text indicates an update from the 2018 version of this document.
Typically, greenhouse gas emissions are reported in units of carbon dioxide equivalent $\left(\mathrm{CO}_{2} \mathrm{e}\right)$. Gases are converted to $\mathrm{CO}_{2} \mathrm{e}$ by multiplying by their global warming potential (GWP). The emission factors listed in this document have not been converted 1o $\mathrm{CO}_{2} \mathrm{e}$. To do so, multiply the emissions by the corresponding GWP listed in the table below.

| Gas | 100-Year GWP |
| :---: | ---: |
| $\mathrm{CH}_{4}$ | 25 |
| $\mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ | 298 |


| Table 1 | Stationary Combustion |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Fuel Type | Heat Content (HHV) | $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ Factor | $\mathrm{CH}_{4}$ Factor | $\mathrm{N}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ Factor | $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ Factor | $\mathrm{CH}_{4}$ Factor | $\mathrm{N}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ Factor |
|  |  | mmBtu per short ton | $\mathrm{kg} \mathrm{CO}_{2}$ per mmBtu | $\mathrm{g} \mathrm{CH}_{4}$ per mmBtu | $\mathrm{g} \mathrm{N}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ per mmBtu | $\mathrm{kg} \mathrm{CO}_{2}$ per short ton | $\mathrm{gCH}_{4}$ per short ton | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{gN} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O} \text { per short } \\ & \text { ton } \end{aligned}$ |
|  | Coal and Coke |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Anthracite Coal | 25.09 | 103.69 | 11 | 1.6 | 2,602 | 276 | 40 |
|  | Bituminous Coal | 24.93 | 93.28 | 11 | 1.6 | 2,325 | 274 | 40 |
|  | Sub-bituminous Coal | 17.25 | 97.17 | 11 | 1.6 | 1,676 | 190 | 28 |
|  | Lignite Coal | 14.21 | 97.72 | 11 | 1.6 | 1,389 | 156 | 23 |
|  | Mixed (Commercial Sector) | 21.39 | 94.27 | 11 | 1.6 | 2,016 | 235 | 34 |
|  | Mixed (Electric Power Sector) | 19.73 | 95.52 | 11 | 1.6 | 1,885 | 217 | 32 |
|  | Mixed (Industrial Coking) | 26.28 | 93.90 | 11 | 1.6 | 2,468 | 289 | 42 |
|  | Mixed (Industrial Sector) | 22.35 | 94.67 | 11 | 1.6 | 2,116 | 246 | 36 |
|  | Coal Coke | 24.80 | 113.67 | 11 | 1.6 | 2,819 | 273 | 40 |
| Other Fuels - Solid |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Municipal Solid Waste | 9.95 | 90.70 | 32 | 4.2 | 902 | 318 | 42 |
|  | Petroleum Coke (Solid) | 30.00 | 102.41 | 32 | 4.2 | 3,072 | 960 | 126 |
|  | Plastics | 38.00 | 75.00 | 32 | 4.2 | 2,850 | 1,216 | 160 |
|  | Tires | 28.00 | 85.97 | 32 | 4.2 | 2,407 | 896 | 118 |
| Biomass Fuels - Solid |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Agricultural Byproducts | 8.25 | 118.17 | 32 | 4.2 | 975 | 264 | 35 |
|  | Peat | 8.00 | 111.84 | 32 | 4.2 | 895 | 256 | 34 |
|  | Solid Byproducts | 10.39 | 105.51 | 32 | 4.2 | 1,096 | 332 | 44 |
|  | Wood and Wood Residuals | 17.48 | 93.80 | 7.2 | 3.6 | 1,640 | 126 | 63 |
|  |  | mmBtu per scf | $\mathrm{kg} \mathrm{cos}_{2}$ per mmBtu | $\mathrm{g} \mathrm{CH}_{4}$ per mmBtu | $\mathrm{g} \mathrm{N}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ per mmBtu | $\mathrm{kg} \mathrm{CO}_{2}$ per scf | $\mathrm{g} \mathrm{CH}_{4}$ per scf | $\mathrm{g} \mathrm{N} \mathbf{2} \mathrm{O}$ per scf |
|  | Natural Gas |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Natural Gas | 0.001026 | 53.06 | 1.0 | 0.10 | 0.05444 | 0.00103 | 0.00010 |
| Other Fuels - Gaseous |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Blast Furnace Gas | 0.000092 | 274.32 | 0.022 | 0.10 | 0.02524 | 0.000002 | 0.000009 |
|  | Coke Oven Gas | 0.000599 | 46.85 | 0.48 | 0.10 | 0.02806 | 0.000288 | 0.000060 |
|  | Fuel Gas | 0.001388 | 59.00 | 3.0 | 0.60 | 0.08189 | 0.004164 | 0.000833 |
|  | Propane Gas | 0.002516 | 61.46 | 3.0 | 0.60 | 0.15463 | 0.007548 | 0.001510 |
|  | Biomass Fuels - Gaseous |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Landfill Gas | 0.000485 | 52.07 | 3.2 | 0.63 | 0.025254 | 0.001552 | 0.000306 |
|  | Other Biomass Gases | 0.000655 | 52.07 | 3.2 | 0.63 | 0.034106 | 0.002096 | 0.000413 |
|  |  | mmBtu per gallon | $\mathrm{kg} \mathrm{CO}_{2}$ per mmBtu | $\mathrm{g} \mathrm{CH}_{4}$ per mmBtu | $\mathrm{g} \mathrm{N}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ per mmBtu | $\mathrm{kg} \mathrm{co}_{2}$ per gallon | $\mathrm{g} \mathrm{CH}_{4}$ per gallon | $\mathrm{g} \mathrm{N}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ per gallon |
|  | Petroleum Products |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Asphalt and Road Oil | 0.158 | 75.36 | 3.0 | 0.60 | 11.91 | 0.47 | 0.09 |
|  | Aviation Gasoline | 0.120 | 69.25 | 3.0 | 0.60 | 8.31 | 0.36 | 0.07 |
|  | Butane | 0.103 | 64.77 | 3.0 | 0.60 | 6.67 | 0.31 | 0.06 |
|  | Butylene | 0.105 | 68.72 | 3.0 | 0.60 | 7.22 | 0.32 | 0.06 |
|  | Crude Oil | 0.138 | 74.54 | 3.0 | 0.60 | 10.29 | 0.41 | 0.08 |
|  | Distillate Fuel Oil No. 1 | 0.139 | 73.25 | 3.0 | 0.60 | 10.18 | 0.42 | 0.08 |
|  | Distillate Fuel Oil No. 2 | 0.138 | 73.96 | 3.0 | 0.60 | 10.21 | 0.41 | 0.08 |
|  | Distillate Fuel Oil No. 4 | 0.146 | 75.04 | 3.0 | 0.60 | 10.96 | 0.44 | 0.09 |
|  | Ethane | 0.068 | 59.60 | 3.0 | 0.60 | 4.05 | 0.20 | 0.04 |
|  | Ethylene | 0.058 | 65.96 | 3.0 | 0.60 | 3.83 | 0.17 | 0.03 |
|  | Heavy Gas Oils | 0.148 | 74.92 | 3.0 | 0.60 | 11.09 | 0.44 | 0.09 |
|  | Isobutane | 0.099 | 64.94 | 3.0 | 0.60 | 6.43 | 0.30 | 0.06 |
|  | Isobutylene | 0.103 | 68.86 | 3.0 | 0.60 | 7.09 | 0.31 | 0.06 |
|  | Kerosene | 0.135 | 75.20 | 3.0 | 0.60 | 10.15 | 0.41 | 0.08 |
|  | Kerosene-Type Jet Fuel | 0.135 | 72.22 | 3.0 | 0.60 | 9.75 | 0.41 | 0.08 |
|  | Liquefied Petroleum Gases (LPG) | 0.092 | 61.71 | 3.0 | 0.60 | 5.68 | 0.28 | 0.06 |
|  | Lubricants | 0.144 | 74.27 | 3.0 | 0.60 | 10.69 | 0.43 | 0.09 |
|  | Motor Gasoline | 0.125 | 70.22 | 3.0 | 0.60 | 8.78 | 0.38 | 0.08 |
|  | Naphtha ( $<401$ deg F) | 0.125 | 68.02 | 3.0 | 0.60 | 8.50 | 0.38 | 0.08 |
|  | Natural Gasoline | 0.110 | 66.88 | 3.0 | 0.60 | 7.36 | 0.33 | 0.07 |
|  | Other Oil ( $>401 \mathrm{deg}$ F) | 0.139 | 76.22 | 3.0 | 0.60 | 10.59 | 0.42 | 0.08 |
|  | Pentanes Plus | 0.110 | 70.02 | 3.0 | 0.60 | 7.70 | 0.33 | 0.07 |
|  | Petrochemical Feedstocks | 0.125 | 71.02 | 3.0 | 0.60 | 8.88 | 0.38 | 0.08 |
|  | Petroleum Coke | 0.143 | 102.41 | 3.0 | 0.60 | 14.64 | 0.43 | 0.09 |
|  | Propane | 0.091 | 62.87 | 3.0 | 0.60 | 5.72 | 0.27 | 0.05 |
|  | Propylene | 0.091 | 67.77 | 3.0 | 0.60 | 6.17 | 0.27 | 0.05 |
|  | Residual Fuel Oil No. 5 | 0.140 | 72.93 | 3.0 | 0.60 | 10.21 | 0.42 | 0.08 |
|  | Residual Fuel Oil No. 6 | 0.150 | 75.10 | 3.0 | 0.60 | 11.27 | 0.45 | 0.09 |
|  | Special Naphtha | 0.125 | 72.34 | 3.0 | 0.60 | 9.04 | 0.38 | 0.08 |
|  | Unfinished Oils | 0.139 | 74.54 | 3.0 | 0.60 | 10.36 | 0.42 | 0.08 |
|  | Used Oil | 0.138 | 74.00 | 3.0 | 0.60 | 10.21 | 0.41 | 0.08 |
|  | Biomass Fuels - Liquid |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Biodiesel ( $100 \%$ ) | 0.128 | 73.84 | 1.1 | 0.11 | 9.45 | 0.14 | 0.01 |
|  | Ethanol (100\%) | 0.084 | 68.44 | 1.1 | 0.11 | 5.75 | 0.09 | 0.01 |
|  | Rendered Animal Fat | 0.125 | 71.06 | 1.1 | 0.11 | 8.88 | 0.14 | 0.01 |
|  | Vegetable Oil | 0.120 | 81.55 | 1.1 | 0.11 | 9.79 | 0.13 | 0.01 |
|  | Biomass Fuels - Kraft Pulping Liquor, by Wood Furnish |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | North American Softwood |  | 94.4 | 1.9 | 0.42 |  |  |  |
|  | North American Hardwood |  | 93.7 | 1.9 | 0.42 |  |  |  |
|  | Bagasse |  | 95.5 | 1.9 | 0.42 |  |  |  |
|  | Bamboo |  | 93.7 | 1.9 | 0.42 |  |  |  |
|  | Straw |  | 95.1 | 1.9 | 0.42 |  |  |  |

ederal Register EPA; 40 CFR Part 98; e-CFR, June 13, 2017 (see link below). Table C-1, Table C-2, Table AA-1

.

| Table 2 | Mobile Combustion $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Fuel Type | $\mathrm{kg} \mathrm{CO}_{2}$ per unit | Unit |
|  | Aviation Gasoline | 8.31 | gallon |
|  | Biodiesel ( $100 \%$ ) | 9.45 | gallon |
|  | Compressed Natural Gas (CNG) | 0.05444 | scf |
|  | Diesel Fuel | 10.21 | gallon |
|  | Ethanol ( $100 \%$ ) | 5.75 | gallon |
|  | Kerosene-Type Jet Fuel | 9.75 | gallon |
|  | Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) | 4.50 | gallon |
|  | Liquefied Petroleum Gases (LPG) | 5.68 | gallon |
|  | Motor Gasoline | 8.78 | gallon |
|  | Residual Fuel Oil | 11.27 | gallon |

Source:
Federal Register EPA; 40 CFR Part 98; e-CFR, June 13, 2017 (see link below). Table C-1.

LNG: The factor was developed based on the $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ factor for Natural Gas factor and LNG fuel density from GREET1_2017. $\mathbf{h l | l x \times \text { Model, Argonne National Laboratory. This represents a methodology change from previous versions. }}$
Table 3 Mobile Combustion $\mathrm{CH}_{4}$ and $\mathrm{N}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ for On-Road Gasoline Vehicles

| Vehicle Type | Year | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{CH}_{4} \text { Factor } \\ (\mathrm{g} / \text { mile }) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{N}_{2} \mathrm{O} \text { Factor } \\ (\mathrm{g} / \text { mile }) \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gasoline Passenger Cars | 1973-74 | 0.1696 | 0.0197 |
|  | 1975 | 0.1423 | 0.0443 |
|  | 1976-77 | 0.1406 | 0.0458 |
|  | 1978-79 | 0.1389 | 0.0473 |
|  | 1980 | 0.1326 | 0.0499 |
|  | 1981 | 0.0802 | 0.0626 |
|  | 1982 | 0.0795 | 0.0627 |
|  | 1983 | 0.0782 | 0.0630 |
|  | 1984-93 | 0.0704 | 0.0647 |
|  | 1994 | 0.0617 | 0.0603 |
|  | 1995 | 0.0531 | 0.0560 |
|  | 1996 | 0.0434 | 0.0503 |
|  | 1997 | 0.0337 | 0.0446 |
|  | 1998 | 0.0240 | 0.0389 |
|  | 1999 | 0.0215 | 0.0355 |
|  | 2000 | 0.0175 | 0.0304 |
|  | 2001 | 0.0105 | 0.0212 |
|  | 2002 | 0.0102 | 0.0207 |
|  | 2003 | 0.0095 | 0.0181 |
|  | 2004 | 0.0078 | 0.0085 |
|  | 2005 | 0.0075 | 0.0067 |
|  | 2006 | 0.0076 | 0.0075 |
|  | 2007 | 0.0072 | 0.0052 |
|  | 2008 | 0.0072 | 0.0049 |
|  | 2009 | 0.0071 | 0.0046 |
|  | 2010 | 0.0071 | 0.0046 |
|  | 2011 | 0.0071 | 0.0046 |
|  | 2012 | 0.0071 | 0.0046 |
|  | 2013 | 0.0071 | 0.0046 |
|  | 2014 | 0.0071 | 0.0046 |
|  | 2015 | 0.0068 | 0.0042 |
|  | 2016 | 0.0065 | 0.0038 |
|  | 2017 | 0.0054 | 0.0018 |
|  | 2018 | 0.0052 | 0.0016 |
| Gasoline Light-Duty Trucks (Vans, Pickup Trucks, SUVs) | 1973-74 | 0.1908 | 0.0218 |
|  | 1975 | 0.1634 | 0.0513 |
|  | 1976 | 0.1594 | 0.0555 |
|  | 1977-78 | 0.1614 | 0.0534 |
|  | 1979-80 | 0.1594 | 0.0555 |
|  | 1981 | 0.1479 | 0.0660 |
|  | 1982 | 0.1442 | 0.0681 |
|  | 1983 | 0.1368 | 0.0722 |
|  | 1984 | 0.1294 | 0.0764 |
|  | 1985 | 0.1220 | 0.0806 |
|  | 1986 | 0.1146 | 0.0848 |
|  | 1987-93 | 0.0813 | 0.1035 |
|  | 1994 | 0.0646 | 0.0982 |
|  | 1995 | 0.0517 | 0.0908 |
|  | 1996 | 0.0452 | 0.0871 |
|  | 1997 | 0.0452 | 0.0871 |
|  | 1998 | 0.0412 | 0.0787 |
|  | 1999 | 0.0333 | 0.0618 |
|  | 2000 | 0.0340 | 0.0631 |
|  | 2001 | 0.0221 | 0.0379 |
|  | 2002 | 0.0242 0.0221 | 0.0424 |
|  | 2003 | 0.0221 | 0.0373 |
|  | 2005 | 0.0105 | 0.0064 |
|  | 2006 | 0.0108 | 0.0080 |
|  | 2007 | 0.0103 | 0.0061 |
|  | 2008 | 0.0095 | 0.0036 |
|  | 2009 | 0.0095 | 0.0036 |
|  | 2010 | 0.0095 | 0.0035 |
|  | 2011 | 0.0096 | 0.0034 |
|  | 2012 | 0.0096 | 0.0033 |
|  | 2013 | 0.0095 0.0095 | 0.0035 |
|  | 2015 | 0.0094 | 0.0031 |
|  | 2016 | 0.0091 | 0.0029 |
|  | 2017 | 0.0084 | 0.0018 |
|  | 2018 | 0.0081 | 0.0015 |
| Gasoline Heavy-Duty Vehicles | <1981 | 0.4604 | 0.0497 |
|  | 1982-84 | 0.4492 | 0.0538 |
|  | 1985-86 | 0.4090 | 0.0515 |
|  | 1987 | 0.3675 | 0.0849 |
|  | $1988-1989$ <br> $1990-1995$ | 0.3492 | 0.0933 |
|  | 1990-1995 | 0.3246 0.1278 | 0.1142 |
|  | 1997 | 0.0924 | 0.1726 |
|  | 1998 | 0.0655 | 0.1750 |
|  | 1999 | 0.0648 | 0.1724 |
|  | 2000 | 0.0630 | 0.1660 |
|  | 2001 | 0.0577 | 0.1468 |
|  | 2002 | 0.0634 | 0.1673 |
|  | 2003 | 0.0602 | 0.1553 |
|  | 2004 | 0.0298 | 0.0164 |
|  | 2005 | 0.0297 0.0299 | $\frac{0.0083}{0.0241}$ |
|  | 2007 | 0.0322 | 0.0015 |
|  | 2008 | 0.0340 | 0.0015 |
|  | 2009 | 0.0339 | 0.0015 |
|  | 2010 | 0.0320 | 0.0015 |
|  | 2011 | 0.0304 | 0.0015 |
|  | 2012 | 0.0313 | 0.0015 |
|  | 2013 | 0.0313 | 0.0015 |
|  | $\frac{2014}{2015}$ | 0.0315 | 0.0015 |
|  | 2016 | 0.0321 | 0.0061 |
|  | 2017 | 0.0329 | 0.0084 |
|  | 2018 | 0.0326 | 0.0082 |
| Gasoline Motorcycles | -1960-1995 | 0.0899 | 0.0087 |
|  |  | 0.0672 | 0.0069 |


| Table 4 | Mobile Combustion $\mathrm{CH}_{4}$ and $\mathrm{N}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ for On-Road Diesel and Alternative Fuel Vehicles |
| :---: | :--- |


| Vehicle Type | Fuel Type | Vehicle Year | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{CH}_{4} \text { Factor } \\ (\mathrm{g} / \text { mile }) \end{gathered}$ | $\mathrm{N}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ Factor (g / mile) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Passenger Cars | Diesel | 1960-1982 | 0.0006 | 0.0012 |
|  |  | 1983-1995 | 0.0005 | 0.0010 |
|  |  | 1996-2006 | 0.0005 | 0.0010 |
|  |  | 2007-2018 | 0.0302 | 0.0192 |
| Light-Duty Trucks | Diesel | 1960-1982 | 0.0011 | 0.0017 |
|  |  | 1983-1995 | 0.0009 | 0.0014 |
|  |  | 1996-2006 | 0.0010 | 0.0015 |
|  |  | 2007-2018 | 0.0290 | 0.0214 |
| Medium- and Heavy-Duty Vehicles | Diesel | 1960-2006 | 0.0051 | 0.0048 |
|  |  | 2007-2018 | 0.0095 | 0.0431 |
| Light-Duty Cars | Methanol |  | 0.0080 | 0.0060 |
|  | Ethanol |  | 0.0080 | 0.0060 |
|  | CNG |  | 0.0820 | 0.0060 |
|  | LPG |  | 0.0080 | 0.0060 |
|  | Biodiesel |  | 0.0300 | 0.0190 |
| Light-Duty Trucks | Ethanol |  | 0.0120 | 0.0110 |
|  | CNG |  | 0.1230 | 0.0110 |
|  | LPG |  | 0.0120 | 0.0130 |
|  | LNG |  | 0.1230 | 0.0110 |
|  | Biodiesel |  | 0.0290 | 0.0210 |
| Medium-Duty Trucks | CNG |  | 4.2000 | 0.0010 |
|  | LPG |  | 0.0140 | 0.0340 |
|  | LNG |  | 4.2000 | 0.0430 |
|  | Biodiesel |  | 0.0090 | 0.0010 |
| Heavy-Duty Trucks | Methanol |  | 0.0750 | 0.0280 |
|  | Ethanol |  | 0.0750 | 0.0280 |
|  | CNG |  | 3.7000 | 0.0010 |
|  | LPG |  | 0.0130 | 0.0260 |
|  | LNG |  | 3.7000 | 0.0010 |
|  | Biodiesel |  | 0.0090 | 0.0430 |
| Buses | Methanol |  | 0.0220 | 0.0320 |
|  | Ethanol |  | 0.0220 | 0.0320 |
|  | CNG |  | 10.0000 | 0.0010 |
|  | LPG |  | 0.0340 | 0.0170 |
|  | LNG |  | 10.0000 | 0.0010 |
|  | Biodiesel |  | 0.0090 | 0.0430 |

Table 5 Mobile Combustion $\mathrm{CH}_{4}$ and $\mathrm{N}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ for Non-Road Vehicles

| Vehicle Type | Fuel Type | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{CH}_{4} \text { Factor } \\ & (\mathrm{g} / \mathrm{gallon}) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \begin{array}{l} \mathrm{N}_{2} \mathrm{O} \text { Factor } \\ (\mathrm{g} / \text { gallon }) \end{array} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ships and Boats | Residual Fuel Oil | 0.55 | 0.55 |
|  | Gasoline (2 stroke) | 9.54 | 0.06 |
|  | Gasoline (4 stroke) | 4.88 | 0.23 |
|  | Diesel | 0.31 | 0.50 |
| Locomotives | Diesel | 0.80 | 0.26 |
| Aircraft | Jet Fuel | 0 | 0.30 |
|  | Aviation Gasoline | 7.06 | 0.11 |
| Agricultural Equipment ${ }^{\text {A }}$ | Gasoline (2 stroke) | 12.96 | 0.06 |
|  | Gasoline (4 stroke) | 7.24 | 0.21 |
|  | Diesel | 0.28 | 0.49 |
|  | LPG | 2.19 | 0.39 |
| Agricultural Offroad Trucks | Gasoline | 7.24 | 0.21 |
|  | Diesel | 0.13 | 0.49 |
| Construction/Mining Equipment ${ }^{\text {B }}$ | Gasoline (2 stroke) | 12.42 | 0.07 |
|  | Gasoline (4 stroke) | 5.58 | 0.20 |
|  | Diesel | 0.20 | 0.47 |
|  | LPG | 1.05 | 0.41 |
| Construction/Mining Offroad Trucks | Gasoline | 5.58 | 0.20 |
|  | Diesel | 0.13 | 0.49 |
| Lawn and Garden Equipment | Gasoline (2 stroke) | 15.57 | 0.06 |
|  | Gasoline (4 stroke) | 5.84 | 0.18 |
|  | Diesel | 0.33 | 0.47 |
|  | LPG | 0.35 | 0.41 |
| Airport Equipment | Gasoline | 2.58 | 0.25 |
|  | Diesel | 0.17 | 0.49 |
|  | LPG | 0.33 | 0.41 |
| Industria/Commercial Equipment | Gasoline (2 stroke) | 15.14 | 0.06 |
|  | Gasoline (4 stroke) | 5.48 | 0.20 |
|  | Diesel | 0.23 | 0.47 |
|  | LPG | 0.44 | 0.41 |
| Logging Equipment | Gasoline (2 stroke) | 12.03 | 0.08 |
|  | Gasoline (4 stroke) | 6.71 | 0.18 |
|  | Diesel | 0.10 | 0.49 |
| Railroad Equipment | Gasoline | 5.78 | 0.19 |
|  | Diesel | 0.44 | 0.42 |
|  | LPG | 1.20 | 0.41 |
| Recreational Equipment | Gasoline (2 stroke) | 7.81 | 0.03 |
|  | Gasoline (4 stroke) | 8.45 | 0.19 |
|  | Diesel | 0.41 | 0.41 |
|  | LPG | 2.98 | 0.38 |

A otes
ipment, such as tractors and combines, as well as fuel consumption from trucks that are used off-road in agricultur
${ }^{5}$ Includes equipment, such as cranes, dumpers, and excavators, as well as fuel consumption from trucks that are used off-road in construction.



Table 7 Steam and Heat

|  | $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ Factor <br> $(\mathrm{kg} / \mathrm{mmBtu})$ | $\mathrm{CH}_{4}$ Factor <br> $(\mathrm{g} / \mathrm{mmBtu})$ | $\mathrm{N}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ Factor <br> $(\mathrm{g} / \mathrm{mmBtu})$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Steam and Heat | 66.33 |  | 0.250 |
| Note: Emission factors are per mmBtu of steam or heat purchased. These factors assume natural gas fuel is used to generate steam or heat at 80 percent thermal efficiency. |  |  |  |

## Scope 3 Emission Factors

Scope 3 emission faccrid
Scope 3 Category 4: Upstream Transportation and Distribution and Category 9: Downstream Transportation and Distribution

| Vehicle Type | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \mathrm{CO}_{2} \text { Factor } \\ & (\mathrm{kg} / \text { unit) }) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{CH}_{4} \text { Factor } \\ \text { (g/ unit) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{N}_{2} \mathrm{O} \text { Factor } \\ (\mathrm{g} / \text { unit) }) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Units |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Medium- and Heavy-Duty Truck | 1.387 | 0.013 | 0.033 | vehicle-mile |
| Passenger $\mathrm{Car}^{\text {A }}$ | 0.335 | 0.009 | 0.008 | vehicle-mile |
| Light-Duty Truck ${ }^{\text {8 }}$ | 0.461 | 0.012 | 0.010 | vehicle-mile |
| Medium- and Heavy-Duty Truck | 0.207 | 0.0020 | 0.0046 | ton-mile |
| Rail | 0.021 | 0.0017 | 0.0005 | ton-mile |
| Waterborne Craft ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | 0.040 | 0.0122 | 0.0017 | ton-mile |
| Aircraft | 1.265 | 0 | 0.0389 | ton-mile |

Source:
$\mathrm{CO}_{2}$, $\mathrm{CH}_{4}$, and $\mathrm{N}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ emissions data for road vehicles are from Table 2-13 of the U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks: 1990-2018 (Feb. 2020).

-2018, which are distributed into $\mathrm{CO}_{2}, \mathrm{CH}_{4}$, and $\mathrm{N}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ emissions based on fuelvehicle emission factors.
Freight ton-mile data for non-road vehicles are from Table 1 -50 of the Bureau of Transportation Statistics, National Transportation Statistics for 2019 (Data based on 2017).
Notes:

Passenger car: includes passenger cars, minivans, SUVs, and small pickup trucks (vehicles with wheelbase less than 121 inches).
Light-duty truck: includes full-size pickup trucks, full-size vans, and extended-length SUVs (vehicles with wheelbase greater than 121 inches).
${ }^{\circ}$ Waterborne Craft: updates due to a methodology change.

## Table 9 Scope 3 Category 5: Waste Generated in Operations and Category 12: End-of-Life Treatment of Sold Products

Tw Table These factors are intended for use in the waste-type-specific method or the average-data method defined in the Scope 3 Calculation Guidance for category 5 and category 12 . Choose the appropriate material and disposal method from the table below. For the average-data method, use one of the mixed material types, such as mixed MSW.

| Material | Metric Tons $\mathrm{CO}_{2} \mathrm{e}$ / Short Ton Material |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Recycled ${ }^{\text {A }}$ | Landfilled ${ }^{\text {B }}$ | Combusted ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | Composted ${ }^{\text {D }}$ | Anaerobically Digested (Dry Digestate with Curing) | Anaerobically Digested (Wet Digestate with Curing) |
| Aluminum Cans | 0.06 | 0.02 | 0.01 | NA | NA | NA |
| Aluminum Ingot | 0.04 | 0.02 | 0.01 | NA | NA | NA |
| Steel Cans | 0.32 | 0.02 | 0.01 | NA | NA | NA |
| Copper Wire | 0.18 | 0.02 | 0.01 | NA | NA | NA |
| Glass | 0.05 | 0.02 | 0.01 | NA | NA | NA |
| HDPE | 0.21 | 0.02 | 2.80 | NA | NA | NA |
| LDPE | NA | 0.02 | 2.80 | NA | NA | NA |
| PET | 0.23 | 0.02 | 2.05 | NA | NA | NA |
| LLDPE | NA | 0.02 | 2.80 | NA | NA | NA |
| PP | NA | 0.02 | 2.80 | NA | NA | NA |
| PS | NA | 0.02 | 3.02 | NA | NA | NA |
| PVC | NA | 0.02 | 1.26 | NA | NA | NA |
| PLA | NA | 0.02 | 0.01 | 0.09 | NA | NA |
| Corrugated Containers | 0.11 | 1.07 | 0.05 | NA | NA | NA |
| Magazines/Third-class mail | 0.02 | 0.50 | 0.05 | NA | NA | NA |
| Newspaper | 0.02 | 0.42 | 0.05 | NA | NA | NA |
| Office Paper | 0.02 | 1.52 | 0.05 | NA | NA | NA |
| Phonebooks | 0.04 | 0.42 | 0.05 | NA | NA | NA |
| Textbooks | 0.04 | 1.52 | 0.05 | NA | NA | NA |
| Dimensional Lumber | 0.09 | 0.08 | 0.05 | NA | NA | NA |
| Medium-density Fiberboard | 0.15 | 0.04 | 0.05 | NA | NA | NA |
| Food Waste (non-meat) | NA | 0.68 | 0.05 | 0.07 | 0.14 | 0.11 |
| Food Waste (meat only) | NA | 0.68 | 0.05 | NA | 0.14 | 0.11 |
| Beef | NA | 0.68 | 0.05 | 0.07 | 0.14 | 0.11 |
| Poultry | NA | 0.68 | 0.05 | 0.07 | 0.14 | 0.11 |
| Grains | NA | 0.68 | 0.05 | 0.07 | 0.14 | 0.11 |
| Bread | NA | 0.68 | 0.05 | 0.07 | 0.14 | 0.11 |
| Fruits and Vegetables | NA | 0.68 | 0.05 | 0.07 | 0.14 | 0.11 |
| Dairy Products | NA | 0.68 | 0.05 | 0.07 | 0.14 | 0.11 |
| Yard Trimmings | NA | 0.38 | 0.05 | 0.09 | 0.11 | NA |
| Grass | NA | 0.29 | 0.05 | 0.09 | 0.09 | NA |
| Leaves | NA | 0.30 | 0.05 | 0.09 | 0.13 | NA |
| Branches | NA | 0.62 | 0.05 | 0.09 | 0.16 | NA |
| Mixed Paper (general) | 0.07 | 0.95 | 0.05 | NA | NA | NA |
| Mixed Paper (primarily residential) | 0.07 | 0.92 | 0.05 | NA | NA | NA |
| Mixed Paper (primarily from offices) | 0.03 | 0.90 | 0.05 | NA | NA | NA |
| Mixed Metals | 0.23 | 0.02 | 0.01 | NA | NA | NA |
| Mixed Plastics | 0.22 | 0.02 | 2.34 | NA | NA | NA |
| Mixed Recyclables | 0.09 | 0.81 | 0.11 | NA | NA | NA |
| Food Waste | NA | 0.68 | 0.05 | 0.07 | NA | NA |
| Mixed Organics | NA | 0.55 | 0.05 | 0.09 | NA | NA |
| Mixed MSW (municipal solid waste) | NA | 0.63 | 0.43 | NA | NA | NA |
| Carpet | NA | 0.02 | 1.68 | NA | NA | NA |
| Desktop CPUs | NA | 0.02 | 0.40 | NA | NA | NA |
| Portable Electronic Devices | NA | 0.02 | 0.89 | NA | NA | NA |
| Flat-panel Displays | NA | 0.02 | 0.74 | NA | NA | NA |
| CRT Displays | NA | 0.02 | 0.64 | NA | NA | NA |
| Electronic Peripherals | NA | 0.02 | 2.23 | NA | NA | NA |
| Hard-copy Devices | NA | 0.02 | 1.92 | NA | NA | NA |
| Mixed Electronics | NA | 0.02 | 0.87 | NA | NA | NA |
| Clay Bricks | NA | 0.02 | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Concrete | 0.01 | 0.02 | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Fly Ash | 0.01 | 0.02 | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Tires | 0.10 | 0.02 | 2.21 | NA | NA | NA |
| Asphalt Concrete | 0.004 | 0.02 | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Asphalt Shingles | 0.03 | 0.02 | 0.70 | NA | NA | NA |
| Drywall | NA | 0.02 | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Fiberglass Insulation | 0.05 | 0.02 | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Vinyl Flooring | NA | 0.02 | 0.29 | NA | NA | NA |
| Wood Flooring | NA | 0.18 | 0.08 | NA | NA | N |

Source: EPA, Office of Resource Conservation and Recovery (February 2016) Documentation for Greenhouse Gas Emission and Energy Factors used in the Waste Reduction Model (WARM). Factors from tables provided in the Management Pracitices Chapters and
Background Chapters. WARM Version 15. Additional data provided by EPA, WARM-15 Background Data
Notes: These factors do not include any avoided emissions impact from any of the disposal methods. All the factors presented here include transportation emissions, which are optional in the Scope 3 Calculation Guidance, with an assumed average distance traveled to the
${ }^{A}$ Recycling emissions include transport to recycling facility and sorting of recycled materials at material recovery facility
Landfilling emissions include transport to landfill, equipment use at landfill and fugitive landfill $\mathrm{CH}_{4}$ emissions. Landilill $\mathrm{CH}_{4}$ is based on typical landfill gas collection practices and average landfill moisture conditions.
Combustion emissions include transport to combustion facility and combustion-related non-biogenic $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ and $\mathrm{N}_{2} \mathrm{O}$
${ }^{\circ}$ Composting emissions include transport to composting facility, equipment use at composting facility and $\mathrm{CH}_{4}$ and $\mathrm{N}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ emissions during composting.
Table 10 Scope 3 Category 6: Business Travel and Category 7: Employee Commuting
These factors are intended for use in the distance-based method defined in the Scope 3 Calculation Guidance. If fuel data are available, then the fuel-based method should be used, with factors from Tables 2 through 5 .

| Vehicle Type | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \mathrm{CO}_{2} \text { Factor } \\ & \text { (kg / unit) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{CH}_{4} \text { Factor } \\ (\mathrm{g} / \text { unit }) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \mathrm{N}_{2} \mathrm{O} \text { Factor } \\ \text { ( } \mathrm{g} / \text { unit) } \end{gathered}$ | Units |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Passenger Car ${ }^{\text {A }}$ | 0.335 | 0.009 | 0.008 | vehicle-mile |
| Light-Duty Truck ${ }^{\text {B }}$ | 0.461 | 0.012 | 0.010 | vehicle-mile |
| Motorcycle | 0.184 | 0.070 | 0.007 | vehicle-mile |
| Intercity Rail - Northeast Corridor ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | 0.058 | 0.0055 | 0.0007 | passenger-mile |
| Intercity Rail - Other Routes ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | 0.150 | 0.0117 | 0.0038 | passenger-mile |
| Intercity Rail - National Average ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | 0.113 | 0.0092 | 0.0026 | passenger-mile |
| Commuter Rail ${ }^{\text {D }}$ | 0.148 | 0.0123 | 0.0030 | passenger-mile |
| Transit Rail (i.e. Subway, Tram) ${ }^{\text {E }}$ | 0.099 | 0.0089 | 0.0013 | passenger-mile |
| Bus | 0.053 | 0.0206 | 0.0009 | passenger-mile |
| Air Travel - Short Haul (<300 miles) | 0.215 | 0.0077 | 0.0068 | passenger-mile |
| Air Travel - Medium Haul (>= 300 miles, < 2300 miles) | 0.133 | 0.0006 | 0.0042 | passenger-mile |
| Air Travel - Long Haul (>=2300 miles) | 0.165 | 0.0006 | 0.0052 | passenger-mile |

$\mathrm{O}_{2}$, $\mathrm{CH}_{4}$, and $\mathrm{N}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ emissions data for highway vehicles are from Table 2-13 of the EPA (2020) Inventory of U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks: 1990-2018
Vehicle-miles and passenger-miles data for highway vehicles are from Table VM-1 of the Federal Highway Administration Highway Statistics 2018 .
uel consumption data and passenger-miles data for rail are from Tables A. 14 to A. 16 and C. 9 to C .11 of the Transportation Energy Data Book: Edition 38 . Fuel consumption was converted to emissions by using fuel and electricity emission factors presented in the tables
Intercity Rail factors from personal communication with Amtrak (Laura Fotiou), March 2020
Air Travel factors from 2019 Guidelines to Defra / DECC's GHG Conversion Factors for Company Reporting. Version 1.0 August 2019.
Notes

Intercity rail: Amtrak long-distance rail between major cities. Northeast Corridor extends from Boston to Washington D.C. Other Routes are all routes outside the Northeast Corridor.
Transit rail: rail typically within an urban center, such as subways, elevated railways, metropolitan railways (metro), streetcars, trolley cars, and tramways.

## Table 11 Global Warming Potentials (GWPs)

| Gas | 100-Year GWP |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ | 1 |
| $\mathrm{CH}_{4}$ | 25 |
| $\mathrm{N}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ | 298 |
| HFC-23 | 14,800 |
| HFC-32 | 675 |
| HFC-41 | 92 |
| HFC-125 | 3,500 |
| HFC-134 | 1,100 |
| HFC-134a | 1,430 |
| HFC-143 | 353 |
| HFC-143a | 4,470 |
| HFC-152 | 53 |
| HFC-152a | 124 |
| HFC-161 | 12 |
| HFC-227ea | 3,220 |
| HFC-236cb | 1,340 |
| HFC-236ea | 1,370 |
| HFC-236fa | 9,810 |
| HFC-245ca | 693 |
| HFC-245fa | 1,030 |
| HFC-365mic | 794 |
| HFC-43-10mee | 1,640 |
| $\mathrm{SF}_{6}$ | 22,800 |
| $\mathrm{NF}_{3}$ | 17,200 |
| $\mathrm{CF}_{4}$ | 7,390 |
| $\mathrm{C}_{2} \mathrm{~F}_{6}$ | 12,200 |
| $\mathrm{C}_{3} \mathrm{~F}_{8}$ | 8,830 |
| ${ }^{\text {c- }-\mathrm{C}_{4} \mathrm{~F}_{8}}$ | 10,300 |
| $\mathrm{C}_{4} \mathrm{~F}_{10}$ | 8,860 |
| $\mathrm{C}_{5} \mathrm{~F}_{12}$ | 9,160 |
| $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{14}$ | 9,300 |
| $\mathrm{C}_{10} \mathrm{~F}_{18}$ | >7,500 |

100 -year GWPs from IPCC Fourth Assessment Report (AR4), 2007. IPCC AR4 was published in 2007 and is among the most current and comprehensive peer-reviewed assessments of climate change. AR4 provides revised GWPs of several GHGS relative to the values

While EPA recognizes that Fifth Assessment Report (AR5) GWPs have been pubbished, in an effort to ensure consistency and comparability of GHG data between EPA's voluntary and non-voluntary GHG reporting programs (e.g. GHG Reporting Program and National SAR GWP values. Utilizing AR4 GWPS improves EPA's ability to analyze corporate, national, and sub-national GHG data consistently, enhances communication of GHG information between programs, and gives outside stakenolders a consistent, predictable set of GWPs to avoid confusion and additional burden.

## Table 12 Global Warming Potentials (GWPs) for Blended Refrigerants

| ASHRAE\# | 100-year GWP | Blend Composition |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| R-401A | 16 | 53\% HCFC-22, 34\% HCFC-124, 13\% HFC-152a |
| R-401B | 14 | 61\% HCFC-22, 28\% HCFC-124, 11\% HFC-152a |
| R-401C | 19 | 33\% HCFC-22, 52\% HCFC-124, 15\% HFC-152a |
| R-402A | 2,100 | 38\% HCFC-22, 6\% HFC-125, 2\% propane |
| R-402B | 1,330 | 6\% HCFC-22, 38\% HFC-125, 2\% propane |
| R-403B | 3,444 | 56\% HCFC-22, 39\% PFC-218, 5\% propane |
| R-404A | 3,922 | 44\% HFC-125, 4\% HFC-134a, 52\% HFC 143a |
| R-406A | 0 | 55\% HCFC-22, 41\% HCFC-142b, 4\% isobutane |
| - -407 A | 2,107 | 20\% HFC-32, 40\% HFC-125, 40\% HFC-134a |
| R-407B | 2,804 | 10\% HFC-32, 70\% HFC-125, 20\% HFC-134a |
| R-407C | 1,774 | 23\% HFC-32, 25\% HFC-125, 52\% HFC-134a |
| 8-407D | 1,627 | 15\% HFC-32, 15\% HFC-125, 70\% HFC-134a |
| R-407E | 1,552 | 25\% HFC-32, 15\% HFC-125, 60\% HFC-134a |
| R-408A | 2,301 | 47\% HCFC-22, 7\% HFC-125, 46\% HFC 143a |
| R-409A | 0 | 60\% HCFC-22, 25\% HCFC-124, 15\% HCFC-142b |
| 8-410A | 2,088 | 50\% HFC-32, $50 \%$ HFC-125 |
| R-410B | 2,229 | 45\% HFC-32, 55\% HFC-125 |
| R-411A | 14 | 87.5\% HCFC-22, 11 HFC-152a, 1.5\% propylene |
| R-411B | 4 | 94\% HCFC-22, 3\% HFC-152a, 3\% propylene |
| R-413A | 2,053 | 88\% HFC-134a, 9\% PFC-218, 3\% isobutane |
| R-414A | 0 | 51\% HCFC-22, 28.5\% HCFC-124, 16.5\% HCFC-142b |
| R-414B | 0 | 5\% HCFC-22 , 39\% HCFC-124, 9.5\% HCFC-142b |
| R-417A | 2,346 | 46.6\% HFC-125,5\% HFC-134a, 3.4\% butane |
| R-422A | 3,143 | 85.1\% HFC-125, 11.5\% HFC-134a, 3.4\% isobutane |
| R-422D | 2,729 | 65.1\% HFC-125, 31.5\% HFC-134a, 3.4\% isobutane |
| R-423A | 2,280 | 47.5\% HFC-227ea, 52.5\% HFC-134a, |
| R-424A | 2,440 | 50.5\% HFC-125, 47\% HFC-134a, 2.5\% butane/pentane |
| R-426A | 1,508 | $5.1 \%$ HFC-125, 93\% HFC-134a, $1.9 \%$ butane/pentane |
| R-428A | 3,607 | 77.5\% HFC-125, 2\% HFC-143a, , 1.9\% isobutane |
| R-434A | 3,245 | 63.2\% HFC-125, 16\% HFC-134a, 18\% HFC-143a, 2.8\% isobutane |
| R-500 | 32 | 73.8\% CFC-12, 26.2\% HFC-152a, 48.8\% HCFC-22 |
| R-502 | 0 | 48.8\% HCFC-22, 51.2\% CFC-115 |
| R-504 | 325 | 48.2\% HFC-32, 51.8\% CFC-115 |
| R-507 | 3,985 | 5\% HFC-125, 5\% HFC143a |
| R-508A | 13,214 | 39\% HFC-23, 61\% PFC-116 |
| R-508B | 13,396 | 46\% HFC-23, 54\% PFC-116 |

00-year GW Irom IPCC Fourth Assess (AR4), 2007. See the source note to Table 11 for further explanation. GWPs of blended refrigerants are based on their HFC and PFC constituents, which are based on data from p//ww .apa

