

Matt Hastie

To: Matt Hastie (mhastie@angeloplanning.com)
Subject: FW: Salem WRC - Potential Evidence Needed to Respond to Public Testimony - Energy Impacts

Email from Michael Hoffman re: Energy Impacts



Matt Hastie, AICP / Project Manager

503.542.3403 / mhastie@angeloplanning.com
921 SW Washington St. Suite 468
Portland OR 97205
<http://www.angeloplanning.com>

From: Michael.Hoffmann@CH2M.com [mailto:Michael.Hoffmann@CH2M.com]
Sent: Wednesday, October 19, 2016 10:07 AM
To: Matt Hastie <mhastie@angeloplanning.com>
Subject: RE: Salem WRC - Potential Evidence Needed to Respond to Public Testimony

Here you go Matt – I’ve pasted the material into this email... Thanks, Michael

Response for the below climate-change related comments from the land use meeting

Linda Walmark and others	New bridge incompatible with actions needed to address climate change	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Information about impact of idling associated with congestion on carbon emissions.Results of energy impacts? Email from Natalie to Mike J. re: review of analysis.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Energy impacts – Dave S – Matt to follow upEnergy impacts – Julie to follow up
--------------------------	---	---	--

Response:

As stated in Section 4.2.1 of the draft Energy Final Technical Report Addendum, the preferred alternative would result in a 16.1 percent increase in operational energy consumption in 2040 compared to the No Build Alternative (Section 4.2.3 of the draft report mistakenly noted a “3.9 percent increase...” -- that value should also be “16.1”; this has been corrected in the draft report). However, current and future improvements in non-fossil fuel vehicle technologies as well as coordinated land use and transportation planning efforts may substantially offset these energy usage impacts. Mitigation efforts to offset potential increased energy usage could include increasing non-single-occupancy vehicle mode share across the Willamette River, such as those outlined in the *Salem Willamette River Crossing Alternate Modes Study* (CH2M, 2010). Encouraging the use of alternatively-fueled vehicles and developing the needed associated infrastructure throughout the study area should also be supported.

Although it is forecasted that there would be more energy usage under the preferred alternative than under the No Build, the regional emissions analysis findings show that vehicle operations of the preferred alternative

would contribute fewer overall emissions to the project area than they would under the No Build Alternative (see Table 4.2-1 of the draft *Air Quality Final Technical Report Addendum*). The reason the No Build Alternative would result in higher criteria pollutant emissions in 2040 than the preferred alternative is because under the No Build there would be a greater amount of delay and a lower average speed compared to the preferred alternative.