

Truck Efficiency & Reduced Idling Study Group

Draft Meeting Notes
 Wednesday, May 19, 2010
 8:30 a.m. – 12:30 p.m.
 PSU



Attendance:

<u>Study group members</u>	<u>Public</u>
Miguel Figliozzi, Chair - Portland State University; Oregon Transportation Research and Education Consortium	Gary Gaussoin – Silver Eagle Mfg. Co.
Emily Ackland - Association of Oregon Counties	Margi Lifsey – Oregon Department of Transportation
Jim Anderson - Truck and Travel Truckstop	
Paul Downes – CUSA Raz, LLC dba Raz Transportation: NW Motorcoach Association	<u>ODEQ</u>
Don Emerson - FMI Trucking	Kevin Downing – ODEQ
Bruce Erickson – Oregon Department of Transportation	Shelley Matthews - ODEQ
Tom Gardiner - Cummins Northwest	Uri Papish - ODEQ
Cynthia Hilton - Biggs Insurance; National Utility Contractors Association; Associated General Contractors	
Brock Howell - Environment Oregon	
Arch Hudelson - NW Propane Gas Association	
Jay Letter - Unified Grocers, Inc.	
Gary McClellan - Ray's Towing; Oregon Tow Truck Association	
Wade Palmer - Kool-Pak	
Doug Pentecost - Cascade Sierra Solutions	
Bob Russell – Oregon Trucking Associations	
Matthew Smith - Navistar	
Vic Stibolt - Jubitz Corporation	
John Sullivan - Loren's Sanitation; Oregon Refuse and Recycling Association	
Catherine Thomasson - Physicians for Social Responsibility	
Denise Thornton - Demitrakikes Trucking Inc.	
Rick Wallace - Oregon Department of Energy	
Chuck Williams - CalPortland Company	

Overview

Oregon's Truck Efficiency and Reduced Idling Study Group convened to provide input on DEQ's recommendations and report on truck efficiency and reduced idling, due to the interim legislative committees on environment and natural resources by October 1, 2010. The Group plans to hold meetings from April 2010 through July 2010. The following is a summary of the Group's discussion at its second meeting. Responses to questions and comments are shown in *italics* and represent responses DEQ provided to the committee at the meeting.

Welcome and Agenda

Chair Miguel Figliozzi welcomed attendees and called the second meeting of the Truck Efficiency and Reduced Idling Study Group to order at 8:30 am. Chair Figliozzi gave an overview of the Agenda (handout).

Draft Charter (revised per 4/27 meeting)

Chair Figliozzi requested comments and approval on the draft charter, which DEQ revised based on committee input at the April 27th meeting of the study group.

Draft Meeting Notes

Chair Figliozzi requested comments and approval on the draft notes from the committee's April 27th meeting. The committee approved the notes with a recommendation to remove the sentence "DEQ successfully enforces safety violations and other infractions on drivers now (top of pg. 6)."

Response: this statement will be removed.

Additional Idling Information

Mr. Downing presented additional idling information provided to DEQ by study group members:

- 1) Crash test information: Fatalities related to large truck crashes are going down. There are a number of contributing factors leading to crashes. A side benefit of reduced idling is drivers experience more restful sleep, which results in less fatigue and could contribute to alert, safer driving. A Federal Motor Carrier study suggests 13% of truck crashes have fatigue as a contributing factor.
- 2) Fuel prices in trucking industry: Fuel prices match or exceed the highest cost centers in the trucking business: cost of drivers and equipment.
- 3) Study from No. Carolina state: Findings showed that the Benefit of an APU comes from its usage. Also, drivers often idle the main truck engine while using APU's, minimizing benefits.
- 4) Study at University of California - Riverside: ECM monitoring data was collected and analyzed. It shows a truck is in idle mode 24-33% of the time. Discussion followed as to whether the idling data reflected total idling time or idling while in park. Dr. Figliozzi offered to follow up with the study authors.
- 5) IdleAire: Initially, IdleAire didn't feel that Oregon's temperate climates were favorable to installing and using IdleAire stations. Later, an internal business study at truck stops indicated it would be cost effective. Twenty-three IdleAire locations elsewhere around the country have indicated they plan to re-open under new company ownership.

Discussion highlights:

- Based on the way miles per gallon were calculated, a member indicated that the estimated 24-33% idle time from the California study may include idling while in traffic. Other members pointed out that ECM's provide data on idling while in park and while driving. In addition, idling while driving varies greatly between local and long-haul trucks, there's a significant amount of idle time in park for local trucks, and California study figure doesn't seem out of the ordinary.

DEQ's Draft Idling Recommendations and Enforcement of Idling Regulations in Other States and Jurisdictions:

Ms. Matthews gave a summary presentation on DEQ's draft idling recommendations, the rationale for those recommendations and Study Group comments from the first meeting (handout). The purpose of this agenda item was to summarize and document information and comments provided at the first meeting and to invite additional comments to ensure that DEQ had captured all of the Study Group's comments and concerns. She pointed out that the majority of the comments already received, pertained to applicability and compliance and invited study group members to submit additional comments to fill in the gaps.

Since the majority of the Study Group's comments from the first meeting pertained to compliance, Ms. Matthews provided additional information on enforcement of idling regulations by other states and jurisdictions in the U.S (handout). The report included information on location, idling limits, fines, enforcement entities, and the different types of enforcement. She noted that education and outreach will be an integral part of DEQ's idling recommendations to Oregon's Legislative committees and focused her discussion on successful education and outreach campaigns employed by other states and jurisdictions.

Discussion highlights:

-Uniform Regulations

- A member suggested that the trucking industry would like the idling regulations enforced uniformly to create a level playing field. He indicated that local (city) idling regulations are very different from state regulations and, due to the complexity of the trucking industry, won't impact everyone the same. He also mentioned that he would like further discussion on incentives and fees.

-APUs

- One member commented that APU's are expensive and drivers are good at finding ways to get around idling requirements, so the state needs to provide economic assistance and incentives to fleet owners and drivers to achieve idle reduction goals.
- Member indicated that the greatest barriers are financial and some owners and operators have bad credit, creating further barriers to getting financing for APUs. One member claimed that an APU costs \$0.03 cents a mile to maintain, and low-cost financing is needed to defray up-front costs.

He also explained that trucking companies are working with thin margins and are very skeptical about data provided by Smartway and the idle reduction manufacturers; they won't simply believe what they're told. He recommended that APUs be provided to fleets and the results monitored to develop real world data to verify information provided by Smartway and idle reduction technology manufacturers.

-Compliance plan

- Some members cautioned DEQ on the use of public call-in/citizen policing to help enforce idling regulations due to potential abuse by disgruntled former employees and other slander issues.
- One member requested that DEQ provide specific recommendations for an idling compliance plan for Oregon at a future meeting of the study group.
- One member suggested that he prefers no idling legislation because the costs and difficulties are insurmountable and an idling regulation would create pockets of hardship/enforcement. For instance, larger truck stops and rest areas like Jubitz and Coburg, Oregon would be hot spots for enforcement. He also suggested that some communities would be more proactive than others in providing education and outreach and complying with a regulation, thereby encouraging drivers to stop at rest areas and truck stops with less aggressive compliance programs. He encouraged DEQ to look at successful compliance programs in other states and jurisdictions to evaluate their programs. In the event that an idling regulation is adopted, he requested a long phase-in process coupled with continued education, warning period, etc.

-Education, Outreach and Incentives

- Several members suggested a strong outreach and education program as part of DEQ's recommendations to the interim legislative committees, with an emphasis on educating owners and operators on the costs of idling and the benefits of changing driver behavior to reduce idling and fuel consumption. Training would focus on coaching, repetition, competition, monitoring, reporting and rewards. One member claimed that education and outreach within fleets is the most effective form of idle reduction and another suggested that a strong outreach and education package may be adequate without enforcement of an idling regulation.
- Members discussed the merits of various idle reduction incentives such as fuel savings, fewer accidents, improved driver and environmental health, lower worker's compensation, reduced insurance rates through partnerships with insurance companies, green company awards, ODOT's "Trusted Carrier Program" sticker, etc.
- A member mentioned that many trucking companies are currently monitoring driver behavior (using ECM's and other devices and methods) and providing training, feedback, and incentives to reduce idling. He suggested that the trucking industry would benefit from assistance to expand these efforts by developing and promoting best practices.
- Another member proposed that DEQ develop an efficiency package demonstrating the significant benefits of reducing idling (reduced fuel consumption and greenhouse gases) etc. This would allow the market to regulate idling based on the costs of running the vehicles. Another member claimed that this method, unlike others (purchasing APU's

has greater impact on some owners and operators than others), would also help create a more level playing field among the trucking industry.

- Another member responded that he's on board for a financial program to incent idle reduction, but cautioned that current economic constraints and thin margins limit incentives, and recommended gathering further information prior to proceeding.

-Availability of Data

- A member asked about the level of information and data available on what trucking companies are currently doing to reduce idling in fleets. Another responded that lots of information is available on EPA's Smartway program, but there's not much data available outside of this program. He claimed to know of many fleets with incentive and penalty programs in place.
- One member asked about the availability of information on driver behavior. Follow-up discussion focused on governed road speeds, automatic idle shutdown technologies, and equipment to monitor/track driver behavior.

-Other

- Members asked DEQ to also consider the following points: some company's would not benefit from fuel savings because fuel charges are passed through to the client; trucks with walking floors must idle the main engine while unloading; space is tight at some loading docks, necessitating frequent movement and making engine shutdown impractical; some organizations with significant fuel consumption are not concerned with reducing idling or gaining efficiencies.

Response: Mr. Papish summarized key issues brought up during the discussion on idling and encouraged members to review DEQ's draft idling recommendations and forward additional comments on to DEQ.

Mr. Downing contacted the EPA and they indicated they don't believe they have authority to adopt a national idling law, so they promoted the Model State Idle Law for those states who could move forward with idling regulations. The EPA also indicated that, within the context of Smartway, they do not know how much idling control equipment has been installed on vehicles in the Smartway program; they don't track this data. Also, Smartway's calculations of tons of CO₂ and fuel saved are theoretical calculations based on inputs from fleet managers. Smartway connects people up and encourages changes in behavior and use of fuel efficient technologies, but they offer no inherent tracking mechanisms. In order to implement a data collection system, we should consider the need for resources at a fleet and agency level.

DEQ has the Fleet Forward Program, which acknowledges fleets for going above and beyond expectations and to differentiate themselves from other fleets.

Voluntary compliance creates a variable pattern, whereas regulation sets a bar. For example, the bottle law combines regulation and incentive (\$.05-.10 cents) for returned bottles.

Mr. Downing encouraged members to have conversations outside the study group process and to think about what a complete incentive program would look like: resources involved; where funds would come from; how we would roll out a program that makes sense and complements a regulatory program; and how this incentive program would apply to approximately 300,000 out-of state vehicles.

Oregon Heavy Duty Truck Greenhouse Gas Measure:

Mr. Downing gave a presentation (PowerPoint and handout) on DEQ's Oregon Heavy Duty Truck Greenhouse Gas Measure. He began by discussing the transportation strategies recommended by the Governor's Task Force on Global Warming and the charge of HB 2186 for DEQ to study potential requirements regarding maintenance or retrofitting of medium and heavy duty trucks to reduce aerodynamic drag and greenhouse gas emissions. He pointed out that trucking activity mirrors industrial production and provided data on the trucking industry's contribution to freight movement and emissions relative to other modes of transportation. He also highlighted the differences among truck weight classes and resulting fuel consumption. Mr. Downing wrapped up the presentation by discussing opportunities available to improve truck efficiency, current federal and state programs and Oregon's Heavy Duty Greenhouse Gas Measure: applicability, requirements, exemptions, phase-in and return on investment.

Discussion highlights:

- One member asked for information/data on fleet turnover. Other members indicated...
 - About 6.8 years, but this is likely low because some go into farm service or are sold to foreign companies.
 - New trucks accumulate more miles the first 5-7 years
 - Mileage drops precipitously when vehicles go into farm or other service
 - 87% of Isuzu trucks are still registered somewhere in U.S.
- A member asked why the measure applies to 53' trailers (boxed and refrigerated)?
Response: It mirrors California and is the major mode of freight movement.
- One member asked if DEQ had taken into account reductions in weight capacity of the tractor due to the weight of aerodynamic equipment. *Response: We could provide an exemption for added weight of aerodynamic condition.* Another member responded that weight exemptions must be approved by Congress.
- A member asked what percentage of vehicles in Oregon would be subject to California's regulations? *Response: We don't know, but will find out. California did an analysis based on the Vehicle Inventory and Use Survey (last done in 2002). This analysis is no longer being supported by the US Census Bureau making it difficult for DEQ to do a comparable analysis. DEQ staff may need to go through California data used in their rulemaking process to determine the universe of vehicles that would be subject to Oregon requirement, outside of those already subject to California's.*
- One member asked what an Oregon requirement would accomplish over and above California's accomplishments? *Response: There's substantial benefit that comes from California being a large freight center and that their rule applies to any vehicle entering the state at any time. California acknowledges that most of the greenhouse benefit they get will come from VMT outside of California.*
- A member noted that most aerodynamic equipment installed on their fleet is removed within 5-6 years due to damage; it's only removed it when it can't be repaired (dock

clearance and railroad tracks a problem). Another commented that aerodynamic equipment is not technologically advanced.

- *Response: When drafting the measure, DEQ avoided picking a technology, but envisioned a more universal plan. For example, having a 5% truck efficiency target. The challenge is identifying the most uniform method we could deploy, without creating an Oregon specific standard. We felt the simplest path is to mirror California and tweak it to make more sense, without creating an extraordinary burden to truckers or regulatory agencies.*

Regarding implementation, we're in discussions with ODOT about forming a partnership. ODOT would send information to DEQ about potentially non-compliant vehicles that haven't installed required technologies. If a fleet submits information and we don't respond within a certain period of time, they would be considered compliant; this would be checked on an occasional basis through audits. Demonstration of compliance with California requirements demonstrates compliance with Oregon as well. Enforcement would be by penalty against the owner and we need to consider the volume of trucks subject to this, as well as ways to ease compliance. This would not be a time or labor intensive program.

At the next meeting, we can walk through more process on this measure and discuss how it might roll-out. We can also discuss financing and the potential for recommendations from the group for strategies to support these kinds of efforts and how the state might help with financing assistance to truckers.

Public Comment:

Gary Gaussoin of Silver Eagle Mfg. Co.

- ROI slides: Consider using payback, 5.5 miles per gallon may be low, and add allowance for maintenance cost of aerodynamic equipment (at least 5%).
- Cost of maintenance information for aerodynamic equipment: Approximately 5-15%. There's not a lot of real-world data and estimates are only reasonable, not accurate.
- Kevin's presentation is excellent!

Conclusion:

The next meeting is on June 29th at DEQ Headquarters from 1-5 p.m. We will continue discussion on truck efficiency. If you have any materials to share with other study group members, please forward those to DEQ.