

# MSTRS Ports Workgroup

## Update for AAPA

Boston, Massachusetts

September 17, 2015



# Charge for MSTRS Ports Initiative Workgroup

- EPA asked MSTRS for recommendations on:
  - Development of an EPA-led voluntary environmental port initiative
  - How to effectively measure air quality and GHG performance of ports and/or terminals within ports
- The workgroup should consider:
  - Past MSTRS and other recommendations
  - Existing port environmental improvement programs
  - Ports in the context of the broader transportation supply chain
  - Information from EPA's Assessments as available

# **EPA Ports Workgroup - Subgroups**

- Definition/Scope
- **Federal Agency Coordination**
- **Strategies for Community-Port Engagement**
- Barriers to Technology Implementation
- **Port Inventory & Metrics**
- **Program Design/Structure**

## DEFINITION / SCOPE:

- The scope of the EPA voluntary ports initiative is maritime activities directly related to the movement of cargo, products or people including those associated with either state/local public port facilities or private terminals and federal facilities as appropriate.
- These activities include operation of vessels, cargo handling equipment, rail, truck/vehicles and storage/warehousing directly related to the transportation of maritime cargo or passengers.
- Activities can be related to infrastructure development and maintenance.

# Federal Agency Coordination

- Alignment and coordination among the many federal agencies
- Federal/State/Local/Private funding and engagement
- Variety of stakeholders recognize significant benefits achieved through DERA
- Developed summary of major port funding sources
- Next Steps
  - Guidance on coordination and leveraging
  - Primer on how to access these programs

# **Community-Port Engagement:**

## **Original themes**

- Defining the stakeholders
- Having transparency and building trust before controversy arises
- Democratizing planning
- Respecting the community's time
- Two-way dialogue

# Community-Port Engagement

- Survey of ports completed
- Coordinating with EPA's curriculum development:
  - Ports 101
  - EJ 101
  - Community Action Roadmap
- Designed to be adaptable for use by other agencies
- Next Steps
  - Sharing survey analysis
  - Developing survey to assess community perspective
  - Advising on implementation of package

# Metrics & Inventories

1. Develop **common vocabulary** and definitions related to emissions inventories and metrics. Coordinate with Definition Subgroup.
2. Develop common methodologies. Consider productivity improvements and show how we account for efficiencies.
3. Consider how **monitoring** fits in and clarify difference between monitoring and inventories and metrics.
4. Stakeholders need to be more integrated into SIP process.
5. Be mindful of inventory methods ports currently using and try to be **consistent**. Pros and cons of standardizing inventories. Remember that different types of inventories have different purposes.
6. Emissions inventories should be **useful** to the port operators, terminal operators, state air quality regulators, and communities.
7. Think about comparisons of inventories (year over year and challenges of comparing two different inventories).
8. Need to incorporate **forecasting** into inventories, which is very complicated.



# Metrics & Inventories

## Next Steps:

- Tiers of inventory types for different uses
- Communications tools for variety of stakeholders
- Recommended metrics

# Program Design

- Mission: Identify and encourage environmental improvements, dialogue and understanding in the maritime ports and their nearby and affected communities.
- Identified some building blocks
  - Identifying environmental impacts
  - Community and stakeholder impacts, education, engagement
  - Technologies
  - Voluntary
  - Reduction strategies
  - Confirm results
  - Executive buy-in
  - Tools, resources, training for achieving improvements
  - BCO leadership and buy-in
  - Systematic program assessment/update
  - Funding and resources

# Program Design Discussion:

## Membership Program

1. How can EPA add value in this space?
2. Is there interest in a “membership” program with both requirements and recognition of accomplishments (like SmartWay or Green Marine) or a focal point resource program. Pros and cons of these?
3. What benefits should there be (if membership program) see for participation? (Preference on grants? Logo use for certain accomplishments? Streamlining or coordinating funding sources and applications?)
4. How to involve all of the entities involved in ports: vessels, trucks, terminals, rail, etc.? Through the Port Authority or directly with EPA?
5. Concepts for community engagement components?

# Program Design Discussion:

## Resource Model

1. Can EPA add value by acting as a resource provider?
  - Technical assistance
  - Inventory protocols
  - Standardization of metrics and methodologies
  - Decision support tools
  - Coordinating multiple port-focused programs into one resource “center”
2. How important is EPA / other funding to air quality improvements at Ports?
  - How could existing programs be improved to achieve higher emissions reductions?

## Next Steps

- Subgroups now meeting via conference calls & webinar
- Next (in person) Work Group meeting ~ October 27-28 Chicago: includes Macro-Assessment Presentation
- On schedule for draft recommendations - Fall/Winter MSTRS

Thank you